

Proposed District Plan Change 56

**Enabling Intensification in Residential and
Commercial Areas**

**Summary of Decisions Requested
(Volume 2 of 3 – Submissions 101 to 200)**

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

DPC56/101	Colin and Margaret Clarke	9
DPC56/102	Graeme Lyon	10
DPC56/103	Roydon McLeod	11
DPC56/104	Darren Laing	12
DPC56/105	Mark Hardy.....	12
DPC56/106	Barbara Bridger.....	13
DPC56/107	Brett Tangye.....	14
DPC56/108	Vivienne Smith	14
DPC56/109	Beverley Tyler	15
DPC56/110	Greg Smith	16
DPC56/111	Ara Poutama Aotearoa - Department of Corrections	17
DPC56/112	Gary Spratt.....	20
DPC56/113	Niels Meyer-Westfeld	21
DPC56/114	Kimberley Vermacy	22
DPC56/115	Christopher MacKay	26
DPC56/116	Petone Community Board	28
DPC56/117	Russell Keenan and Karen Mooney	40
DPC56/118	Mark Blackham	41
DPC56/119	Wikitoria Love.....	42
DPC56/120	Glen Shardlow.....	43
DPC56/121	Maria Shardlow	45
DPC56/122	Russell Boaler	46
DPC56/123	Kevin Day	48
DPC56/124	Merran Bakker.....	48
DPC56/125	Benjamin Wells	49
DPC56/126	Tania Penafiel Bermudez.....	50
DPC56/127	Spencer and Tracey Joe	51
DPC56/128	Sam Lister	51
DPC56/129	Robert Brathwaite	52
DPC56/130	Dwayne McDonald	53
DPC56/131	Marianne Linton	53
DPC56/132	Pam Roberts	54
DPC56/133	Graeme Silcock.....	55
DPC56/134	Keith Fraser.....	55
DPC56/135	Martyn Becker	57
DPC56/136	Woolworths New Zealand Ltd	57
DPC56/137	Dennis Palmer.....	58
DPC56/138	Sonja Penafiel Bermudez	59

DPC56/139	Bjorn Johns	60
DPC56/140	Peter Ricketts	61
DPC56/141	Alan Bell	61
DPC56/142	Allison Thwaite	62
DPC56/143	Sheree Freeman	63
DPC56/144	Lily Moran.....	64
DPC56/145	Meng Xu.....	65
DPC56/146	Sharon Hardy	66
DPC56/147	Jonathon Devonshire	66
DPC56/148	Korokoro Environmental Group	67
DPC56/149	Wellington Regional Council	67
DPC56/150	Annette Paterson	104
DPC56/151	New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	105
DPC56/152	Marcel Podstolski.....	118
DPC56/153	Transpower New Zealand Ltd.....	119
DPC56/154	Ruth Gilbert and Terry Pinfold	125
DPC56/155	Andrea Collings.....	127
DPC56/156	Noel Rostron	128
DPC56/157	Hutt Voluntary Heritage Group.....	128
DPC56/158	Wellington Electricity Lines Ltd	129
DPC56/159	Alan Smith.....	131
DPC56/160	Rebecca Leask and Mike Stewart	131
DPC56/161	Michael Basil-Jones	132
DPC56/162	Design Network Architecture Ltd	133
DPC56/163	Petone Historical Society	135
DPC56/164	Kathryn MacKay.....	147
DPC56/165	Anne Tindle	147
DPC56/166	Fiona Christeller	148
DPC56/167	Dawn Becker.....	150
DPC56/168	Sylvia and Bill Allan.....	151
DPC56/169	Hayley Bird.....	153
DPC56/170	Anthony Phillip Dee Smith	153
DPC56/171	Maria Biedermann.....	154
DPC56/172	Sarah Poole	155
DPC56/173	Megan Drayton.....	156
DPC56/174	Laura Gaudin	157
DPC56/175	Brain Boyer	158
DPC56/176	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	159
DPC56/177	Nick Beswick	188
DPC56/178	Design Network Architecture Ltd	189
DPC56/179	Oyster Management Ltd	190

DPC56/180	EQC (Toka Tū Ake)	197
DPC56/181	Paul Rowan.....	200
DPC56/182	Blair Bennett.....	201
DPC56/183	Donna Tairua	201
DPC56/184	Anna Williams	202
DPC56/185	Chris Cornford.....	203
DPC56/186	Rachel Inglis.....	204
DPC56/187	M Playford	204
DPC56/188	KiwiRail	206
DPC56/189	Argosy Property No. 1 Ltd.....	215
DPC56/190	Stephen Taylor.....	218
DPC56/191	Ian Cassidy – IPC Family Trust	219
DPC56/192	Bryan Gillies	221
DPC56/193	Lesley Haines.....	222
DPC56/194	Clifford George.....	223
DPC56/195	Anne Smith.....	224
DPC56/196	Robert and Marie Whitney	226
DPC56/197	Theresa Cooper	228
DPC56/198	Les Jones.....	228
DPC56/199	Justin Cargill.....	229
DPC56/200	Stephen Prebble	231

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.

DPC56/101 Colin and Margaret Clarke				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
101.1	Building height	Amend	Withdraw the height provisions for residential dwellings in Lower Hutt, restricting this development to the Central Business District.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of more than 2 storeys in residential areas is out of character with the district (with the exception of the Central Business District area). • Proceeding with these density provisions will negatively impact the quality of life of many residents living in these zones. • Expecting new residents to not have private vehicles is not realistic, and in many residential areas there is already significant pressure on street parking. This is limiting the safety and useability of this space for pedestrians, especially in zones close to schools. • Reduction of flora and fauna within the city boundaries and reduction in sunlight will have a detrimental impact on quality of life and the health of residents. • Increase in stormwater run-off due to reduction of grass and garden areas. Increase in roof and concrete will put an additional strain on the already overloaded stormwater and flood system.
101.2	-	New provision requested	Create 'special character areas' and specific 'special character properties'.	
101.3	-	New provision requested	Preserve all trees and shrubs of 3m high on a section that is either being re-developed by removing dwellings, or having dwelling added, and any trees or shrubs of 2m high within 2m of the boundary of such properties.	

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
102.1	Heritage	Amend	Confirm heritage categories on the Petone Commercial Area and the Petone Foreshore Heritage Area, perhaps extending it to Queen, Beach, and Bay Streets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the proposals for changes that the Voluntary Heritage Group are promoting. It is a view which serves themselves but not the community or neighbourhood. The proposed protection of heritage areas, rather than forcing stagnation as that group label it, will prevent out of character development. Voluntary heritage classification does not make sense as there would be no continuity. • There are examples in Petone of inappropriate and out-of-character buildings. Zoning as heritage will still allow development, but with permission which requires it to suit the surrounding environment. • Heritage zoning will prevent the development of 3 storeys, which is inappropriate in this environment. • On Bolton Street, infill of extra units has been permitted. This does not detract from the character of the street, except for the undesirable aspect of not requiring off-street parking. • Further intensification will not be completely prevented, but will be more in character. • The Foreshore Zone is of significant value to the community.
102.2	Open space	Amend	The quality of open space should be more generous and more defined (for example, in Amendments 53, 77, 84, 105, 153).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intensification should only be permitted if there is adequate open space for the dwelling's occupants.
102.3	Landscaping	Amend	The quality of outdoor and landscaping requirements should be more generous and more defined (for example, in Amendments 53, 77, 84, 105, 153).	-
102.4	Vegetation	Amend	Indigenous vegetation should be retained (Amendment 103).	-

102.5	Density	Amend	Intensification should be restricted to suitable areas, not blanket zoning.	-
102.6	Natural hazards	Amend	In vulnerable areas, such as Petone and other low areas, that are subject to the overlays of either tsunami inundation, flood hazard inundation, or coastal hazard inundation overlays, the rules should require high buildings to be excluded from intensification. Maximum building heights should be not more than 8m.	-

DPC56/103 Roydon McLeod				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
103.1	General	Amend	That the reasons given in the submission are treated as "qualifying matters" that permit the Council to change the proposed zoning and limit the rules.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal has not adequately considered natural hazard risks for the scale of development enabled by the proposal (earthquake, slip, severe weather, flooding). • Slope gradients in the Harbour View and Tirohanga area are severe. Slips are common, and recently have blocked roads, disrupted traffic, and caused property damage.
103.2	Maps	Amend	Remove the high density zoning classification from the Harbour View and Tirohanga residential areas, and re-zone them medium density residential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local roading is fragile and cannot support the traffic volumes that the proposal would enable. • Buildings as permitted without Hutt City Council consents and controls increases risks to all residents should those buildings or supporting ground fail. • The 1.2km "walking distance" is arbitrary, acceptable on flat terrain, achievable by some in Harbour View and Tirohanga, but denied to many residents with poor mobility. There is no public transport in Harbour View. The Melling Link and rail reconstruction will move the railway station South making a walk to the new station unachievable for most residents.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic volumes will increase the carbon footprint.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/104 Darren Laing				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
104.1	Plan change as a whole	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of property owners in the Hutt Valley have had enough of the high density being built. Government and Hutt City Council will be liable for any costs associated with loss of value to private property or any legal cost/actions taken by ratepayers or property owners.
104.2	Development in general	Oppose	Either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Immediately stop any further development in residential areas of Lower Hutt; or Allow full compensation, payable by Government or Hutt City Council, to owners of properties who will incur the costs of the proposed plan change. 	

DPC56/105 Mark Hardy				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
105.1	Heritage	Oppose	Amend the plan change to include the following statement:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Against Hutt City Council listing private property as heritage without homeowner's consent.

			<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"> • Heritage status imposes restrictions on what homeowners can and cannot do with their property. Hutt City Council approval and consents are expensive. • Some houses are in need of repair, and some need to be demolished for the health and safety of those living there and the community (main structure, floor, and rafters with borer). Homeowners cannot afford the legal fees which would now be attached to these activities. • To rebuild a house in the heritage precinct would be very restrictive – size and building type – making the project much more expensive than in a non-heritage area. • Houses included in the heritage precinct were built in 1980. • If this proposal gets accepted it leaves other areas open to being changed to the same Heritage restrictions at a later date. • Buildings next to Heritage sites can build 5-6 storeys without consents, taking away privacy and sunlight. However, heritage buildings are not allowed to build additions up or sideways from the original plan to protect their privacy without expensive consents. • Classification of a personal property as heritage should only happen with the written consent of the property owner.
--	--	--	---	---

DPC56/106 Barbara Bridger				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
106.1	Maps	Amend	Modify the proposed plan change to have less Medium and High Density Residential Activity Areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provisions apply to too great an area of the Lower Hutt region and residential space. • Developments of three storeys and three units per site will change the environment around them. Lack of sunlight,
106.2	Density	Amend	Make provision for low density residential areas.	

106.3	Whole plan change	Oppose	[Alternatively] the council to follow the lead of Christchurch City and reject the implementation of the Government's housing density legislation.	<p>privacy, and garden space, along with the creation of wind tunnels are some concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 storey developments will have more impacts than 3 storey. • Concerns regarding infrastructure. Roading, public transport etc. need improving. Climate change concerns with more people and more growth. • Lower Hutt already has traffic choke points, with many streets effectively becoming one way at certain times of the day. • Submitter would like to some residential areas in Lower Hutt designated as low density residential. Alternatively, follow the lead of Christchurch City Council and not implement density legislation.
-------	-------------------	--------	--	---

DPC56/107 Brett Tangye				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
107.1	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>	-

DPC56/108 Vivienne Smith				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
108.1	Building height	Amend	Limit building heights to two storeys.	

108.2	Site coverage	Support (HDRAA and MDRAA), Amend (other) (inferred)	Limit site coverage to 50% of site area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding peoples mental and physical health if the proposed provisions go through. Concerns regarding privacy, sunlight, section enjoyment, financial security, property values. Protect and enhance the local neighbourhood, not destroy what has already been established. Maintain the amenity of the current environment, which mostly consists of single storey homes.
108.3	Yards	Amend	Minimum side yards of 1.5m.	
108.4	Yards	Amend	Minimum front yards of 5m (to allow for off street parking).	
108.5	Height in relation to boundary	Amend	Height control planes of 3m on boundary then 45 degrees, to a maximum building height of 9m.	
108.6	Yards	Amend	Minimum rear yards of 3m (to allow for outdoor service areas).	
108.7	Carparking	Requests new provision	Provision of a 5m x 3m carpark on site for each unit on the site.	
108.8	Site area	Requests new provision	Minimum site area of 300m ² per unit.	

DPC56/109 Beverley Tyler				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
109.1	Whole plan change	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts on privacy, Impacts on access to sunlight, including impacts on warmth of their home, Impacts on gardens, Impacts on outdoor living spaces,

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on families, which would move away to more spacious homes in other areas and use cars to access the Central Business District. • Six storey apartments belong in the Central Business District, not in residential areas.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/110 Greg Smith				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
110.1	Building height	Amend	Limit building heights to two storeys.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns regarding peoples mental and physical health if the proposed provisions go through. • Concerns regarding privacy, sunlight, section enjoyment, financial security, property values. • Protect and enhance the local neighbourhood, not destroy what has already been established. • Maintain the amenity of the current environment, which mostly consists of single storey homes.
110.2	Site coverage	Support (HDRAA and MDRAA), Amend (other) (inferred)	Limit site coverage to 50% of site area.	
110.3	Yards	Amend	Minimum side yards of 1.5m.	
110.4	Yards	Amend	Minimum front yards of 5m (to allow for off street parking).	
110.5	Height in relation to boundary	Amend	Height control planes of 3m on boundary then 45 degrees, to a maximum building height of 9m.	
110.6	Yards	Amend	Minimum rear yards of 3m (to allow for outdoor service areas).	
110.7	Carparking	Requests new provision	Provision of a 5mx3m carpark on site for each unit on the site.	

110.8	Site area	Requests new provision	Minimum site area of 300m ² per unit.	
-------	-----------	------------------------	--	--

DPC56/111 Ara Poutama Aotearoa - Department of Corrections				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
111.1	Chapter 3 – Definitions	Requests new provision	<p>Add the following definition of “Community Corrections Activity”:</p> <p><i>Community Corrections Activity: means the use of land and buildings for non-custodial services for safety, welfare and community purposes, including probation, rehabilitation and reintegration services, assessments, reporting, workshops and programmes, administration, and a meeting point for community works groups.</i></p>	<p>Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They build strong and resilient communities and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>Intensification and population growth in urban areas creates more demand for these types of facilities. Specifically with the higher population, the proportion of those people needing community corrections services will correspondingly increase. It is therefore important that provision is made to enable non-custodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas.</p>
111.2	Chapter 3 – Definitions	Requests new provision	<p>Add the following definition of Residential Activity”:</p> <p><i>Residential Activity: means the use of land and building(s) for people’s living accommodation.</i></p>	<p>The new definition would be consistent with the National Planning Standard definition.</p> <p>The National Planning Standards includes a definition for “residential activity” that must be used when a local authority includes a definition for such in its plan. The current definition of “residential activity” in the HCDP is inconsistent with the National Planning Standard definition.</p>
111.3	Amendment 41 Chapter 3 – Definitions	Support	Retain the proposed definition of “Residential Unit”.	The definition is consistent with the wording provided for in the National Planning Standards.

111.4	Chapter 3 – Definitions	Request new provision	<p>Add the following definition of “Household”:</p> <p><u><i>Household: means a person or group of people who live together as a unit whether or not:</i></u></p> <p><u><i>a. any or all of them are members of the same family; or</i></u></p> <p><u><i>b. one or more members of the group (whether or not they are paid) provides day-to-day care, support and supervision to any other member(s) of the group.</i></u></p>	<p>The National Planning Standards includes a definition for “Residential Unit” that must be used when a local authority includes a definition for such in its plan. Plan Change 56 proposes the inclusion of such a definition.</p> <p>However, the definition of “Residential Unit” (and the current definition of “Dwelling” in the HCDP) refers to a “Household” which is not defined in the HCDP, nor Plan Change 56. Ara Poutama seeks that a new definition be added, to clarify that a household is not necessarily limited to a family unit or a flatting arrangement (which are more commonly perceived household situations).</p>
111.5	Amendment 56 Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Area – Objective 4F2.3	Amend	<p>Amend Objective 4F 2.3 as follows:</p> <p><u><i>The Medium Density Residential Activity Area provides for a variety of housing types, households, and sizes that respond to:</i></u></p> <p><u><i>1. Housing needs and demands; and</i></u></p> <p><u><i>2. The neighbourhood’s planned urban built character, including three-storey buildings.</i></u></p>	<p>Ara Poutama requests Objective 4F 2.3 is retained but amended so that a variety of household types that meet the community’s diverse social and economic housing needs are provided for in residential zones, including households that involve an element of supervision, assistance, care and/or treatment support.</p> <p>Providing for a range of residential activities with support in residential zones is important to meet community needs, build strong and resilient communities, and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA and give effect to the NPS-UD.</p>
111.6	Amendment 61 Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Area – Policy 4F3.2	Amend	<p>Amend Policy 4F 3.2 as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Enable a variety of housing types and households with a mix of densities within the Medium Density Residential Activity Area, including three-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments.</i></u></p>	<p>Ara Poutama requests Policy 4F 3.2 is retained but amended so that a variety of household types that meet the community’s diverse social and economic housing needs are provided for in residential zones, including households that involve an element of supervision, assistance, care and/or treatment support.</p> <p>Providing for a range of residential activities with support in residential zones is important to meet community needs, build strong and resilient communities, and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA and give effect to the NPS-UD.</p>
111.7	Amendment 109	Amend	<p>Amend Objective 4G 2.3 as follows:</p>	<p>Ara Poutama requests Objective 4G 2.3 is retained but amended so that a variety of household types that meet the community’s</p>

	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Area – Objective 4G2.3		<p><u><i>The High Density Residential Activity Area provides for a variety of housing types, households, and sizes that respond to:</i></u></p> <p><u><i>1. Housing needs and demands; and</i></u></p> <p><u><i>2. The neighbourhood’s planned urban built character, including six storey buildings.</i></u></p>	<p>diverse social and economic housing needs are provided for in residential zones, including households that involve an element of supervision, assistance, care and/or treatment support.</p> <p>Providing for a range of residential activities with support in residential zones is important to meet community needs, build strong and resilient communities, and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA and give effect to the NPS-UD.</p>
111.8	Amendment 117 Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Area – Policy 4G3.2	Amend	<p>Amend Policy 4G3.2 as follows:</p> <p><i>Enable a variety of housing types <u>and households</u> with a mix of densities within the High Density Residential Activity Area, including three-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments.</i></p>	<p>Ara Poutama requests Policy 4F 3.2 is retained but amended so that a variety of household types that meet the community’s diverse social and economic housing needs are provided for in residential zones, including households that involve an element of supervision, assistance, care and/or treatment support.</p> <p>Providing for a range of residential activities with support in residential zones is important to meet community needs, build strong and resilient communities, and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA and give effect to the NPS-UD.</p>
111.9	Chapter 5 – Commercial	Amend	Amend Objective and Policy 5B 1.1.2A to enable Community Corrections Activities.	Ara Poutama requests the amendment of the objectives, policies, and rules for the Central Commercial Activity Area, Petone Commercial Activity Area - Area 2, and Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area to enable “Community Corrections Activity” as a permitted activity. Ara Poutama’s existing community corrections site in Hutt City is located in the Central Commercial Activity Area.
111.10	Chapter 5 – Commercial	Request new provisions	Amend the rules in the Central Commercial, Petone Commercial and Suburban Mixed Use Activity Areas to enable Community Corrections Activities as permitted activities.	Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They build strong and resilient communities and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA. Intensification and population growth in urban areas creates more demand for these types of facilities, specifically the higher population the perceptible of those people needing community corrections services will correspondingly increase. It is important that provision is made to enable non-custodial community

				corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas.
111.11	Chapter 6A – General Business Activity Area	Oppose	Amend Objective and Policy 6A 1.1.1 to enable Community Corrections Activities.	<p>Ara Poutama requests the amendment of the objectives, policies, and rules for the General Business Activity Area to enable “Community Corrections Activity” as a permitted activity. Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They build strong and resilient communities and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>Intensification and population growth in urban areas creates more demand for these types of facilities. Specifically with the higher population, the proportion of those people needing community corrections services will correspondingly increase. It is therefore important that provision is made to enable non-custodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas.</p>
111.12	Chapter 6A – General Business Activity Area	Oppose	Amend the rules of the General Business Activity Area to enable Community Corrections Activity as a permitted activity.	

DPC56/112 Gary Spratt				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter’s reasons for decision requested
112.1	Building height Density	Oppose	No specific decision requested, but opposes the proposed plan change in general.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on carparking, • The potential impact of cycle lanes, • Impacts on privacy, • Impacts on access to sunlight, • Impacts on values of existing properties, • The number of bins on pavements in Central Hutt and the difficulty of collecting them, • Lack of support for taller and denser housing.

DPC56/113 Niels Meyer-Westfeld				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
113.1	Whole plan change	Oppose	Hutt City Council should follow the lead of Christchurch City Council with regard to intensification provisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local government should govern local issues and not be overwritten by government. Should rethink the strategy of solving the housing crisis. Eastbourne/Eastern Suburbs/Lowry Bay is not suitable for intensification. Concern that intensification will not solve the housing problem. Existing infrastructure is inadequate, infrastructure will place and additional strain on this. Maintenance costs are already substantial and will only get worse. Even though more people will generate more rates revenue - necessary spending due to infrastructure upgrades (bigger schools, more carparks, roads, hill landscaping, bus-stops etc.) will increase accordingly. Risk that not much would be gained. Intensification will result in loss of amenity values and environmental depletion. Negative impact on the spirit of this intact community. A survey is not required to know that nobody wants to live next to a 12m high building. There are only a few areas in New Zealand where beech forest is so close to the waters edge. The natural heritage of this area needs protection from development. 3 dwellings on one section will result in a significant reduction of trees, increasing erosion and carbon in this area. More people working at home since COVID, which justifies more greenfield development further away from the Central
113.2	Density	Oppose	Exempt Eastbourne from the intensification provisions.	
113.3	Whole plan change	Oppose	Reconsider the intensification strategy, and seek a way forward which is more environmentally friendly, preserves trees, and the character of Eastbourne.	

				<p>Business District of Wellington. However, there are more suitable and accessible areas than Eastbourne.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New development areas will have associated start up costs to establish the necessary infrastructure. New locations could avoid the long term burden of high maintenance costs and constantly increasing rates due to climate change.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/114 Kimberley Vermacy				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
114.1	Flood Hazard	Amend	Amend the provisions so no resource consent is required where building are located within flood depths of 0.5m. For floodwater depths 0.5m or greater, resource consent is needed as proposed, with displacement effects considered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant area of flood hazard overlays within Hutt City. • The proposed approach does not recognise the nuance in flood depths, and as such could result in off-site effects to neighbouring properties from flood water displacement. • There will be some areas of greater water depth within the Hutt where there may be displacement effects. • Instead of all buildings being permitted, a threshold should apply. • Better alignment between the proposed policy and the rule framework pertaining to the inundation area.
114.2	Fault Lines	Amend	<p>In areas where there is a good understanding of the fault hazard location, more restrictive policies and rules (such as an avoid policy and non-complying activity status for new buildings, additions, and conversions).</p> <p>Where there is a poorer understanding of the fault location, then less restrictive policies and rules should apply (a policy framework that requires the identification of the position of the fault and a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the fault hazard overlays there are areas where the fault is well understood and well-defined. There are also areas where understanding is low and as such the fault bands are very wide. • Policy frameworks for fault hazards need to reflect this differing understanding in the overlays. • Would provide greater clarity and certainty to future applicants around the construction of buildings (including the conversion of buildings) within the Wellington Fault Overlay.

			corresponding permitted, controlled, or restricted discretionary activity status).	
114.3	Natural Hazard	Not stated	No specific decision requested by submitter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the natural hazard and coastal hazard overlays do not address alterations to existing buildings. • There is potential for alterations to increase the risk from the conversion of non-habitable buildings. There needs to be consideration as to whether it is appropriate for conversions to existing buildings to be covered. This is to ensure the rule frameworks are consistent with the additions framework.
114.4	Coastal Hazard	Amend	<p>Refine the policy and rule frameworks to recognise different inundation depths, which may have some implications on the hazard classification frameworks.</p> <p>Alternatively, hazard map overlays could be adjusted to remove inundation depths below a certain level as they do not warrant land use planning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current coastal hazard framework does not give any consideration to the inundation depths. As a result, areas with 2m of coastal hazard inundation depth would be treated the same as areas with 0.1m of coastal hazard inundation depth. • Expert advice may be required, to determine the most appropriate depth. As a suggestion, it could be 0.15m and less. • This may also apply to flood hazard inundation.
114.5	Coastal Hazard	Amend	Allow only one residential unit in High Hazard Areas, aligning with the NZCPS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a disconnect between the High Coastal Hazard Area and the NZCPS with allowing for 2 residential units to be constructed. This allows for an increase in risk. • Aligning with the NZCPS would also align with the approach to the Wellington Fault and Stream Corridor, which are also high hazard areas.
114.6	Subdivision	Amend	Better alignment of the objectives, policies, and rules pertaining to the subdivision with the land use provisions. This may require a reworking of the subdivision provisions to ensure this alignment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a disconnect between the subdivision chapter and the proposed land use provisions. • The subdivision provisions tend to be less restrictive (Discretionary activity) for subdivision in High Hazard Areas. The land use consent may be a non-complying activity (it is also noted that there is no subdivision rule pertaining to stream corridors).

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without revision of the proposed provisions, there are potential loopholes in the subdivision chapter that would allow for an increase in risk. These comments are equally applicable to low and medium hazard areas (including coastal hazard areas), and all subdivision provisions that apply to these areas may need to be reworked to ensure better alignment with the land use rules.
114.7	Coastal Hazard	Amend	Review Coastal Inundation Mapping.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Coastal Inundation Mapping is very extensive for the Hutt Valley. This model behind this map may need further review as the sea ward extents of this inundation seems a bit disconnected between what Eastbourne will experience and what the Valley Floor experiences.
114.8	Subdivision	Amend	Subdivision objectives, policies, and rules should be updated to reflect the use of the Wellington Water Standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing subdivision objectives, policies, and rules do not reflect the Wellington Regional Water Services and Standards. There is an inherent conflict between the current practice and the District Plan. Given the MDRS will place more demands on services, this seems the appropriate time to undertake this update. This will result in a complete rewrite of the subdivision provisions.
114.9	Density	Amend	The stormwater tank provisions in the Medium Density and High Density residential zones should be updated to exempt these structures from the yard requirements of the District Plan and to also identify the other Wellington Water Acceptable Solutions that exist.	-
114.10	Heritage	New provision requested	Require resource consent for the removal of the residential unit which make up the heritage value of the site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The residential heritage precinct allows for the demolition of buildings, which undermines the purpose of protecting heritage.

114.11	Density	Amend	The underlying zoning should reflect the actual development potential, and if this potential is being significantly limited by an overlay, then this overlay should be down zoned.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are several areas where the zone allows for high density residential development, but an overlay would prevent it (High Hazard Areas and Heritage Areas). • Require an update to the District Plan maps to ensure that areas where this conflict occurs is resolved.
114.12	Design Guide	Amend	Update the Hutt City Design Guide to reference apartments and higher density development. This may result in changes to the relevant matters of discretion for the bulk and form policies and rules within the Medium and High Density Residential Zones, to reflect any amended design guide headings that may be applicable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Design Guide does not really reference apartments and the higher density development envisioned in the residential zones. • This should be updated to ensure that good environmental and urban design outcomes are met.
114.13	Design Guide	Amend	The landscaping pallet in the design guide should better reflect biodiversity needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would be consistent with the proposed RPS policy position around biodiversity in urban environments.
114.14	Design Guide	Amend	There should be better reference in the design guide to developments reflecting the natural landform and features of a site, and how to retain and improve these as part of future development. These would include hillsides, stream edges, prominent vegetation, or any other relevant natural features.	-
114.15	Density	New provision requested	A maximum fence height of 1.8m on the side boundary and 1.5m on the front boundary would be appropriate. The 1.5m fence height on the front boundary should also have a permeability requirement of either 25% or 50% to ensure the passive surveillance outcome sought through the glazing rule is achieved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no clear rule framework around fences. Given the need for better urban design outcomes, there is a case for fence heights in the Medium and High Density Residential Zones to be further controlled.
114.16	Density	New provision requested	Bring the vegetation rule in the Medium Density Residential Zone through to the High Density Residential Zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that there is some consideration of the removal of prominent native vegetation from urban environments. Such a rule would also provide support to a design guide change to better reflect natural landforms and features.

			Limit development around stream edges. Set explicit setback distances.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow for better environmental outcomes that align with the Regional Policy Statement and Proposed Natural Resources Plan. • These include improved water quality, riparian margins, cultural outcomes, and conveyancing of flood flows. The Enabling and Housing Bill would allow for these setbacks to be introduced as a qualifying matter. • This change would require objective, policy, and changes to the Medium Density and High Density Residential Zones as well as the commercial zones.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/115 Christopher MacKay				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
115.1	Heritage	Oppose	Require agreement from homeowners before designating as heritage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage areas will restrict development.
115.2	Whole plan change	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the city is within 800m of a rail or transport hub or within 1200m of the Central Business District. The proposed change means that almost all the valley floor will be zoned "High Density". • High density development will hasten the demise of green suburbs and the bird life it sustains. Woburn and Boulcott have special value and significance, with an abundance of mature trees and shrubs which assist with climate change mitigation and maintain birdlife. • Some advocates of high density development have cited cities such as London as examples of how well intensification can work. It is important to note that London is made up of 40% green space, including 3000 parks totalling 35,000
115.3	Residential	Oppose	Reinstate the previous special residential areas of Woburn and Boulcott.	
115.4	Density	Oppose	Hutt City Council should not continue with the proposed intensification mandate of 3x3 development or houses up to 6 stories high.	
115.5	Car parking	Oppose	Require that any new builds have at least one car park per dwelling.	
115.6	General	Oppose	Explore other ways to increase housing supply. For example, lifestyle blocks (of several to many	

			acres in size) on the Western Hills and in Wainuiomata could be rezoned from rural to residential.	acres, for residents use. Hutt City does not have this much green space.
115.7	Density	Oppose	Return to the previous zones and district plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Off-street parking is still required, as people need their cars to take kids to sporting games and visit people in retirement villages. • Intensification will result in no recreation areas for kids to play in. Even a modest front or back yard provides space to kick a ball in, bike, or trampoline. • Overseas COVID death rates were lower in areas which had access to outdoor green spaces. • Existing intensification in Hutt City has resulted in removal of trees and shrubs, exacerbating the carbon crisis and removing green corridors for native birds. • The proposed amount of outdoor space is only big enough for a rubbish bin and some artificial grass. • Intensification will put a strain on the stormwater system, as rainwater cannot be soaked through the garden and lawn. In some areas this will also put additional strain on the Opahu Stream, increasing risk of flooding to the houses located nearby. • Poorly drained fine-grained soils such as sandy, silty, and gravelly soils are the most susceptible to liquefaction. • Multi storey buildings would require extra-long piles to provide stable foundations. The potential danger of developers puncturing the aquifer is too great a risk and would compromise Wellington Region's water supply. • Concerns regarding shading if high density development was constructed next door. Invasion of privacy and loss of enjoyment of life.

DPC56/116 Petone Community Board				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
116.1	Amendment 4 [Chapter 1 (1.10.1A Urban Environment)] Policy 1 (i), (ii),(iv) and (v)	Oppose	All of Petone and Moera be made four storeys in height, with anything higher only possible in walkable catchments from the railway stations	Petone Commercial Area 1 is mainly the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct and any associated sites should also be a part of the Precinct. Moera is also very prone to flooding and other hazards and six storey buildings should not be contemplated there
116.2	Amendment 5 Chapter 1 (1.10.1A Urban Environment)] Policy 2(b),	Partially support	<p>Amend Policy 2 as follows:</p> <p><u>The building heights and density of urban form in Policy 1 are modified only to the extent necessary to provide for the following qualifying matters:</u></p> <p><u>(a) recognize and provide for the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga,</u></p> <p><u>(b) recognize and provide for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate demolition, subdivision, use, and development,</u></p> <p><u>(c) recognize and provide for the management of significant risks from natural hazards,</u></p> <p><u>(d) ensure the safe and efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure,</u></p> <p><u>(e) protect the purpose of open space provided for public use, but only in relation to land that is open space,</u></p> <p><u>(f) give effect to a designation or heritage order, but only in relation to the land that is subject to the designation or heritage order.</u></p>	For the protection of historic heritage demolition needs to be included in (b)

116.3	Amendment 5 [Chapter 1 (1.10.1A Urban Environment)] Add new Policy 2	Oppose in part	<p>Amend Policy 2 as follows:</p> <p><u>The building heights and density of urban form in Policy 1 are modified only to the extent necessary to provide for the following qualifying matters:</u></p> <p><u>(a) recognize and provide for the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga,</u></p> <p><u>(b) recognize and provide for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development,</u></p> <p><u>(c) recognize and provide for the management of avoid significant risks from natural hazards,</u></p> <p><u>(d) ensure the safe and efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure,</u></p> <p><u>(e) protect the purpose of open space provided for public use, but only in relation to land that is open space,</u></p> <p><u>(f) give effect to a designation or heritage order, but only in relation to the land that is subject to the designation or heritage order.</u></p>	Having “Recognise and provide for the management of significant risks from natural hazard” as a policy is the crux of the problem. The NZ Coastal Policy Statement (CPS) expects in Policy 25 councils to “avoid redevelopment, or change in land use, that would increase the risk of adverse effects from coastal hazards”
116.4	Amendment 13 Chapter1 (1.10.2 Amenity Values)] Explanation and Reasons–Medium Density Residential Activity Area, Maps	Partially support	Include most of Petone and Moera in the Medium Density Activity Area	Requirements of the national Policy Statement (NPS) are stated but most of Petone and Moera need to also be in the medium density Residential Activity Area because of the prevalence of heritage and hazards in these two areas
116.5	Amendment16 Chapter1 (1.10.2 Amenity Values)] Explanation and	Partially support	Reference to “Petone metropolitan centre” is deleted	Requirements of the NPS are stated but reference to “Petone metropolitan centre” needs to be deleted because of the prevalence of heritage and hazards in the Petone area.

	Reasons–High Density Residential Activity Area			
116.6	Amendment 25 Chapter 1 (1.10.4 Commercial Activity)] Policy (b)	Oppose	Delete reference to Petone Area commercial centres	The Petone Area 1 should be seen as and called a heritage area (Jackson Street) and a Petone mixed use area (Current Petone Commercial Area 2). Big box development is the predominant current use of Petone Area 2 but there are also big box developments in Wellington and Porirua, and Petone has nothing commercial that compares with Queensgate.
116.7	Amendment 26 Chapter 1 (1.10.4 Commercial Activity)] Explanation and reasons	Oppose	Delete reference to Petone Area and concentrate on the Central Area as the primary centre.	Petone should not be seen as one of two primary centres. Petone’s commercial role and function should be seen as that of a heritage area and a mixed use area that has potential beyond the current big box developments which are often not considered where you should shop local by residents.
116.8	Amendment 27 Chapter 1 (1.10.10 Heritage)] Policy (c)	Oppose	Replace discourage with prevent	Areas of significant historic heritage value, as a S6 matter, need to have incompatible development prevented rather than discouraged.
116.9	Amendment 31 [Chapter 1 (1.10.11 Lessening Natural Hazards)] Amend Explanation and Reasons – Flood Hazard Flood Hazard	Oppose in part	Delete ‘may be’ and replace with ‘is’	In the Inundation Overlay area it is necessary to mitigate the impacts of flooding.
116.10	Amendment 32 [Chapter 1 (1.10.11 Lessening Natural	Support in part	Ensure that safe evacuation is seen as a limitation in the hazard areas	It is stated: It is necessary to manage development in medium and High Coastal hazard Areas to ensure ...that occupants can safely evacuate from the coastal hazard. Dr William Power, a tsunami modeller at GNS science has already done modelling

	Hazards)] Amend Explanation and Reasons – Flood Hazard Coastal Hazard			that shows that there are evacuation bottlenecks in Petone so it is imperative that new development is limited in any Coastal Hazard areas in Petone.
116.11	Amendment 48 and 49 [Chapter 4 Residential] (f) and (g)	Oppose	In (f) replace significant with large and ensure that significant is included in (g)	f) states that the proposed Medium Density Residential Activity Area covers a significant portion of Lower Hutt's residential areas when in fact this is the case for the High Density Residential Activity Area
116.12	Amendment 53 [Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area] 4F 1 Introduction	Oppose in part	Replace significant with large and ensure that significant is included in the equivalent section for High Density	This Introduction/Zone statement again states that the proposed Medium Density Residential Activity Area covers a significant portion of Lower Hutt's residential areas when in fact this is the case for the High Density Residential Activity Area
116.13	Amendment 54 Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Objectives) Objective 4F 2. 1AA	Support in part	Ensure that the words in this objective could be actualised.	A well functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future is the objective. People's health and safety will be jeopardised by more than 3 or 4 storeys in Petone and Moera because of their hazards status plus the lack of sunlight that 6 or more storeys will cause
116.14	Amendment 58 and 62 Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Objectives) Objective 4F 2.5 and Policy 4F 3.2A	Support in part	Add a definition of high quality	We would like to totally support the possibility of 'high quality' built development and are just not sure what is meant by the term

116.15	Amendment 76 [Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules)] Rule 4F 4.1.11 (c) (inferred)	Oppose	Delete Rule 4F 1.11 (c)	The removal of trees on an Urban Environment Allotment as a permitted activity means that Petone and Moera could be devoid of already scarce trees and what is called vegetation.
116.16	Amendment 78 [Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules)] Rule 4F 4.2.1 (b)	Support	Keep Rule 4F 4.2.1 (b) as is	It is very important that the building coverage is 50% and that anything over that is a restricted discretionary activity. This is particularly important in Petone and Moera with the historically small sites.
116.17	Amendment 79 and Amendment 80 [Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules)] Rule 4F 4.2.2 (b) (ii) and (iii) and 4.2.3 (b) (ii) and (iv)	Support	Keep the identified parts of Amendments 79 and 80 in the Plan Change	The impacts of shading on primary internal and external living areas plus public open space can have a major negative effect on people's health and wellbeing
116.18	Amendment 82 [Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules)] Rule 4F 4.2.4A (a)	Amend (inferred)	Include this maximum height in relation to boundary of 2.5m+45 degrees to marae and also to sites abutting the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.	It is important that sites of significance such as Marae have a reasonable boundary recession plane. The same recession plane needs to be applied to sites abutting the Jackson Street Heritage precinct.
116.19	Amendment 84 [Chapter 4F Medium Density	Support	Retain Rule 4F 4.2.6 (a) Outdoor Living	Each residential unit having a required or minimum outdoor space is vital for health and wellbeing

	Residential Activity Area (Rules)] Rule 4F 4.2.6 (a) Outdoor Living Space			
116.20	Amendment 88 Rule 4F 4.2.11 Outlook Space (a) and (b)	Support	Retain Rule 4F 4.2.11 Outlook Space (a) and (b)	Again such a density standard is very important to provide the best possible living conditions
116.21	Amendment 89 Rule 4F 4.2.12 Windows to Street	Support	Retain Rule 4F 4.2.12 Windows to Street	A minimum of 20% of the street facing façade is important
116.22	Amendment 90 Rule 4F 4.2.13 Landscaped Area	Support	Retain Rule 4F 4.2.13 Landscaped Area	Landscaping of at least 20% needs to be a given to help with reducing possible stormwater runoff and effects associated with impermeability.
116.23	Amendment 92 Residential Heritage Precinct	Support except for one word	Delete the word may at the top of page 47	Any residential precincts possible are important and need building heights and density restricted when in fact a lot of the Petone and Moera areas should be designated a heritage area and particularly most of the area between Jackson Street and The Esplanade
116.24	Amendment 94 Objective 4F 5.1.1.1	Support in part	The word 'demolition' needs to be added after 'inappropriate'	The historic heritage of residential areas in the Residential Heritage Precinct are protected from new development with inappropriate building heights and density
116.25	Amendment 103 4F 6 AER	Support	Keep the Anticipated Environmental Result in both medium and high density residential areas	This anticipated environmental result won't be able to be achieved if any tree on any allotment can be cut down
116.26	Amendment 105 4G 1 Introduction/Zone Statement	Support in part	Add the words as requested and delete Petone Metropolitan Centre	At the top of page 52 the words 'subject to qualifying matters' needs to be added after 'enabled.' There is also a spelling mistake in that 'standard' needs to be 'standards' Petone and Moera also need to be added in alongside Eastbourne, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata

116.27	Amendment 123 Policy 4G 3.8	Support	Keep the wording of Policy 4G 3.8 in the Plan Change	Managing the effects of built development on adjoining sites and the street by controlling height, bulk and form of built development is critical for meeting the day to day needs of residents and especially their health and safety
116.28	Amendment 125 to 129 Policy 4G 3.10 to Policy 4G 3.14	Support	Retain these provisions	All these provisions are necessary
116.29	Amendment 131 Policy 4G 3.16	Support in part	Add Petone and Moera to this policy	Petone and Moera need the general approach modified as well because of their heritage and hazard status
116.30	Amendment 144 Rule 4G 4.1.11 (c)	Oppose	Delete (c)	This makes possible the removal of all trees which is so bad for climate change emissions and people's general wellbeing.
116.31	Amendment 147 Rule 4G 4.2.2 Building Coverage	Support	Keep Rule 4G 4.2.2 and 50% site coverage	Building coverage of 50% is very important for allowing as much light and sunlight as possible in adjacent properties – especially with the increased height in relation to boundary
116.32	Amendment 151 Rule 4G 4.2.6 Height for Sites Abutting Marae	Support	Retain Rule 4.2.6 for Marae and also apply this to the Jackson Street precinct	This is a better height to boundary than that in other parts of the proposed Plan Change. This should also be applied to buildings on sites that abut the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct
116.33	Amendment 152 Rule 4G 4.2.7 Permeable Surface	Support	Retain Rule 4.2.7	At least 30% of the site being permeable is very important in terms of stormwater effects
116.34	Amendment 153 Rule 4G 4.2.8 Outdoor Living Space	Support	Retain Rule 4G 4.2.8 Outdoor Living Space	A minimum outdoor living space is so important
116.35	Amendment 157 Rule 4G 4.2.12	Support	Retain Rule 4G 4.2.12 Stormwater retention	The less stormwater we can experience is so much better for everyone and especially Petone, Moera, Gracefield and

	Stormwater retention			Waiwhetū South residents who are at the end of the stormwater chain or live by rivers impacted by run off
116.36	Amendment 158 Rule 4G 4.2.13 Outlook Space	Support	Retain Rule 4G 4.2.13	This at least a minimal requirement that should add some wellbeing value
116.37	Amendment 159 Rule 4G 4.2.14 Windows to Street	Support	Retain Rule 4G 4.2.14	Another example of at least minimum living conditions that should be applied and available to everyone
116.38	Amendment 160 Rule 4G 4.2.15 Landscaped area	Support	Retain Rule 4G 4.2.15	This is so important for permeability as well as for people's health and wellbeing
116.39	Amendment 171 to Amendment 177 Rules 4G 5.2 to 4G 5.2.3.1	Support in part	Retain these rules of residential heritage precincts. Delete the word 'may' in the sentence about building heights.	We particularly support the Moera and Hutt Road Railway Heritage Areas. Building heights and density need to be restricted to protect historic heritage.
116.40	Amendment 178 4G 5.3 Heretaunga and Riddlers Crescent Precincts	Support in part	Delete the 5th paragraph and delete the word 'acceptable' X2	The fifth paragraph does not add anything to the description. Minimum conditions are what are described in e.g. Rule 4G 5.3.3.1. They can't be acceptable or unacceptable. The same stands for maximum site coverage.
116.41	Amendment 180 to 185 4G 5.3.1.1 to 4G 5.3.2.3	Support	Retain these provisions	These provisions are important for protecting heritage values
116.42	Amendment 186 G 5.3.2.4	Support in general	Add 'and fences' after non-residential buildings	High fences can also detract from residential heritage values. Fences need to be added to the objectives and rules applying to residential heritage precincts
116.43	Amendment 187 to 189 4G 5.3.2.4	Support	Keep these provisions	These are important provisions for the Heretaunga and Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precincts

116.44	Amendment 191 4G 5.3.3.1 Alterations, Repairs etc	Partially support	Remove the word 'redecorating' in vi and add structures to (i) under discretion so that fences could be included, and 'listed' on p83 needs to be 'listed.'	Overall the requirements and restricted discretionary status are all good. However, there is a danger that new wallpaper in a living room could be seen from the street
116.45	Amendments 206 and 103 4G 6 AER	Support	Keep the Anticipated Environmental Result in both medium and high density residential areas	This anticipated environmental result won't be able to be achieved if any tree on any allotment can be cut down
116.46	Amendment 253 Petone Commercial Issue	Oppose	Replace 'around' with 'in' and delete (Petone Commercial Activity Area – Area 1)	The current Jackson Street Heritage Precinct should be kept in full. That title should replace Commercial Area 1 – see Reason for Submission for Amendment 4
116.47	Amendment 254 Policy (b) and (c)	Oppose in parts	Replace 'around' with 'in' X2 and replace (Petone Commercial Activity Area – Area 1) with Heritage Precinct X2	Again the word 'around' is not appropriate for Jackson Street and the precinct is what should be acknowledged and focussed on. The traditional retail area in Petone is in the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct not around it. Around might be suitable to use for the Hutt Central Business District but the Jackson Street heritage precinct is where the traditional retail is in Petone.
116.48	Amendment 255 Explanation and Reasons	Oppose in part	Replace 'around' with 'in' X8 and delete (Petone Commercial Activity Area – Area 1) X8 and replace with adding Heritage Precinct after Jackson Street X8	Again the word 'around' is not appropriate for Jackson Street and the precinct is what should be acknowledged and focussed on not Commercial area 1. There are a few sites outside the current precinct in e.g. Elizabeth Street, the Library site, Scholes Lane and Nelson Street that look like they are part of the precinct in the current map and should be treated as such.
116.49	Amendment 258 Objective	Amend (inferred)	Keep this Objective if it refers to the whole current precinct [inferred – amend objective to refer to the whole of Petone Commercial Area 1]	The new wording is fine as long as it means the whole current precinct
116.50	Amendment 259 Area 1 Policy (b)	Oppose	In Policy (b) delete the words 'in Area 1 outside' and replace with 'adjacent to'	The Jackson Street Historic Precinct should stay at the size it is now and this then would only refer to the sites written about for Amendment 255
116.51	Amendment 260 Area 1	Support	Retain the wording as used.	In the heading and the body of this Amendment the current wording of the area generally between and bounded generally by Victoria and Cuba Streets is used and needs to stay as used.

	Explanation and reasons			
116.52	Amendment 267 Deletion of current Permitted Activity in Area1	Support	Keep this deletion and ensure that a reasonable site coverage is managed in another way	Deletion of “Site Coverage: Up to a maximum of 100%” is a very good move as no site should be covered 100% and the danger is the loss of nooks and crannies behind buildings that help add atmosphere to Jackson Street or the squeezing out of real access for the delivery of bulky goods or storage of wheelie bins – as has happened in the past.
116.53	Amendment 268 Maximum Height of Buildings in Petone Commercial Area	Partly support	In (ii) replace ‘not within’ to ‘not adjacent to’ the Jackson Heritage Precinct	(i) 10m within the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct – as long as it means the whole current Precinct which needs to stay. (ii) should read 22m where not adjacent to the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.
116.54	Amendment 278 Sites abutting Te Puni Urupā	Amend (inferred)	Keep Amendment 278 and broaden its application to the Jackson Street Precinct	It is good see “iii. A minimum yard of 3 metres on any boundary with the urupā” as an amendment. This same provision needs to be applied to the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.
116.55	Amendment 305 5E1 Introduction/Zone Statement	Oppose in part	Remove the two references to Petone metropolitan centre.	“The Suburban Mixed Use AA applies to local commercial areas that complement the city centre” needs to stop there. Reference to Petone metropolitan centre needs to be taken out X2
116.56	Amendment 319 to 321 6A 1.2.3 Effects on Cultural practices at Marae Issue, Objective and Policy	Support with Additional application	Broaden the application of these amendments so that they apply to the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct as well	Each of these three amendments relating to marae are important for marae. The also need to be applied the entire current Jackson Street Heritage Precinct to protect the heritage from e.g. poor design, visual domination
116.57	Amendment 340 [[Chapter 11 Subdivision (Issues, Objectives and Policies)] A	Oppose in part	Remove mitigation possibilities in such situations	(bc) and (bd) as mitigating subdivision where building platforms are in the Inundation Area and/or Medium and High Coastal Hazard Overlays seems an impossibility

116.58	Amendment 347 11.2.2.1	Support	Keep this amendment	It is important that all residential heritage precincts are excluded from the general allotment design for medium or high density residential
116.59	Amendment 355 [Chapter 11 Subdivision (Rules)] _Add new Restricted Discretionary Rules 11.2.3(e), 11.2.3(f) and 11.2.3(g) _	Oppose	Change the new Rules to be fully discretionary	Creating building platforms within an Overland Flow Path area, or within the Medium Coastal Hazard areas should be fully discretionary alongside those within the Wellington Fault Overlay and the High Coastal Hazard Overlay
116.60	Amendment 360 [Chapter 11 Subdivision (Rules)] Amend section 11.2.4 Discretionary Activities	Amend (inferred)	Retain this amendment but sort out the reference in (da)	Full discretion for building platforms within the Wellington Fault Overlay and the High Coastal Hazard Overlay is really important.
116.61	Amendment 372 12.2.1.8 Financial Contributions relating to reserves	Support (aa) and (bb)	Keep amendment 372	It is important that developers are charged per allotment rather than per subdivision so that the cost of development is not unfairly put on the ratepayer
116.62	Amendment 392 Chapter 14F Explanation and reasons	Support	Keep this amendment	The wording used “ with significant heritage values when considered together” is an improvement on “with a particular character.”
116.63	Amendment 393 14F 2.1	Support in part	Remove ‘redecorating’ from (i)	There are some problems here similar to Amendment 191

116.64	Amendment 397 Appendix Heritage 3	Oppose in part	Delete Tory Street and replace with Cuba Street and change the map back to Cuba Street as well	The section headed Jackson Street Heritage Precinct, Petone needs to refer to the total current precinct from Victoria to Cuba Street
116.65	Amendment 403 [Chapter 14H Natural Hazards (Introduction)] Add Risk Section of introduction for Chapter 14H Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	Get rid of raising floor or ground levels.	Minimum floor levels do not seem to be a very sound way of 'managing' risk and neither do raising floor or ground levels as any of these have negative effects on neighbouring properties. The supply of utilities can also be compromised.
116.66	Amendment 415 [Chapter 14H Natural Hazards (Issue, Objective and Policies)] Add new Policy 14H 1.5	Oppose in part	Delete 'Provide for' and replace with 'Manage.'	Provide for seems too optimistic. Manage as in Amendment 416 would be more suitable and realistic
116.67	Amendment 417 to 421 [Chapter 14H Natural Hazards (Issue, Objective and Policies)] Add new Policy 14H 1.7 to 14H 1.11	Oppose in part	GNS Science work and advice needs to be sought and wording re evacuation tightened up plus 'Manage' in Amendment 421 changed to "Limit"	Each of these amendments refers to the need to demonstrate safe evacuation routes or that people can safely evacuate the property. This could be done as a technical exercise when in practise getting out of Petone in a major event is extremely unlikely to be achieved in time. And to have the expectation that residential units can be built in the High Coastal Hazard Area seems reckless.
116.68	Amendment 423 [Chapter 14H Natural Hazards (Issue, Objective and Policies)] Add new Policy 14H 1.7 to 14H 1.13	Oppose in part	Incorporate GNS science work into the thinking here	Again, evacuation from the Petone Commercial Area will be a problem

116.69	Amendment 426 and 427 Chapter 14H Natural Hazards (Rules)] Add new Rule 14H 2.2 and 2.3 Additions to residential buildings in the Inundation Area, Overland Flow Path or Stream Corridor Flood Hazard Overlays	Oppose	Delete raising of floor levels and also delete safe evacuation as a mitigating matter	The raising of floor levels is not the answer and safe evacuation is again a part of the 'mitigating' matters
--------	--	--------	---	---

DPC56/117 Russell Keenan and Karen Mooney				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
117.1	Heritage	Support	Continue with creating the Hutt Railway Heritage Area, including the related height and density protection provisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the proposal to create the Hutt Road Railway Heritage area, on the basis that it is used as a means to allow current and future homeowners to protect their properties from the process of intensification.
117.2	Whole plan change	Cannot be inferred	No specific decision requested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rights of current homeowners of access to sunlight and privacy outweighs the rights of developers. • In the future, intensification will be viewed as being short-sighted and selfish. The lack of quality will lead to a situation worse than the leaky home epidemic. Putting the health and wellbeing of the occupants and neighbours at risk. • There is a lack of quality and care which is inherent with intensification development. It is driven by profit. • There are limits to growth in cities and suburbs, which needs to be acknowledged by councils, central government, and

				<p>individuals in New Zealand. Continuous growth will not result in better outcomes, except for a privileged few.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homeowning is an investment, and the resource consent process needs to protect these citizens, their property, and the surrounding environment. • Intensive housing will degrade the environment and quality of life. It will not have a sustainable outcome. • The intensification policy needs to be reviewed, to look after the existing population and environment and allow people the opportunity to discuss these challenges. By not allowing people to engage, a few will profit from their inability to have a say in the outcomes. • PC56 has had very little public consultation time. Residents need 6 months to engage with the content. The outcomes of these decisions will affect many lives, including future generations.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/118 Mark Blackham				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
118.1	Heritage	Oppose	Reject new heritage zones, or at the very least, make participation in them voluntary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homeowner consent should be required before houses are listed as heritage. • Infringement on the right of homeowners to have control of their property. Many people choose to live in different ways and use their property to reflect their pursuit of happiness. • Appreciate that Hutt City Council expanded heritage areas to protect them from intensification. If Hutt City Council is freezing these homes in time, then they should acknowledge the madness of the intensification policy. • Hutt City Council claims these zones are creating a holding pattern for the District Plan. Many people are aware that
118.2	General	Oppose	Reject intensification and refuse to implement the Government's law.	

				<p>these interim steps will not be rescinded, and will only led to tougher rules.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage listings impose significant ongoing costs and problems for property owners. Increased insurance premiums, additional costs in repairing to the original standard, and further Hutt City Council consent fees. Reduced property value. • Houses in the proposed heritage areas vary significantly in quality and type. Many don't look like heritage at all (new or significantly altered). Some are deteriorated and unsavable. • Intensification will impact on factors essential for individual and social wellbeing – sunlight, sky, greenery, views, distance. Increase of social tensions, disruptions, and disputes as people take advantage of the rules to build residences which impinge on the neighbours. • Hutt City Council should not have the power to implement these rules. • Concerns regarding the infrastructure (roads, transport, power, three waters networks). Installing new infrastructure will cause significant disruption to existing residents, to allow intensification which jeopardises the current way of life.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/119 Wikitoria Love				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
119.1	Maps	Amend	Exclude Rakeiora Grove, Te Whiti Grove, the area surrounding Korokoro urupā and Te Puni urupā (on Te Puni Street) from the High Density Residential Activity Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The detrimental impact the increased development and population would have on sites of significance to Māori.

119.2	General	Oppose	No specific decision requested but opposes higher density development that may affect sites of significance to Māori	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas affected by this proposal contain multiple sites of cultural significance and wāhi tapu from the submitter's tūpuna and hold great importance for both existing and future generations. • If this proposed High Density Residential Activity Area were to be implemented in Korokoro, it would cause anxiety and stress within our whānau and much pāmamae (trauma) if these sites were disturbed. As a result, the effect on the Treaty relationship between local and central government and mana whenua could be negatively impacted. • Our 3rd Great Grandfather, Wiremu Tako Ngātata (1815-1887), is buried in the Korokoro urupā, along with his wife, daughter and granddaughters. His grandson, Wi Hapi Pakau Love and his wife, Ripeka Wharawhara Matene, built the wharenui Taumata in 1901, which welcomed manuhiri from Taranaki regularly. The wharenui still stands today and is very much cared for by its guardians whom we have an ongoing relationship with. • Sir Makere Rangiatea Ralph Love, created and named the street we continue to reside in, Rakeiora, after a tohunga of the Tokomaru waka. He also named other streets in Korokoro (such as Te Whiti Grove) and had great affection for Pito-one (Petone) and Te Awakairangi. • We are very protective of sites that hold significance to Māori, iwi, and our whānau as they shape our understanding of the past and provide meaning for our future.
-------	---------	--------	--	--

DPC56/120 Glen Shardlow				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
120.1	Heritage	Amend	Amend the plan change to include the following statement:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property owners have much to lose from the imposition of any unwanted heritage categorisation, as has Hutt City from the costs of increased management, loss of citizen goodwill

			<p>That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</p>	<p>and the likely litigation for its removal by informed property owners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I believe a voluntary heritage policy is very much in the best interests and for the benefit of Hutt City and its citizens. • Heritage areas will drastically impact the layout and aesthetic of the Hutt. While neighbouring streets build up to three or six storeys high, these heritage areas will be forced into stagnation. • A heritage area imposes significant restrictions on what a home-owner can and can't do with their property. Once a property is in one of these areas, the owner will have to get the Council's consent to make any changes to their home, or if they want to change the number of stories or number of houses. • The rules for when the Council may do this are very vague and leave a lot of discretion to the Council. • This seems to contradict people's ability to exercise freedom of choice and ability to renovate older houses to a healthy home standard by limiting their ability to renovate accordingly. • Heritage listings can impose significant ongoing costs and problems for property owners. • Decreased property value as a result of the heritage listing. • Concern listed homes don't meet the heritage classification. • Concern homes don't meet healthy homes standards and may result in health issues for residents, or limit ability for property to be rented. • I want to have the choice as to whether my property is included in the Plan Change as now being in a heritage area.
--	--	--	---	--

DPC56/121		Maria Shardlow		
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
121.1	Heritage	Amend	<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"> • Property owners have much to lose from the imposition of any unwanted heritage categorisation, as has Hutt City from the costs of increased management, loss of citizen goodwill and the likely litigation for its removal by informed property owners. • I believe a voluntary heritage policy is very much in the best interests and for the benefit of Hutt City and its citizens. • Heritage areas will drastically impact the layout and aesthetic of the Hutt. While neighbouring streets build up to three or six storeys high, these heritage areas will be forced into stagnation. • A heritage area imposes significant restrictions on what a home-owner can and can't do with their property. Once a property is in one of these areas, the owner will have to get the Council's consent to make any changes to their home, or if they want to change the number of stories or number of houses. • The rules for when the Council may do this are very vague and leave a lot of discretion to the Council. • This seems to contradict people's ability to exercise freedom of choice and ability to renovate older houses to a healthy home standard by limiting their ability to renovate accordingly. • Heritage listings can impose significant ongoing costs and problems for property owners. • Decreased property value as a result of the heritage listing. • Concern listed homes don't meet the heritage classification.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern homes don't meet healthy homes standards and may result in health issues for residents, or limit ability for property to be rented. • I want to have the choice as to whether my property is included in the Plan Change as now being in a heritage area.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/122 Russell Boaler				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
122.1	Maps	Oppose	No specific decision requested.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that 6 storey dwellings could be constructed anywhere in the Hutt Valley and without resource consent. • Concern high density housing will spoil the heritage/feel of existing areas and impose on immediate neighbours. • Oppose the blanket approach and think it has been rush through without real consideration of its potential adverse impacts on individual residents whose voice will be lost in the proposed process should the proposal go through. • Accept that solutions are needed to resolve the housing shortage. However, a more considered targeted approach should be taken. The approach proposed seems more applicable to a new development area rather than for existing residential areas. • The proposed high-density zones should far be more restricted than what is currently proposed and high density areas should be defined in a much more targeted way. For example, limiting high-density zones to areas directly adjacent the Central Business District or directly adjacent major train stations only.

122.2	Amendment 80 – Chapter 4F MDRAA – Rule 4F 4.2.3 Height in relation to boundary	Oppose	Retain the height in relation to boundary recession angle of 45 degrees, which could still enable (for a typical 16m wide section) a 12m high ridge line.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed recession angle of 60 degrees will result in significant loss of sunlight to adjoining properties which could affect the adjoining property's occupants health and wellbeing.
122.3	Amendment 354 – Chapter 11 Subdivision assessment criterion 11.2.2.3(b) and related provisions Carparking	Oppose, Request new provisions (inferred)	Require off-street parking (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intensification of dwellings will result in more cars in the area. By not requiring off-street parking, this will result in significantly more cars being parked on the streets which will cause heavier demand on the existing roadside parking. The submitter supports the proposal for three units per site being a permitted activity, but notes the units should allow for off street parking.
122.4	Amendment 77 – Chapter 4F MDRAA – Rule 4F 4.2.1AA Number of Residential Units per Site	Support with condition (inferred)	Support subject to requested relief in submission point 122.3 (inferred)	
122.5	Amendment 78 – Chapter 4F MDRAA – Rule 4F 4.2.1 Building coverage	Support	Retain building site coverage as notified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposal for permitted building site coverage increasing from 40% to 50%.

DPC56/123 Kevin Day				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
123.1	HDRAA	Requests amendment	Set minimum standards on outdoor space.	Raises concerns on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in open space, • Lack of off-street parking and outdoor living space in new developments, • Impacts on infrastructure, and • Impacts on quality of life.
123.2	Carparking	Requests amendment	Set minimum standards on off-street parking.	

DPC56/124 Merran Bakker				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
124.1	General	Amend	Do not identify Petone as equivalent to a Metropolitan Centre Zone (inferred)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petone is a village and does not have the capacity for intensification. It should not be described as a metropolitan centre. • Natural hazard risks and low-rise heritage precinct. • Support the limiting of building heights in Policy 1.10.10. • Unclear why Hutt City needs a second 'centre' only 2km from the main city centre, which has the capacity and infrastructure for higher intensification.
124.2	Maps	Oppose	Remove Petone from high density area.	
124.3	Site coverage (MDRAA and HDRAA)	Support	Supports limiting site coverage to 50%	
124.4	Residential	Amend / request new provisions	Strengthen minimum standards for sunlight, outlook, and vegetation.	
124.5	Density	Amend	For areas of Petone other than the specified precincts, limit maximum building height to that listed in Policy 1.10.10.	

DPC56/125 Benjamin Wells				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
125.1	Maps	Oppose (inferred)	Do not apply HDRAA to Alicetown (inferred)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that allowing the intensification of buildings within the Hutt Valley, and in particular the suburb of Alicetown, under the building allowances of a High Density Residential Activity Area, developers would be encouraged to heavily increase intensification to maximize their personal profits, with little care for the well-being of residents in the neighbouring properties. • Concern that not enough forethought has been put into how this intensification will affect the surrounding properties on several issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the availability of off-street parking ○ the strain on water infrastructure ○ the availability of sunlight ○ changes to the character of the neighbourhood • The preservation of the historical significance of Alicetown which encompasses the original European settlement of Aglionby.
125.2	HDRAA	Not stated	Revise the application of the High Density zoning plan.	

DPC56/126 Tania Penafiel Bermudez				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
126.1	Heritage	Amend	Only classify a property as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner/s.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not satisfied that the review of homes and areas considered 'heritage' was well done, and therefore have very little confidence in the whole process. • Homeowners should have to give consent for their house to be added to the heritage list. • Whilst neighbouring properties may build up to 3-6 stories high, the restrictions enforced by heritage status will unfairly impact the homeowners and limit renovations and developments on their properties.
126.2	Density	Cannot be inferred	Hutt City Council have discretion on consultation with community regarding determination of intensification areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hutt City Council (in consultation with the community) should have discretion around what areas are able to be intensified, as opposed to the blanket rules set out by government.
126.3	Carparking	Requests new provision	Require a minimum of one off-street carpark per dwelling.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of a minimum 1x car park per household/-dwelling should apply to all developments covered under the new intensification regime. The streets currently cannot cope with parking and traffic volume.
126.4	Effects on neighbours	Amend	Require an assessment of adverse effects on neighbours (sunlight and privacy) for 3-6 storey buildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of adverse effects on neighbours sunshine, light, and privacy needs to upheld when considering any build of 2 stories, particularly with the risk of a one story house being surrounded on 3 sides by 3-6 story developments. Consent of neighbours.

DPC56/127 Spencer and Tracey Joe				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
127.1	Plan change as a whole	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater consideration should be given to inclusion of Special Residential Activity Areas, and public consultation (community/neighbourhood workshops), in the high density residential zone. • PC56 takes a 'one size fits all' approach, and has not given consideration to background factors and the reasons why existing residential District Plan provisions were included. • Greater stewardship and a far-sighted approach is required by Hutt City Council. This approach was demonstrated by Christchurch City Council and its vote against changing their planning rules.

DPC56/128 Sam Lister				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
128.1	Maps	Requests amendment	Incorporate 23A McGowan Road into the proposed Medium Density Residential Activity Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property at 23A McGowan Road, Wainuiomata is currently zoned Hill Residential, situated within a 1km radius and walking distance of both the Village and Central Wainuiomata shopping areas and located 300m from rapid transport service. • Mostly flat or of gentle slope and well suited for intensification. The flat and gentle sloped areas are situated at a lower contour level to other established residential development in the higher section of McGowan Road and is in close proximity to all services. The property ticks the boxes for intent of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development for improved development capacity objectives.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would provide consistency with the zoning of neighbouring properties (11 Coast Road, upper areas of Wise Street, Wellington Road, Stockdale Street, and Sunny Grove). • The proposed district plan changes fail to meet Hutt City Council's legal duty under Section 77G paragraph (2) of the RMA.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/129 Robert Brathwaite				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
129.1	Building height	Oppose	Require resource consent for buildings of up to six stories.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed height of buildings will impact sunlight and privacy of neighbouring one or two storey houses. This will be particularly severe during the winter months. Six storey buildings should only be allowed where this will not occur. • Piecemeal development that leaves individual by single and double storey houses surrounded by buildings of up to 6 stories should be avoided. • Negative impacts on the health of occupants of neighbouring properties, heating costs, and property values.
129.2	Natural hazards	Oppose, requests amendment	Remove the "within 1200m from the edge of the Lower Hutt Central Business District " area from the targeted intensification areas until the stopbank downstream from the Melling Bridge and the bridge itself is rebuilt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not allow building intensification while the risk of flooding from the Hutt River remains high. Limited protection from the current stopbanks and a choke point at the Melling bridge.

DPC56/130 Dwayne McDonald				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
130.1	Maps	Requests amendment	Rezone the properties from 1/149 to 159 Hill Road, Belmont so that they have the same zoning as the rest of the housing on Hill Road (Rural).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hill Road is not of a standard that can support more cars parked on the side of the road and traffic using the road. • Some of the properties border on the Park Hill Reserve and a large build-up of housing would be detrimental to the environment. • Some of the properties between 1/149 and 159 are far too small to build three houses on. • The lane for 1/149 to 153 is too small and not suitable to support any more traffic. • There is not enough public transport to support more housing.

DPC56/131 Marianne Linton				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
131.1	Residential	Amend	Ensure neighbouring properties still enjoy sunlight (including by amending light planes).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of intensification on sunlight and privacy of neighbouring homes.
131.2	Residential	Amend	More green spaces developed to counter intensification.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are large sections in Woburn with established trees and active bird life which provides an area for native birds in the valley. Consideration needs to be made for a corridor for native birds to live across the Hutt Valley. • Concern the specific provisions will have a negative impact on the native environment and Hutt City.

131.3	Trees	Requests amendment	Council assessment of heritage trees for protection, rather than seeking owners nominate them.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a large number of nikau trees which are not protected. • An area of special character needs to remain to ensure many large trees still remain in. • The Council should ensure good examples of native flora and fauna remain.
-------	-------	--------------------	--	---

DPC56/132 Pam Roberts				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
132.1	Heritage	Oppose	Exclude heritage area HA-08 (Petone Foreshore Heritage Area) from the District Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient information and consultation with affected homeowners (particularly what can/cannot be done to properties in the heritage area). • No information on the additional costs associated with heritage area consents. • Many homes within the proposed heritage area have already been renovated/partially renovated or are new builds. Some of these are highlighted in the proposed area as appearing to be 'exempt' but not all. There needs to be clarification of this and what that means for consents/additions for these sites. • When people purchased homes in this area they did so with the expectation that they could renovate without restriction and they would not end up with a 3-6 storey building next to them or bordering them. • Concern that if the cost of renovations is too restrictive it may result in homes not being maintained.
132.2	Natural hazards	Amend	Consider heritage areas in conjunction with a plan for sea level rise protection for Petone Foreshore.	

DPC56/133 Graeme Silcock				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
133.1	Plan change as a whole	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns it will reduce the quality of life of Hutt City residents and make it a less desirable place to live. The Hutt Valley is not geologically suitable for the proposed scale of the buildings due to poor foundations, earthquake shaking, fault rupture and liquefaction potential. Rising sea levels and/or earthquake subduction will lead to increased flood risk for areas proposed for intensification. Foundations associated with larger buildings will increase the risk of damage to the aquifer which provides a major part of our drinking water. Present infrastructure is not coping well with the existing population and increasing the population will make this worse. No space available for additional infrastructure required. The city was never intended to have the population intensity proposed. Concern that a significant area of trees and gardens will be removed if intensification occurs and will reduce the bird population.

DPC56/134 Keith Fraser				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
134.1	Natural hazards	Requests new provision	Amend the District Plan to require only relocatable residential buildings in Petone and in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little doubt that climate change will result in greater risk to the Hutt Valley from flooding and inundation.

			other suburbs within 1.5 vertical metres of sea level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hutt River protections and stop-bank strengthening is underway but cannot remove all risk. The risk from tributary inflow remains high – particularly from the Waiwhetū Stream and in Stokes Valley. • High density development should not occur where there is a material flood risk. • At Petone, which is effectively sinking, the greatest risk appears to be from sea-level rise, yet building is proposed where there is a significant risk from sea level rise within the lifetime of the buildings. • The Hutt City may be subject to legal risk if allowing development in an area such as Petone where there is evidence it will be subject to sea level rise in the future. • The risk to these buildings must be mitigated by requiring houses to be built off the ground. • In Petone, and areas that are no more than 1-1.5m above sea level, housing should ideally be modular, but at the very least should be re-locatable so not have concrete floors, as that would impede relocation and re-use.
134.2	Carparking	Requests new provision	Require at least one off-street carpark space per new residential unit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hutt City Council should require off-street parking and storage space for the vehicles we will be using in a low carbon future. That will enable accessible and safer roads for the transport purpose for which they are intended. • In a low carbon future there will be a number of vehicles that will require secure storage space with access to electricity including: Electric cars, Bicycles and Mobility scooters. • The 2018 census records that there were 39,549 households in Lower Hutt and a population of 104,532 (Stats NZ). NZTA report car ownership of 0.68 cars per capita in the Wellington region. Lower Hutt is likely therefore to have around 1.8 cars per household. Even if that halves in the near future, which seems unlikely, there will be a need to be parking for at least one car per household for the foreseeable future.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A safe requirement would be to require off-street parking for at least one vehicle per household for at least the next 20 years.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/135 Martyn Becker				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
135.1	Height in relation to boundary	Amend	Change the recession plane and setback to 4m + 50°.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The change in recession plane together with the increased building height will adversely affect neighbouring properties privacy, sun and quality of life.

DPC56/136 Woolworths New Zealand Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
136.1	SMUAA	Support	Approve the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Woolworth's NZ, through its subsidiary, General Distributors Limited, is redeveloping a site at 20 The Strand and 12 Wainuiomata Road, as part of the Wainuiomata Town Centre upgrade (including a new supermarket and a mix of commercial, retail and possibly residential development). The site is currently zoned Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area, which is proposed to be retained through PPC56. This zoning allows for residential activities located above the ground floor or on the ground floor where there is no frontage to public open spaces. Woolworths NZ supports the greater development enabled on the site including increased building height up to 22m, reduced yard setbacks and outdoor living space, while

				<p>retaining the permitted activity rules for residential development in the underlying zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Woolworths NZ supports the inclusion of a walkable catchment (in line with the NPS-UD) around this site (which is in the Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area), with the High Density Residential Activity Area (HDRAA) surrounding the supermarket site.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/137 Dennis Palmer				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
137.1	Plan change as a whole	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule 1, Part 6 of the RMA has not gone through appropriate parliamentary scrutiny. Intensification is required in all cities, but needs to be coordinated with infrastructure (services, transport, road, car parking/charging). Adequate planning to ensure retention of light and outdoor amenity. Unrestrained 'right to build' is not the solution. Ignoring recession planes on a 300m2 section and allowing developers to construct a 3 or 6 storey apartment block within 1m of neighbouring properties. Risk that lack of sunlight, privacy, parking, and noise control will reduce the asset value of surrounding houses and force them to sell. This type of development will lead to poor living conditions. Proposed provisions will affect most ratepayers. The future of Hutt City Council housing policies should be made via referendum or other means.

DPC56/138 Sonja Penafiel Bermudez				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
138.1	Heritage	Amend	Only classify properties as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner/s.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The restrictions enforced by heritage status will unfairly impact the homeowners and severely limit renovations and developments on their properties. The heritage status will likely reduce the value of these properties. Properties have been listed without homeowners consent.
138.2	Density	Amend	Hutt City Council have discretion on consultation with community regarding determination of intensification areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I believe the council (in consultation with the community) should have discretion around what areas are able to be intensified, as opposed to the blanket rules set out by government.
138.3	Carparking	Request new provision	Require a minimum of one off-street carpark per dwelling.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of a minimum 1 x car park per household/dwelling should be made for all developments covered under the new intensification regime. The streets we have cannot cope with the parking and traffic volume as it is.
138.4	Development Standards	Request new provision	Require an assessment of adverse effects on neighbours (sunlight and privacy) of building 3-6 storey buildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration/consent of adverse effects on neighbours sunshine/light/privacy needs to be upheld when considering any build of 2 stories, particularly with the risk of a one story/bungalow being surrounded on 3 sides by 3-6 story developments.

DPC56/139 Bjorn Johns				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
139.1	Natural hazards	Support	No specific reasoning provided.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the interpretation of natural hazards to allow the Council to control and futureproof intensification.
139.2	Infrastructure	Amend	Special consideration needs to be applied to such neighbourhoods where the single access roads are also threatened by natural hazards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern on the impact of intensification on infrastructure in single road access communities like Wainuiomata, Stokes Valley, and Eastbourne. Intensification makes the most sense in areas that are close to good public transport, have good access, are close to amenities, and not excessively exposed to natural hazards.
139.3	Public transport	Amend	Better public transport must be facilitated if new regional hubs are encouraged.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better public transport must be facilitated if new regional hubs are encouraged - again Eastbourne, Wainuiomata, and Stokes Valley are good examples.
139.4	Amenity	n/a	The submitter would like to see the Council actively involved in ensuring the densification also results in appealing neighbourhoods.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern on the quality of life in neighbourhoods.
139.5	Density/Permitted Standards/Resource Consents	Amend	The submitter requests the Council communicates further allowances to these rules to the public (such as developments breaching them) (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They wish for the Council to make it clear that a hard line will be taken on granting any exceptions to the expanded development rules. The impact of what will be allowed by the new rules will be 'severe enough'.
139.6	Carparking	Amend	Think through the management of parking.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that streets will clog, traffic will get worse and there will be competition for available parking. Streets are not wide enough for parking on both sides. Public transport does not work for all trips, and can be improved on. Concern on impact on the quality of life of residents.

DPC56/140 Peter Ricketts				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
140.1	Plan change as a whole	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that PC56 condemns large areas of many existing suburbs and urban areas to a level of intensification which will, over a relatively short period of time, change the nature and style of living from current practices. • Concern about the loss of existing homes/low density in favour of medium and high density development. • Concerns about social and infrastructure failure. • Undemocratic and a lack of public consultation. • Loss of character. • No specifics on garages, parking spaces, charging spaces and garden/green areas are provided. • Lack of input from Councils and local area representatives.

DPC56/141 Alan Bell				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
141.1	HDRAA	Amend	Assess "qualifying matters" that permit the Council to change the proposed zoning and limit the rules – particularly in respect of Natural Hazards and their impact. (inferred)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural Hazard risks have not been adequately considered for the scale of development enabled. • Concern around slip risk as the topography in Harbour View and Tirohanga is steep.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings as permitted without Council consents and controls increase risks to all residents should those buildings or supporting ground fail.
141.2	Maps	Requests amendment	Rezone the High Density Residential Activity Area in Harbour View and Tirohanga to Medium Density Residential Activity Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 1.2km “walking distance” is not suitable for application in Harbour View and Tirohanga. There is no public transport in Harbour View. The Melling Link and rail reconstruction will move the railway station South making a walk to the new station unachievable for most residents. Traffic volumes will increase the likelihood of accidents on the steep and narrow roads. Local roading cannot support the traffic volumes that the proposal would attract. Parking space is minimal with no flat ground and the narrow road does not allow for safe on-road parking.

DPC56/142 Allison Thwaite				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter’s reasons for decision requested
142.1	HDRAA	Oppose	Have Manor Park assessed for the density zoning by an independent specialist.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern around natural hazard risks such as earthquakes and flooding. Concern around the location of the Wellington Fault Line in relation to residential areas, and its impact on high density development. Concern around soil condition/stability for development. The timing of the GNS report and did it consider high density zoning in these areas.

DPC56/143 Sheree Freeman

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
143.1	Amendment 254 – Chapter 5B Petone Commercial AA Policies 5B 1.1.2A (b) and (c)	Support in part	Alter to read: (b) Manage larger scale retail activities to ensure they do not detract from the vibrancy and vitality of the traditional retail area in the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct. (c) Restrict smaller scale retail activities to ensure they do not detract from the vibrancy and vitality of the traditional retail area in the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.	'around' should only apply to the Central Commercial Area and the amendment should read 'in' not 'around the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct. And there is only one traditional retail area. The traditional retail area in the current Jackson Street Heritage Precinct needs to be protected from large scale retail activities which would detract from the Precinct's vibrancy and vitality.
143.2	Amendment 259 – Chapter 5B Petone Commercial AA Policy 1.2.1 (a)	Support	Support as notified	-
143.3	Amendment 259 – Chapter 5B Petone Commercial AA Policy 1.2.1 (b)	Amend (inferred)	Delete 'in Area 1' and replace "outside" with "adjacent to".	I oppose Policy (b) as it is worded as the whole of the current Jackson Street Heritage precinct needs to be retained.
143.4	Amendment 267 – Chapter 5B Petone Commercial AA Condition 2.1.1.1(a)	Support, Request new provision (inferred)	Keep the deletion of up to a maximum of 100% site coverage and ensure that new wording is added to manage a reasonable site coverage.	New buildings should not cover 100% of any site. Support amendment, however, something else to manage a reasonable site coverage needs to be added.
143.5	Amendment 268 – Chapter 5B Petone Commercial AA Condition 2.1.1.1(b)	Amend (inferred)	Amend condition 2.1.1.1(b): (b) Maximum Height of Buildings and Structures: (i) 10m within the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct (ii) 22m where not within the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct except where adjacent to the	I oppose Amendment 268 (b) (ii) because the current Jackson Street Heritage Precinct needs to be kept intact and the following wording needs to be added to (ii) 'except where adjacent to the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct where 12m is the maximum height.'

			Jackson Street Heritage Precinct where 12m is the maximum height. Maximum Height of Buildings and Structures: 10.0m.	
143.6	Amendment 397 – Chapter 14F Heritage Buildings and Structures (Appendices)	Amend	the words “Tory Street” need to be replaced with “Cuba Street”	-
143.7	Maps	Amend (inferred)	Extend Jackson Street Heritage Precinct HA-04 to Cuba Street (inferred)	-
143.8	General	n/a	No specific decision requested	Conclusion: The areas surrounding heritage items, settings and areas have the ability to detract or add to the heritage values that are being protected under S6(f) of the RMA. This is recognised in the RMA which includes surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources in the definition of historic heritage. The surroundings associated with the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct are particularly influential over such a protected area and therefore need to be regulated so as to accomplish the protection of historic heritage under section 6(f).

DPC56/144 Lily Moran				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter’s reasons for decision requested
144.1	Heritage	Oppose, requests amendment	Only classify a property as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the classification of heritage properties in the District Plan without homeowner consent.

DPC56/145 Meng Xu				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
145.1	Heritage	Oppose, requests amendment	Remove the six proposed residential heritage precinct areas, identify houses with significant historical value individually and protect them.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support protection of buildings and houses that have true heritage value, but the six proposed residential heritage precincts have been mis-identified by making blanket identification following the blanket guidelines. • The submitter's houses, which do not have much heritage value, have been included in the precinct. This will cause negative impact to the individual homeowner and the communities. • Homeowners should have right to make their own decisions voluntarily whether they want their homes as heritage property. • Interested in the evidence that demonstrates the six proposed residential heritage precinct areas have significant historical value.
145.2	Heritage	Oppose, requests amendment	Remove 73 Hutt Road from the heritage schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter has requested this property is removed from the heritage schedule/area because it does not have any historical value.
145.3	Special Residential Activity Areas	Oppose, requests amendment	Keep the three Special Residential Activity Areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the removal of the three Special Residential Activity Areas plan for the following reasons: • It would be difficult to re-establish areas of this size. • Concerned that Hutt City Council has followed the wrong blanket guidelines and the properties that have true heritage value have been mis-identified or wrongly removed from the District Plan.

DPC56/146 Sharon Hardy				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
146.1	Heritage	Amend	<p>Adopt the following policy:</p> <p>A private or commercial 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"> • Concern on the restrictions and cost of consenting imposed by a heritage classification. • Concern that new buildings will be restricted in size and type, therefore resulting in increased cost in the heritage area. • Concern that the buildings included don't have heritage value. • Concern around loss of sunlight and privacy should a 6 storey building be developed next to a heritage site. • Concern around loss of property value.

DPC56/147 Jonathon Devonshire				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
147.1	Heritage	Support	No specific decision requested	Supports the inclusion of heritage provisions to retain the history and character of Hutt suburbs but wants to understand the impacts and support available for homeowners, with their prior approval required.
147.2	Density	Support	No specific decision requested.	Supports intensification but notes it needs to be planned carefully, including infrastructure provision (such as schools, doctors and roading), so that existing issues aren't exacerbated. They also suggest rules that impact sunlight be reconsidered as this may impact property values. They question the options assessed for housing and whether local population and council views have been considered, and if so what the next steps are to consider this feedback.

DPC56/148 Korokoro Environmental Group				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
148.1	Density	n/a	No specific decision requested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implications of balance between residential development and the preservation of the natural environment. • To give weight to the views of the local residents who bring a wealth of knowledge and experience of the history and management of this unique part of Lower Hutt.
148.2	Density	n/a	<p>That Council considers the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The slope in relation to proposed development. • Land slip risk. • Potential impacts on the local gully stream Tuara-whatī-o-te-Mana. • Impact on habitat for flora and fauna. • Negative impact on heritage sites (including Taumata). • Amenity impacts/loss of suburban character. 	

DPC56/149 Wellington Regional Council				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
149.1	Plan change as a whole	Support with amendment	Include objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for the qualities of well-functioning urban environments.	The District Plan requires further amendments to give effect to Policy 1 of the NPS-UD 2020. Greater Wellington considers that additional provisions are required to meet clauses (a)(ii), (e), and (f) of Policy 1 of the NPS-UD 2020 and would have regard to Objective 22 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.

149.2	Plan change as a whole	Support with amendment	Insert objectives, policies and rules that ensure adverse effects on the Hutt Valley Aquifer from urban intensification are avoided. Also insert provisions or advice notes referring to the probable need for resource consent under the Regional Plan where excavations may penetrate the Hutt Valley Aquifer.	<p>Urban intensification will inevitably lead to the redevelopment of existing sites that involve earthworks.</p> <p>The depth of excavation for foundations and services required for multi-storey buildings poses a significant risk to the Hutt Valley Aquifer and the bulk community drinking water supply for Hutt City, Upper Hutt, Wellington and Porirua. Conventional foundations for multi-storey buildings would be deep enough that they could penetrate the aquifer, creating a pathway for contaminants to enter the groundwater posing a risk to the health of the community.</p> <p>Building foundations can be constructed in a way that avoids penetrating the aquifer and the District Plan should ensure that such foundations are used.</p> <p>In accordance with Section 3.5 of the NPS-FM, Hutt City Council is required to include provisions in its district plan to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies, freshwater ecosystems and receiving environments – including the Hutt Valley Aquifer.</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policies FW.3 and FW.4 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.3	Plan change as a whole	Support	Retain current approach that does not include any land that is zoned for greenfield development.	Greater Wellington strongly supports Hutt City Council's approach to intensification within the existing urban footprint and not including any greenfield land zoned for intensification.
149.4	Plan change as a whole	Support with amendment	Include objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020, including Subpart 1.3 Te Mana o te Wai and the hierarchy of obligations and subpart 3.5 Integrated management, as captured throughout this submission.	<p>Hutt City Council is required to include provisions in its district plan to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that it is a district-wide matter.</p>
149.5	Plan change as a whole	Support with amendment	Include objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that implement the recommendations directed at territorial authorities in the Te Whaitua te Whanganui-a-Tara Implementation	Te Whaitua te Whanganui-a-Tara Implementation Programme and Te Mahere Wai o Te Kāhui Taiao are the outputs of the Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara process, which Hutt City Council was involved in.

			Programme and Te Mahere Wai o Te Kāhui Taiao.	<p>While they are not statutory documents, Hutt City Council was involved in their preparation and development as a party on the whitua committee and are expected by the wider community to implement the recommendations in the WIPs.</p> <p>Intensification has the potential to increase stormwater and sediment runoff, which would lead to further degradation of waterbodies on the Hutt Valley floor. The WIPs contain community-endorsed recommendations</p> <p>for dealing with the existing effects of urban areas on waterbodies, which are also applicable to urban intensification.</p>
149.6	Plan change as a whole	Support with amendment	Remove residential areas in the high hazard coastal overlay earmarked as suitable for medium or high-density intensification in Petone and the east Harbour Bays.	<p>Greater Wellington strongly recommends removing residential areas in the high hazard coastal overlay earmarked as suitable for medium or high-density intensification in Petone and the east Harbour Bays. Intensification of residential development in these areas will increase the risk to communities that will worsen over time as sea level rises in tandem with ongoing tectonic subsidence. This is a change in the natural environment that individuals cannot mitigate against, and council will struggle to deal with in the long term. Policy 1(f) of the NPS-UD 2020 also requires that planning decisions contribute to urban environments that are resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(e) of the RMA, in that the management of significant risks from natural hazards are an identified qualifying matter.</p> <p>This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.7	Plan change as a whole	New provisions	Insert a new Papakāinga chapter which includes objectives, policies and rules that enable Papakāinga to be developed subject to rule requirements to manage built form and servicing. Greater Wellington recommends using the Papakāinga chapter in Kāpiti Coast District Council's Plan Change 2 as a starting point.	While Greater Wellington acknowledges there are some Papakāinga provisions in the existing District Plan, these do not adequately provide for the full breadth of Papakāinga development (in part because the provisions relate only to residential housing, while Papakāinga is much wider). As part of providing for tino rangatiratanga

				<p>tangata whenua need to be able to develop papakāinga. A new chapter specifically for Papakāinga would give effect to the direction in Objective 1 and Policy 1(a)(ii) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is provided for by s80E(1)(b)(ii) of the RMA as it relates to enabling papakāinga housing in the district.</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policies UD.1 and UD.2 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.8	Plan change as a whole	Support with amendment	<p>Ensure the intensification planning instrument:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps/schedules natural character ratings from the Boffa Miskell Natural Character assessment (2016); and • Includes provisions (objectives, policies and rules) which seek to give effect to NZCPS Policies 13 and 14. 	<p>Natural character ratings from the 2016 Boffa Miskell natural character assessment are not mapped in the District Plan, nor does it contain provisions which seek to give effect to NZCPS Policy 13. This will make it more difficult for the district plan to manage the effects of intensification on natural character.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that these amendments are related provisions under s80E(2)(e) of the RMA, in that coastal natural character is a section 6 matter.</p> <p>These amendments would also give effect to Policy 3 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.</p>
149.9	Chapter 1.10.1 (inferred)	New provisions	<p>Include or amend strategic direction objectives and/or policies to provide direction regarding ki uta ki tai, partnering with mana whenua, upholding Māori data sovereignty, and making decisions with the best available information, for example:</p> <p>Insert new objective as follows:</p> <p>To recognise the interconnectedness between air, freshwater, land, coastal marine areas, ecosystems and all living things – ki uta ki tai.</p> <p>Insert new policies for the above objective as follows:</p> <p>(a) To recognise the interrelationship between natural resources and the built environments.</p>	<p>Section 3.5(1) of the NPS-FM 2020 requires that local authorities must adopt an integrated approach that recognises the interconnectedness of the whole environment.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that these amendments are related provisions under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that they are district-wide matters.</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policy IM.1 and Policy FW.3(e) of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>

			<p>(b) To make decisions based on the best available information, improvements in technology and science, and mātauranga Māori.</p> <p>(c) To recognise that the impacts of activities may extend beyond immediate and directly adjacent area, and beyond organisational or administrative boundaries.</p> <p>Amend policy (d) as follows:</p> <p>(d) To consult partner with the tangata whenua when discharging functions and duties under the Act and provide for tangata whenua involvement in resource management.</p> <p>Insert a new policy (e) as follows:</p> <p>(e) To make decisions based on mātauranga Māori, while upholding Māori data sovereignty; and requiring Māori data and mātauranga Māori to be interpreted within Te Ao Māori.</p>	
149.10	Chapter 1.10	New provision	<p>Include a new policy to require regard is had to equity and inclusiveness issues in decision making, for example:</p> <p>To give particular regard to achieving the objectives and policy outcomes of this District Plan in an equitable and inclusive way that:</p> <p>(a) Does not compound historic grievances with tangata whenua/Māori.</p> <p>(b) Does not exacerbate existing inequities, in particular but not limited to, access to public transport, amenities and housing.</p> <p>(c) Does not exacerbate environmental issues.</p> <p>(d) Does not increase the burden on future generations.</p>	<p>Equity and inclusiveness are essential to ensuring intensification is done in a way that is socially and culturally appropriate.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that these amendments are related provisions under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that they are district-wide matters.</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policy IM.2 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>

149.11	Chapter 1.10.1	Amend	<p>Amend Policy (a) to include tino rangatiratanga, for example:</p> <p>(a) To have particular regard to tangata whenua's desire to carry out kaitiakitanga and exercise tino rangatiratanga.</p> <p>Retain the existing Objective and Policy (c).</p> <p>Include policy that enables mana whenua to develop land owned by tangata whenua in a way that supports tikanga and mātauranga Māori values, for example:</p> <p>(g) Enable tangata whenua to develop land owned by tangata whenua in a way that is consistent with tikanga and provides for kaitiakitanga and tino rangatiratanga.</p>	<p>Greater Wellington is supportive of retaining the reference to kaitiakitanga in (a) but considers that this needs to be expanded to include tino rangatiratanga. Intensification around tangata whenua-owned land may inadvertently preclude tangata whenua from using or developing the land how they want. It is therefore important to recognise the right of tangata whenua to exercise tino rangatiratanga over tangata whenua-owned land.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is provided for by s80E(2)(e) of the RMA as a qualifying matter (the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral land).</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policy FW.3(c) of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.12	Chapter 1.10.1	New provision	<p>Insert a policy to recognise, protect and enhance Māori freshwater values, including mahinga kai, for example:</p> <p>To protect and enhance Māori freshwater values, including mahinga kai, including by:</p> <p>(a) enabling protection activities such as planting, and</p> <p>(b) managing works in riparian margins.</p>	<p>Mahinga kai is a compulsory value in the NPS-FM 2020 and Hutt City Council is required by clause 3.5(1)(c) of the NPS-FM 2020 to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems, which includes mahinga kai. Increased runoff of stormwater and sediment during and after intensified housing development risks degrading the few remaining mahinga kai sites in Hutt City to the point where they cannot be used any longer.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is provided for by s80E(2)(e) of the RMA as a qualifying matter (the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral land).</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policy FW.3(b) of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.13	Chapter 1.10.1	New provision	<p>Include an objective that mana whenua values relating to indigenous biodiversity are recognised and involvement in decision making and management is supported, for example:</p>	<p>Greater Wellington considers it important that tangata whenua are actively involved in managing indigenous biodiversity. The district plan should enable tangata whenua involvement in relevant decision making (e.g., the effects of urban intensification on indigenous biodiversity values).</p>

			Tangata whenua values relating to indigenous biodiversity are recognised and involvement in decision making and management is supported.	Greater Wellington considers that these amendments are related provisions under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that they are district-wide matters. These amendments would also have regard to Policy IE.2 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.14	Chapter 1.10.1	New provision	Include policy to enable tangata whenua to undertake customary activities in accordance with tikanga such as customary harvest of mahinga kai species and exercise kaitiakitanga, for example: Mana whenua are enabled to undertake customary activities in accordance with tikanga such as customary harvest of mahinga kai species and exercise kaitiakitanga.	Hutt City Council is required by clause 3.5(1)(c) of the NPS-FM 2020 to ensure that intensification avoids, remedies, or mitigates adverse effects, including cumulative effects, on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems (which includes mahinga kai), and receiving environments. Increased runoff of stormwater and sediment during and after intensified housing development risks degrading the few remaining mahinga kai sites in Hutt City to the point where they cannot be used any longer. Greater Wellington considers that these amendments are related provisions under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that they are district-wide matters. These amendments would also have regard to Policies IE.1 and IE.2 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.15	Chapter 1.10.1	New provision	Include policy to support provision of access to indigenous biodiversity sites, for example: Support provision of access to indigenous biodiversity sites.	Hutt City Council should ensure that intensification is done in a way that does not compromise the ability of tangata whenua and the community to access significant indigenous biodiversity sites. Greater Wellington considers that these amendments are related provisions under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that they are district-wide matters. These amendments would also have regard to Policies IE.1 and IE.2 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.16	Chapter 1.10.1A (Amendment 3) – new Objective 1	Support	Retain as notified.	This objective gives effects to Objective 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.

149.17	Chapter 1.10.1A	New provision	<p>Include a high-level objective that addresses integrated urban form and transport, for example:</p> <p>To ensure integrated land use development and transport that is efficient, well connected to employment and key activity centres, along growth corridors, reduces reliance on private vehicles and encourages active and public transport use.</p> <p>Also insert a new policy for integrated land use and transport as articulated by Policy 57 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>	<p>Greater Wellington supports higher density development along public transport routes. Urban intensification provides an opportunity to support modal shift by making active transport and public transport a more convenient mode of transport.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it relates to infrastructure.</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policy 57 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.18	Chapter 1.10.1A (Policy 1)	Support	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports buildings of at least six stories within a walkable catchment of rapid transit stops, provided there is infrastructure to support it. Increasing density around rapid transit stops is important to move people towards using public transport which will help Greater Wellington meet its mode shift goals of 40% shift to shared and active modes of transport, as set out in the Regional Public Transport Plan.
149.19	Chapter 1.10.1A (Policy 2(b))	Support	Retain as notified.	This qualifying matter gives effect to Policy 22 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.
149.20	Chapter 1.10.1A (Policy 2(c))	Support	Retain as notified.	This qualifying matter has regard to Policy 29 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.21	Chapter 1.10.1A (Policy 2)	New provision	<p>Insert a new qualifying matter as follows:</p> <p>(j) protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</p>	<p>Urban intensification has the potential to adversely affect indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity. Greater Wellington considers that there is benefit in inserting a qualifying matter that empowers Hutt City Council to manage the intensity of development when development poses a risk to indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity as mapped in the significant natural resource site overlay.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that these amendments are related provisions under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that they are district-wide matters.</p>

				These amendments would also give effect to Policy 24 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.
149.22	Chapter 1.10.1A (Policy 3)	Support	Retain as notified.	This policy gives effect to Policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and also has regard to Policy 67 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.23	Chapter 1.10.1A (Explanation and reasons)	Support	Retain as notified.	The approach of addressing qualifying matters (such as Natural Hazards) using overlays is supported. This will allow council to consider targeted matters when considering use and development.
149.24	Chapter 1.10.1A	New provision	<p>Include policies that enable the ongoing use and development of marae as appropriate, for example:</p> <p>Enable tangata whenua to exercise tino rangatiratanga through the ongoing use and development of marae.</p>	<p>It is important that tangata whenua can continue to use and develop marae as part of maintaining their relationship with ancestral lands. Intensification around tangata whenua-owned land and marae may inadvertently preclude tangata whenua from using or developing the land how they want. It is therefore important to recognise the right of tangata whenua to exercise tino rangatiratanga over tangata whenua-owned land and marae.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is provided for by s80E(2)(e) of the RMA as a qualifying matter (the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral land).</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policies UD.1(f) and UD.2 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.25	Chapter 1.10.1A	New provision	<p>Insert a policy that requires the use, development and subdivision of land to consider effects on rivers, lakes, wetlands, springs and riparian margins, including any relevant water quality attribute targets in a regional plan, ecosystem values and drinking water sources, for example:</p> <p>The use, development and subdivision of land must consider effects on:</p> <p>i. gully heads, rivers, lakes, wetlands, springs, riparian margins and estuaries</p> <p>ii. drinking water sources</p>	<p>Hutt City Council is required by clause 3.5(1)(c) of the NPS-FM 2020 to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems. Intensification can increase stormwater runoff (with contaminants picked up in the process) from impermeable surfaces and sediment runoff during earthworks and construction, which often ends up in already degraded urban streams. Increased intensification risks increasing these adverse effects, and thus requires good management of effects on waterbodies.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that it is a district-wide matter.</p>

			<p>iii. ecosystem values</p> <p>iv. any relevant water quality attribute targets in a regional plan</p>	<p>These amendments would also have regard to Policy FW.3(h), (k), (l), (p), and (q) of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.26	Chapter 1.10.1A	New provision	<p>Insert a policy that requires hydrological controls for use, development and subdivision of land, for example:</p> <p>The effects of stormwater runoff quantity (flows and volumes) on natural stream flows shall be avoided as far as practicable by requiring hydrological controls for new development and subdivision.</p>	<p>Hutt City Council is required by clause 3.5(1)(c) of the NPS-FM 2020 to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems. Intensification can increase stormwater runoff (with contaminants picked up in the process) from impermeable surfaces and sediment runoff during earthworks and construction, which often ends up in already degraded urban streams. Increased intensification risks increasing these adverse effects, and thus requires good management of effects on waterbodies.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(f) of the RMA, in that it relates to stormwater management.</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policy FW.3(m) of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.27	Chapter 1.10.1A	New provision	<p>Insert a policy which requires the application of water sensitive urban design principles, including sustainable stormwater design to minimise impacts on the natural environment and achieves outcomes additional to stormwater treatment such as providing amenity spaces, ecological habitat etc, for example:</p> <p>The design of new development and subdivisions shall adopt Water Sensitive Urban Design Principles and Methods in the control of stormwater.</p>	<p>Hutt City Council is required by clause 3.5(1)(c) of the NPS-FM 2020 to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems. Intensification can increase stormwater runoff (with contaminants picked up in the process) from impermeable surfaces, which often ends up in already degraded urban streams. Increased intensification risks increasing these adverse effects, and thus requires good management of effects on waterbodies.</p> <p>While the existing District Plan and Plan Change 56 both have a number of good provisions for stormwater retention (mostly through the use of rainwater tanks), Greater Wellington considers that the Plan needs to go further in incorporating water sensitive urban design into the Plan.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that it is a district-wide matter.</p>

				<p>These amendments would also have regard to Policy FW.3(i) of the Proposed RPS Change 1 and implement Recommendation 96 of the Te Whaitua te Whanganui-a-Tara Implementation Programme.</p>
149.28	Chapter 1.10.1A	New provision	<p>Insert a policy that seeks to minimise the effects of earthworks, including offsite effects of erosion and sediment loss, for example:</p> <p>Manage the effects of urban development on freshwater and the coastal marine area by requiring that urban development is located and designed to minimise the extent and volume of earthworks and to follow, to the extent practicable, existing land contours.</p>	<p>Urban intensification may result in an increase in earthworks and accompanying sediment runoff. When this runoff enters urban streams, it can have adverse effects on aquatic ecosystems and water quality. Hutt City Council is required by clause 3.5(1)(c) of the NPS-FM 2020 to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that it is a district-wide matter.</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policy FW.3(j) of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.29	Chapter 1.10.1A	New provision	<p>Insert a policy to manage earthworks and vegetation removal to limit erosion and siltation of waterways and impacts on māhinga kai and restrict earthworks on highly erodible soils and steeper slopes, for example:</p> <p>Manage the effects of earthworks and vegetation removal on water and cultural values by controlling earthworks and vegetation removal to the extent necessary to:</p> <p>(a) achieve the target attribute states for water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, including the effects of these activities on the life-supporting capacity of soils, and</p> <p>(b) to provide for tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.</p>	<p>Urban intensification may result in an increase in earthworks and accompanying sediment runoff. When this runoff enters urban streams, it can have adverse effects on aquatic ecosystems and water quality. Hutt City Council is required by clause 3.5(1)(c) of the NPS-FM 2020 to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(b) of the RMA, in that it is related to earthworks.</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policy 15 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>

149.30	Chapter 1.10.1A	New provision	<p>Include policies which seek to improve climate resilience of urban areas through measures identified in Policy CC.14 of the Proposed RPS Change 1, for example:</p> <p>Provide for a climate resilient urban environment, including by:</p> <p>(a) maintaining, enhancing, restoring, and/or creating urban greening at a range of spatial scales to provide urban cooling, including working towards a target of 10 percent tree canopy cover at a suburb-scale by 2030, and 30 percent cover by 2050,</p> <p>(b) the application of water sensitive urban design principles to integrate natural water systems into built form and landscapes, to reduce flooding, improve water quality and overall environmental quality,</p> <p>(c) capturing, storing, and recycling water at a community-scale such as requiring rain tanks, and setting targets for urban roof area rainwater collection,</p> <p>(d) protecting, enhancing, or restoring natural ecosystems to strengthen the resilience of communities to the impacts of natural hazards and the effects of climate change,</p> <p>(e) providing for efficient use of water and energy in buildings and infrastructure, and</p> <p>(f) encouraging buildings and infrastructure that are able to withstand the predicted future temperatures, intensity and duration of rainfall and wind.</p>	<p>Given the future challenges posed by climate change, it is essential that urban development and intensification focuses on ensuring urban areas are resilient to the negative effects of climate change, such as more variable rainfall, warmer urban areas, and more severe storm and hazard events.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that these amendments are related provisions under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that they are district-wide matters.</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policy CC.4 of the Proposed RPS Change 1 and implement Recommendation 96 of the Te Whaitua te Whanganui-a-Tara Implementation Programme.</p>
149.31	Chapter 1.10.2 (Objective 1)	Support	Retain as notified.	This objective gives effects to Objective 4 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and has regard to Policy 67 of Proposed RPS Change 1.

149.32	Chapter 1.10.2 (Explanation and reasons – HDRAA)	Support	Retain as notified.	Support higher density residential zoning around train stations to encourage more development around public transport hubs and increase public transport use.
149.33	Chapter 1.10.3 (Policy 1)	Support	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports the approach in this policy of intensification within the existing urban footprint, except in circumstances where a qualifying matter applies.
149.34	Chapter 1.10.3 (Policy 2)	Support	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports the approach in this policy of managing the rate of greenfield development.
149.35	Chapter 1.10.10 (Policy (c))	Support	Retain as notified.	This policy gives effect to Policy 22 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.
149.36	Chapter 1.10.11 (Objective)	Support with amendment	Amend the objective as follows: To avoid or mitigate the vulnerability and risk of people and development to natural hazards. <u>Reduce minimise the risk to people, property and infrastructure from natural and coastal hazards</u>	Use of the word ‘reduce’ is not strong enough, as it sets a policy direction that provides for minimal decreases in risk. Using minimise aligns with the RPS and makes it clear what the intent and purpose is. This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.37	Chapter 1.10.11 (Policy)	Support with amendment	Retain as notified, provided the objective is amended as submitted above.	Provided the objective is amended as requested, the policies would have regard to Policy 29 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.38	Chapter 1.10.11 (Explanation and Reasons – Seismic Induced Hazards)	Support	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports the inclusion of more information about the Wellington Fault.
149.39	Chapter 1.10.11 (Explanation and Reasons – Flood Hazards)	Support with amendment	Amend to include a stronger provision than ‘manage’ in the second bullet point. For example: <u>The Overland Flowpath Overlay identifies the modelled path followed by rainwater during a 1:100 year storm event. In these areas it is necessary to manage development by way of</u>	Greater Wellington supports a risk-based framework to assessing hazards with respect to subdivision, development and use. This Policy adopts a risk-based framework and is consistent with Greater Wellington guidance. Greater Wellington does suggest stronger wording in the second bullet point, such as including mitigation and/or minimisation provisions.

			avoidance, mitigation or minimisation methods to ensure overland flowpaths are not impeded.	This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.40	Chapter 1.10.11 (Explanation and Reasons – Coastal Hazard)	Support with amendment	<p>Provide differentiation between the high and medium coastal hazard overlays to minimise development in the high coastal hazard overlay and manage development within the medium coastal hazard overlay.</p> <p>Remove high and medium density residential areas from these overlays in Petone, Lowry Bay, Days Bay and Eastbourne.</p>	<p>Greater Wellington supports the inclusion of coastal hazard overlays and introduction of a risk-based approach. Due to sea level rise the risk to development in both the medium and high hazard coastal overlay in particular will worsen over time, including by rising groundwater impeding stormwater and pluvial drainage.</p> <p>Increasing the density in these areas will increase the risk to the community and its assets and is contrary to the Regional Policy Statement and national direction on hazard risk management and the national adaptation plan. Coastal hazards should be included as a qualifying matter to limit intensification in these areas.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(e) of the RMA, in that the management of significant risks from natural hazards are an identified qualifying matter.</p> <p>This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.41	Chapter 3	New provision	<p>Insert a definition of “minimise” as follows:</p> <p>Reduce to the smallest amount reasonably practicable. Minimised, minimising and minimisation have the corresponding meaning.</p>	<p>Greater Wellington is seeking several amendments to natural hazards provisions that insert the term “minimise”. Minimise provides useful and clear direction in managing environmental effects or risk from natural hazards. The focus on reducing to the smallest amount reasonably practicable is clearer and provides better outcomes than terms such as “reduce”.</p> <p>This definition is currently used in the regional plan, so adopting it would not make the district plan inconsistent with the regional plan.</p>
149.42	Chapter 3 (definition of “qualifying matter”)	Support	Retain as notified.	This definition gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.

149.43	Chapter 3 (definition of “rapid transit stop”)	Support	Retain as notified.	This definition gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.
149.44	Chapter 4 (Amendment 49 - new paragraph (g))	Support	Retain as notified.	Support higher density residential zoning around areas with good access to public transport to encourage more development around public transport hubs and increase public transport use.
149.45	Chapter 4F, Chapter 4G – Objectives 4F 2.1A, 4G 2.1	Support	Retain as notified.	This objective gives effects to Objective 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.
149.46	Chapter 4F, Chapter 4G – Objectives 4F 2.8, 4G 2.7	Support	Retain as notified.	This objective gives effect to Policy 1(a)(ii) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.
149.47	Chapter 4F, Chapter 4G – Policies 4F 3.10, 4G 3.14, Chapter 3 (definitions)	Support with amendment, new provision (inferred)	<p>Amend policies to require hydrological controls, for example:</p> <p>Require development to be stormwater neutral and incorporate hydrological controls.</p> <p>Insert the definition of hydrological controls used in the Proposed RPS Change 1 as follows:</p> <p>For greenfield development:</p> <p>(a) the modelled mean annual runoff volume generated by the fully developed area must not exceed the mean annual runoff volume modelled from the site in an undeveloped (pastoral) state</p> <p>(b) the modelled mean annual exceedance frequency of the 2-year Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) so-called ‘channel forming’ (or ‘bankfull’) flow for the point where the fully developed area discharges to a stream must not exceed the mean annual exceedance frequency</p>	<p>Hutt City Council is required by clause 3.5(1)(c) of the NPS-FM 2020 to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems. Hydrological controls are broader than stormwater neutrality and include measures to control a range of flows and volumes to manage both flooding and ecosystem health.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that it is a district-wide matter.</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policy FW.3(m) of the Proposed RPS Change 1 and implement Recommendations 57 and 60 of the Te Whaitua te Whanganui-a-Tara Implementation Programme.</p>

			<p><u>modelled for the same site and flow event arising from the area in an undeveloped (pastoral) state.</u></p> <p><u>For brownfield and infill development:</u></p> <p><u>(a) the modelled mean annual runoff volume generated by the fully developed area must, when compared to the mean annual runoff volume modelled for the site prior to the brownfield or infill development, be reduced as far as practicable towards the mean annual runoff volume modelled for the site in an undeveloped state</u></p> <p><u>(b) the modelled mean annual exceedance frequency of the 2-year ARI so-called 'channel forming' (or 'bankfull') flow for the point where the fully developed area discharges to a stream, or stormwater network, shall be reduced as far as practicable towards the mean annual exceedance frequency modelled for the same site and flow event in an undeveloped state.</u></p>	
149.48	Chapter 4F, Chapter 4G Policy 4F 3.13, Policy 4G 3.15	Support	Retain as notified.	These policies give effect to Policy 1(a)(ii) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.
149.49	Chapter 4F, Chapter 4G Rule 4F 4.1.11, Rule 4G 4.1.11	Support with amendment	<p>Include as a matter of control or discretion, the adverse effects on mahinga kai, other customary uses and access for these activities, for example:</p> <p><u>(e) The removal of vegetation not otherwise provided for as a permitted activity is a restricted discretionary activity.</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Amenity Values:</u></p>	Mahinga kai is a compulsory value in the NPS-FM 2020 and Hutt City Council is required to include provisions in its district plan to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems, which includes mahinga kai. Increased runoff of stormwater and sediment during and after intensified housing development risks degrading the few remaining mahinga kai sites in Hutt City to the point where they cannot be used any longer.

			<p><u>The adverse effects upon the visual amenity values of the site and surrounding area caused by the removal of vegetation. Consideration shall be had to the visual prominence of the vegetation, and any replacement planting to be undertaken.</u></p> <p><u>(ii) Site Stability:</u></p> <p><u>The adverse effects upon the stability of the site caused by the removal of vegetation.</u></p> <p><u>(iii) Indigenous Biodiversity and the Intrinsic Values of Ecosystems:</u></p> <p><u>(a) The extent to which the proposal will adversely affect the indigenous biodiversity and intrinsic value of ecosystems on the site and surrounding area.</u></p> <p><u>(b) Applying the criteria in Policy 23 of the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region 2013.</u></p> <p><u>(iv) Mahinga kai</u></p> <p><u>The adverse effects on mahinga kai, other customary uses, and access for these activities.</u></p>	<p>These amendments would also have regard to Policies FW.3(c) and IE.1 and align with Policy IE.2 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.50	Chapter 4F, Chapter 4G	New provisions	<p>Insert new development standards to restrict the use of copper/zinc building materials and the retain the extent of impervious surfaces i.e., 50% (required by MDRS).</p>	<p>An increase in intensification (especially when accompanied by an increase in impervious surfaces) may lead to an increase in stormwater runoff, which can become contaminated by heavy metals. Hutt City Council is required by clause 3.5(1)(c) of the NPS-FM 2020 to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems. Hutt City Council has the jurisdiction to manage the use of building materials as the organisation that regulates construction.</p>

				<p>Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(f) of the RMA, in that it relates to stormwater management.</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policy FW.3(o) of the Proposed RPS Change 1 and give effect to Policy 42 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.</p>
149.51	Chapter 4F, Chapter 4G	Support	These chapters contain generally appropriate zoning for residential zones.	Greater Wellington supports the new Medium Density Residential Activity Area and the new High Density Residential Activity Area
149.52	Chapter 4F Rule 4F 4.2.10	Support	Retain as notified.	This rule has regard to Policy 14 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.53	Chapter 4F Objective 4F 5.1.1.1	Support	Retain as notified.	This policy gives effect to Policy 22 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.
149.54	Chapter 4F Policy 4F 5.1.2.1	Support	Retain as notified.	This policy gives effect to Policy 22 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.
149.55	Chapter 4F, Chapter 4G	New provisions	<p>Include direction in the District Plan, including zone and subdivision provisions, to provide for decentralised wastewater re-use and treatment (of grey and black water) and disposal using alternative wastewater systems (but not septic tanks, due to their existing issues with contamination and leaching) anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. Where connections are available and there is network capacity, a connection to the wastewater network should still be required. This includes any necessary consequential amendments to provide this direction.</p>	<p>Intensification will add additional strain to a wastewater system that is already lacking in capacity, which increases the risk of overflows and associated adverse environmental and human health effects. Greater Wellington considers that the District Plan should provide for approved alternative wastewater systems anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. Septic tanks are excluded from this recommendation due to their known issues with leakage of untreated wastewater and nitrates, particularly when poorly maintained. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it relates to infrastructure. Providing for alternative wastewater treatment options aligns with recommendation 35 of Te Mahere Wai and gives effect to Te Mana o Te Wai. Alternative wastewater treatment options often reduce potable water use significantly. Reducing pressure of new development on the wastewater network may also make intensification in some areas with existing network capacity</p>

				constraints more feasible. Relevant direction from the operative Regional Policy Statement includes policies 16 and 45. Relevant direction from Proposed RPS Change 1 1 includes policies FW.2, FW.3 and FW.5, CC.14 and 42(r), FW.5 and 58. Regional plan rules would apply to discharges from all wastewater systems to manage potential impacts on groundwater and surface water quality, aquatic ecosystems and soil health. These requirements could feasibly be met by approved alternative wastewater systems in brownfield development.
149.56	Chapter 4F, Chapter 4G, Chapter 5, Chapter 6	New provision	Include a rule and associated standard that requires EV or e-bike charging stations, including for residential development, for example: (a) Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if: (i) The building includes an electric vehicle or ebike charging station.	Urban intensification provides an opportunity to support greater uptake of electric-powered private transport options by making them an easier and more convenient mode of transport. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it relates to infrastructure. These amendments would also have regard to Policies CC.1 and CC.3 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.57	Chapter 4F, Chapter 4G, Chapter 5, Chapter 6, Chapter 11	New provisions	Include as a matter of control or discretion for subdivision and comprehensive housing development a requirement to consider the extent to which the development provides for zero or low carbon, public and active transport modes, for example: Control/Discretion is restricted to: (x) the extent to which the development provides for zero or low carbon, public and active transport modes.	Urban intensification presents an opportunity to develop ancillary zero carbon or low carbon transport infrastructure. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that climate change is a district-wide matter. These amendments would also have regard to Policies CC.1 and CC.3 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.58	Maps, as they relate to the HDRAA (inferred)	Support	No relief sought.	Zoning the area around train stations as High-Density Residential Activity Areas aligns with the train stations being designated as rapid transit stations. Development around key public transport hubs is important as it will help shift people out of cars and onto public transport. This is a key goal of the Regional Public Transport Plan. Greater Wellington is looking at transit-oriented development at Waterloo Station. Higher Density housing around Waterloo Station will increase demand on the station. The current station can be better connected to the community around it to ensure it is fit for purpose and a key, modern transport and community hub

				through transit-oriented development. Transit oriented development at Waterloo Station is not a residential activity but fits within the Activity Area as it is compatible with residential activities.
149.59	Chapter 4G Rule 4G 4.2.7 Permeable Surface	Support	Retain as notified.	These amendments have regard to Policy FW.3(i) of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.60	Chapter 4G Rule 4G 4.2.12 Stormwater Retention	Support	Retain as notified.	This rule has regard to Policy 14 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.61	Chapter 4G Objective 4G 5.2.1.1	Support	Retain as notified.	This objective gives effect to Policy 22 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.
149.62	Chapter 4G Policy 5.2.2.1	Support	Retain as notified.	This policy gives effect to Policy 22 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.
149.63	Chapter 4G Objective 4G 5.3.1.1, Objective 4G 5.3.1.2	Support	Retain as notified.	These objectives give effect to Policy 22 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.
149.64	Chapter 4G Policy 5.3.2.1, Policy 5.3.2.2, Policy 5.3.2.3, Policy 5.3.2.4, Policy 5.3.2.5, Policy 5.3.2.6, Policy 5.3.2.7	Support	Retain as notified.	These policies give effect to Policy 22 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.
149.65	Chapter 5E 1 Introduction/Zone Statement	Support	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports medium and high-density development in areas that are within walking distance to rapid transit stops. This goes towards achieving mode shift, getting

				people out of cars and onto public transport. A 40% mode shift is one of the goals set out in the Regional Public Transport Plan.
149.66	Chapter 11.1	New provision	<p>Insert a new subdivision policy to encourage subdivision design to achieve efficient water use require alternate water supplies for non-potable use i.e., roof water capture in new developments, for example:</p> <p>Manage the demand for water supply from new subdivision and development by: (a) encouraging the efficient use of water, including in subdivision design; and (b) requiring alternate water supplies for non potable use such as roof water capture.</p>	<p>Hutt City Council is required to include provisions in its district plan to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems. Inefficient water use can lead to higher water takes that adversely affect freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it is relates to infrastructure. These amendments would also have regard to Policy FW.2 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.67	Chapter 11	New provision	<p>Include policy that requires the provision of infrastructure in subdivision development that supports modal shift and consideration of how design can reduce greenhouse gas emissions, for example:</p> <p>(c) To provide infrastructure in subdivision development that supports modal shift and consideration of how design can reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>Urban intensification provides an opportunity to ensure development supports a modal shift in transport towards public transport, active transport, and other methods that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it is related to infrastructure. These amendments would also have regard to Policies CC.1 and CC.3 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.68	Chapter 11 Section 11.1.3 Objective	Support	Retain as notified.	<p>Greater Wellington supports the inclusion of this objective and its intention. It also has regard to Policy 29 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.69	Chapter 11 Section 11.1.3 Policy	Support with amendment	<p>Clause (bd) should be differentiated between high and medium coastal hazard areas - to minimise development in the high coastal hazard overlay and manage development within the medium coastal hazard overlay.</p>	<p>Due to sea level rise the risk to development in both the medium and high hazard coastal overlay in particular will worsen over time, including by rising groundwater impeding stormwater and pluvial drainage. In the medium to long term, there is little option but to relocate from low lying, high hazard coastal areas. It will be very difficult for individuals to mitigate this risk and will a require vast investment of resources from local councils to implement groundwater and stormwater pump schemes and seawall embankments. Increasing the density in these areas will increase the risk to the community and its assets and is contrary</p>

				to the objective outlined in amendment 339, the Regional Policy Statement and national direction on hazard risk management and the national adaptation plan. This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.70	Chapter 11 Section 11.1.3 Explanations and Reasons	Amend	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Subdivision of land subject to natural hazards may lead to allotments which are inappropriate as the adverse effects cannot be controlled or mitigated. It is important that the subdivision is designed in a manner that the natural hazard can be avoided or mitigated. In this respect, it is important that allotments are of sufficient size and are of an appropriate shape so that the proposed use or development can be sited to avoid the natural hazard, or the necessary mitigation measures can be implemented <u>to manage minimise the risk to people, property and infrastructure and adverse effects on the natural environment from hazard mitigation measures.</u> without affecting detrimentally the viability of the use or development.</p>	Using the submitted definition of “minimise” provides stronger and clearer direction for the management of risk. Accounting for adverse effects on the natural environment also makes it consistent with Amendment 403, the Regional Plan and the Regional Policy Statement direction to consider the impacts on the environment from development and hazard mitigation measures, including a direction for green based infrastructure and nature-based solutions. This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.71	Chapter 11 Section 11.2.2.1	Support with amendment	<p>As a matter of control or discretion for subdivision include the extent to which the design protects, enhances, restores or creates nature-based solutions to manage the effects of climate change, or similar, for example:</p> <p><u>(x) Nature-based solutions (i) the extent to which the design protects, enhances, restores or creates nature-based solutions to manage the effects of climate change.</u></p>	Urban intensification may pose a risk nature-based solutions to climate change, so it is essential they are protected. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that climate change is a district-wide matter. These amendments would also have regard to Policy CC.7 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.72	Chapter 11 11.2.2.2 Matters in which Council Seeks to Control	Support	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports the inclusion of this new clause. It also has regard to Policy 29 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.

149.73	Chapter 11 11.2.2.2 Matters in which Council Seeks to Control, 11.2.3.1 Matters in which Council has restricted its discretion	Support with amendment	Include as a matter of control or discretion for subdivision the extent to which the development will avoid the potential reverse sensitivity on the health of people, the amenity and nuisance effects.	Intensification and accompanying subdivision of land risks adverse effects on amenity if not properly managed, as well as more common nuisance effects such as noise. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it relates to the subdivision of land. These amendments would also give effect to Policy 1 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.
149.74	Chapter 11 11.2.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	Support	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports the inclusion of new clauses (e) and (f) as matters of discretion. It also has regard to Policy 29 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.75	Chapter 11 11.2.3.1 Matters in which Council has restricted its discretion (a)(v) (inferred)	Support	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports the inclusion of coastal hazards as a matter of discretion.
149.76	Chapter 11 11.2.3.1(d) Matters in which Council has restricted its discretion	Support	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports the inclusion of flood hazards as a matter of discretion
149.77	Chapter 11 11.2.3.1(e) Matters in which Council has restricted its discretion	Support	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports the inclusion of coastal hazards as a matter of discretion.
149.78	Chapter 11 11.2.3.1(f) Matters in which Council has restricted its discretion	Support	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports the inclusion of coastal hazards as a matter of discretion.

149.79	Chapter 11 11.2.4 Discretionary Activities	Support	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports the inclusion of high coastal hazards and fault hazards as a matter of discretion.
149.80	Chapter 11 11.2.4.1 Assessment Criteria for Discretionary Activities	Support	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports the inclusion of high coastal hazards and fault hazards as a matter of discretion.
149.81	Chapter 11 11.2.5 Non Complying Activities	Support	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports the inclusion of this new clause.
149.82	Chapter 12 11.2.5 Non Complying Activities	Support with amendment	<p>Include a non-complying activity rule where any required financial contribution is not paid, for example:</p> <p>(d) Any subdivision of land where any financial contribution that is not mandatory has not been paid</p>	To encourage the payment of financial contributions to support new development it would be beneficial to add a new non-complying activity rule for subdivision where any optional financial contributions are not paid to Hutt City Council. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(1)(b)(i) of the RMA, in that it is related to financial contributions. These amendments would also have regard to Policy FW.4 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.83	Chapter 12 12.2.1.5(b)	Support	Retain as notified provisions that requires financial contribution to be paid where stormwater treatment and management is provided offsite.	This provision sets out clear direction on financial contributions for off-site stormwater treatment. It also has regard to Policy FW.4 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.84	Chapter 12	New provision	Insert a new schedule or appendix that includes the method for determining the costs of a financial contribution.	It would be beneficial to clearly set our methods for determining financial contributions in the district plan. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(1)(b)(i) of the RMA, in that it relates to financial contributions. These amendments would also have regard to Policy FW.4 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.85	Chapter 14	New provision	<p>Insert high level policy on efficient water use and water re-use where possible, for example:</p> <p>Reduce demand for water from registered water suppliers and users, including where practicable</p>	Hutt City Council is required by clause 3.5(1)(c) of the NPS-FM 2020 manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems. Inefficient water use can lead to higher water takes that adversely affect freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems. Greater

			<p>by: (a) improving the efficiency of the end use of water on a per capita basis for new developments; and (b) requiring alternate water supplies for non potable use in new developments.</p> <p>Create design guidelines or best practice guides that may/could be incorporated into District Plans may be useful in providing examples of how to reduce demand i.e., types of building design or technological solutions.</p>	Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it is relates to infrastructure. These amendments would also have regard to Policy FW.2 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.86	Chapter 14	New provision	<p>Insert a policy to require new development to ensure adequate available water supply including consideration of how climate change may affect existing supplies and the need to develop further water supply sources, for example:</p> <p>Require new development to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply available, including consideration of how climate change may affect existing water supplies.</p>	Ensuring that new development has an adequate supply of water available for the long term will be key to improving climate change resilience. Changing rainfall patterns are likely to affect the supply of water available in the long-term and this should be factored into development. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it is relates to infrastructure. These amendments would have regard to Policy FW.2 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.87	Chapter 14	New provision	<p>Include an objective that nature-based solutions (those mapped by Greater Wellington and not mapped) are protected, restored and enhanced, for example:</p> <p>Nature-based solutions are protected, restored and enhanced.</p>	<p>Urban intensification may pose a risk to existing nature based solutions to climate change, so it is essential they are protected. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it is relates to infrastructure.</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policy CC.7 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.88	Chapter 14	New provision	<p>Include policy that seeks to avoid effects of development on, or modification of nature-based solutions that would compromise their function, for example:</p> <p>Avoid effects of development on, or modification of nature-based solutions that would compromise their function.</p>	Urban intensification may pose a risk nature-based solutions to climate change, so it is essential they are protected. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it is relates to infrastructure. These amendments would also have regard to Policy CC.7 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.

149.89	Chapter 14	New provision	<p>Include policy that encourages the restoration of nature-based solutions, for example:</p> <p>Encourage the restoration of nature-based solutions.</p>	<p>Urban intensification may pose a risk nature-based solutions to climate change, so it is essential they are protected. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it is relates to infrastructure. These amendments would also have regard to Policy CC.7 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.90	Chapter 14	New provision	<p>Include policy that seeks nature-based solutions when providing for new infrastructure and in new developments such as the use of green infrastructure, for example:</p> <p>Make use of nature-based solutions where practicable when providing for new infrastructure and in new developments, such as the use of green infrastructure.</p>	<p>Urban intensification may pose a risk nature-based solutions to climate change, so it is essential they are protected. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it is relates to infrastructure. These amendments would also have regard to Policy CC.7 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.91	Chapter 14	New provision	<p>Insert a new rule to permit the development of appropriate zero carbon, public transport and active transport infrastructure, for example:</p> <p>(a) Construction or alteration of infrastructure is permitted if it: (i) is for new or existing zero carbon infrastructure; or (ii) is for new or existing public transport infrastructure; or (iii) is for new or existing active transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>Urban intensification presents an opportunity to develop ancillary zero carbon or low carbon transport infrastructure. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it is relates to infrastructure. These amendments would also have regard to Policies CC.1 and CC.3 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.92	Chapter 14	New provision	<p>Include objectives, policies, rules to require greenhouse gases to be reduced rather than offset for the type and scale of activities identified.</p>	<p>Offsetting cannot be the only focus of climate change mitigation; it is important to reduce emissions as well. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it is relates to infrastructure. These amendments would also have regard to Policy CC.8 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.93	Chapter 14	New provision	<p>Include policy to direct the circumstances when and how biodiversity offsetting can be used and if used, the outcome must be at least a 10 percent biodiversity gain or benefit. Refer to an appendix for full details. Provisions could require management plans for managing offset</p>	<p>Avoiding adverse effects on biodiversity is preferable to offsetting adverse effects on biodiversity, but Greater Wellington recognises that there will be situations when adverse effects will need to be offset. As there appear to be some mapped significant natural resource areas that are zoned for intensification, the District Plan</p>

			biodiversity areas and managing effects on significant areas. Monitoring requirements would form part of these plans and plan direction could encourage the adoption of mātauranga Māori in monitoring of indigenous species in relevant circumstances. Include an appendix which sets out the limitations where biodiversity offsetting is not appropriate as described in Policy 24 and Appendix 1A of the Regional Policy Statement.	needs to provide policy guidance as to what these situations would be. Greater Wellington considers that these amendments are related provisions under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that they are district-wide matters. These amendments would also have regard to Policies IE.1, IE.2, 24 and 47 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.94	Chapter 14	New provision	Permit the development of green infrastructure in appropriate locations and subject to necessary controls, i.e., planting works undertaken by regional council.	Urban intensification may pose a risk nature-based solutions to climate change, so it is essential they are protected. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it relates to infrastructure. These amendments would also have regard to Policy CC.7 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.95	Chapter 14	New provision	Include a policy to encourage carbon emissions assessment for new or altered transport infrastructure over a certain threshold and specify what these assessments must include. Rules could manage the provision of new, or additions or upgrades to, transport infrastructure.	In order to ensure new or altered transport infrastructure that supports intensification are contributing to a reduction in carbon emissions, it would be beneficial to insert policy direction requiring assessments of the project's whole of life carbon emissions. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, as climate change is a district-wide matter. These amendments would have regard to Policy CC.11 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.96	Chapter 4F, Chapter 4G	New provisions	Include matter of control or discretion to require proper disposal of building waste when redeveloping sites/brownfield development (e.g., demolition).	Urban intensification will require significant infill development. This means it will be crucial to ensure the disposal of building waste is properly managed. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, as soil and contaminants are a district-wide matter. These amendments would also have regard to Policy 34 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.
149.97	Chapter 14A	New provision	Include a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity rule for high trip generating activities subject to a travel demand management plan being provided. Include a matter of control or	Urban intensification presents an opportunity to transition towards a transport system that more effectively considers travel demand. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it relates to

			<p>discretion, the extent to which the travel demand management plan will minimise reliance on private vehicles and maximise public and active transport modes. For example:</p> <p>(a) An activity is a restricted discretionary activity if: (i) it is a high trip generating activity; and (ii) a travel demand management plan has been provided. Discretion is restricted to: i. the extent to which the travel demand management plan will minimise reliance on private vehicles and maximise public and active transport modes.</p>	<p>infrastructure. These amendments would also have regard to Policy CC.2 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.98	Chapter 14A	New provision	<p>Insert objective for the transport system to reduce dependence on fossil fuels and private vehicles, for example:</p> <p>A transport system that reduces dependence on fossil fuels and private vehicles and maximises use of public transport and active modes</p>	<p>Urban intensification presents an opportunity to transition towards a transport system that reduces dependence on fossil fuels and private vehicles. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it is relates to infrastructure. These amendments would also have regard to Policies CC.1 and CC.3 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.99	Chapter 14A	New provision	<p>Insert policy that enables the development of zero and low carbon and public transport infrastructure (i.e., charging stations, park and ride facilities), for example:</p> <p>Enable development of zero carbon, low carbon and public transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>Urban intensification presents an opportunity to transition towards a transport system that reduces dependence on fossil fuels and private vehicles. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it is relates to infrastructure. These amendments would also have regard to Policies CC.1 and CC.3 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.100	Chapter 14A	New provision	<p>Insert policy that prioritises development where there are public transport links, for example:</p> <p>Prioritise development and intensification where there are public transport links.</p>	<p>Urban intensification should be prioritised where there are existing public transport links in order to take advantage of existing low-carbon transport infrastructure. Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it is relates to infrastructure.</p> <p>These amendments would also have regard to Policies CC.1 and CC.3 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.101	Chapter 14A	New provision	<p>Insert a rule condition that prescribes thresholds requiring when consent applicants need to</p>	<p>Urban intensification presents an opportunity to transition towards a transport system that more effectively considers travel demand.</p>

			prepare Travel Demand Management Plans. The thresholds can be size of the subdivision, number of dwellings, people, floor size of retail development etc. Develop policy direction to manage effects of high trip generating activities on the transport network by requiring travel demand management plans. This policy should set out what is required to be addressed by the management plan, which would include the measures to be undertaken to reduce reliance on private vehicles and encourage modal shift to low carbon, active or public transport options.	Greater Wellington considers that this amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(d) of the RMA, in that it relates to infrastructure. These amendments would also have regard to Policy CC.2 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.102	Chapter 14E Policy 14E 1.1(c), (d), (h), (i).	Support	These policies provide good high level policy direction to protect historic heritage, archaeological sites and wāhi tapu.	These provisions also give effect to Policy 28 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.
149.103	14E 2.2.1 Matters in which Council has Restricted its Discretion and Standards and Terms	Support	Retain the matters of discretion relating to the extent and effects of the works on the values of the outstanding natural feature or landscape.	These provisions also give effect to Policy 28 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.
149.104	Chapter 14E	New provision	Include policy direction to provide for subdivision, use and development where the values of the feature or landscape can be protected, and any adverse effects minimised.	Greater Wellington supports subdivision, use or development where natural character can be protected, provided any adverse effects are minimised, and it would be beneficial for policy direction to articulate this. Greater Wellington considers that these amendments are related provisions under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA, in that they are district-wide matters. These amendments would also give effect to Policy 26 of the Operative Regional Policy Statement.
149.105	Chapter 14E	New provision	Insert rules that requires setbacks for areas adjacent to significant cultural areas to the extent necessary following site-specific analysis, except where the associated buildings and structures will provide for tino rangatiranga.	Intensification, even when it does not take place on a significant cultural area, can still have adverse effects on the cultural values of a site. This could be managed by requiring a setback from significant cultural sites for intensification and only permitting development within that setback if the development is for the purposes of tino rangatiranga. Greater Wellington considers

				that this amendment is provided for by s80E(2)(e) of the RMA as a qualifying matter (the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral land).
149.106	Chapter 14H Introduction, Coastal Hazards, Risk, Overlays, Qualifying Matters (Amendments 401- 405)	Support with amendment	Retain as notified.	Greater Wellington supports the text in the introduction and the inclusion of hazard overlays and a risk-based approach to managing the risks associated with natural hazards, including the introduction of natural hazards as a qualifying matter in MDR areas. However, Greater Wellington strongly recommends removing residential areas in the high hazard coastal overlay earmarked as suitable for medium or high-density intensification in Petone and the east Harbour Bays. Intensification of residential development in these areas will increase the risk to communities that will worsen over time as sea level rises in tandem with ongoing tectonic subsidence. This is a change in the natural environment that individuals cannot mitigate against and council will struggle to deal with in the long term. This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.107	Chapter 14H Issue section 14H 1.1.1	Support with amendment	Amend as follows: <u>There is a risk of harm to people and damage to their property from natural hazards associated with natural and coastal hazards. The risk to people and their property should be avoided, minimised or mitigated.</u>	Greater Wellington supports the inclusion of this new issue. To keep it consistent with the risk-based approach promoted in this new hazards chapter, minimise should be included to recognise managing the risk as an option apart from avoiding or mitigating the hazard. This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.108	Objective 14H 1.1	Support with amendment	Amend as follows: <u>To avoid or reduce minimise the risk to people, property, and infrastructure from natural hazards and coastal hazards.</u>	Minimise provides useful and clear direction in managing environmental effects or risk from natural hazards. The focus on reducing to the smallest amount reasonably practicable is clearer and provides better outcomes than terms such as “reduce”. This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1.
149.109	Policy 14H 1.1	Support with amendment	Amend as follows: <u>Subdivision, use and development reduce or do not increase minimises the risk to people, property and infrastructure by:</u>	Greater Wellington supports the goal to limit the scale of subdivision, use and development in the natural hazard and coastal hazard overlays. Minimise provides useful and clear direction in managing environmental effects or risk from natural hazards. The focus on

			<p><u>1. Limiting the scale of subdivision, use and development on sites within the medium and high Natural Hazard Overlays and the medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays; and</u></p> <p><u>2. 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 Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays.</u></p>	<p>reducing to the smallest amount reasonably practicable is clearer and provides better outcomes than terms such as “reduce”.</p> <p>This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.110	Policy 14H 1.2	Support with amendment	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><u>Manage Structures and Buildings, within the Wellington Fault Overlay by ensuring that:</u></p> <p><u>1. The activity is located more than 20m from the Wellington Faultline, or</u></p> <p><u>2. The activity, excluding additions to existing building, has an operational or functional need to locate within the Wellington Fault Overlay and locating outside of these Overlays is not a practicable option; and</u></p> <p><u>3. The activity incorporates mitigation measures that ensure the risk from fault rupture to people and property is reduced or not increased minimised; or</u></p> <p><u>4. For additions to existing buildings, the change in risk from fault rupture to people and property is reduced or not increased minimised.</u></p>	<p>Minimise provides useful and clear direction in managing environmental effects or risk from natural hazards. The focus on reducing to the smallest amount reasonably practicable is clearer and provides better outcomes than terms such as “reduce”.</p> <p>This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.111	Policy 14H 1.3	Support	Retain as notified.	This provision has regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1.
149.112	Policy 14H 1.4	Support	Retain as notified.	This provision has regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1.

149.113	Policy 14H 1.5	Support	Retain as notified.	This provision has regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1.
149.114	Policy 14H 1.6	Support	Retain as notified.	This provision has regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1.
149.115	Policy 14H 1.7	Support with amendment	Amend Policy 14H 1.7 to prevent residential dwellings from being built in the stream corridor.	It will be very important to enforce point 1 in this policy. It is expected that a residential dwelling would not qualify under any circumstances as having an operational or functional need to be located in the stream corridor. This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1.
149.116	Policy 14H 1.8	Support with amendment	Remove HDRAA and MDRAA from the high coastal hazard overlay and rezone to MDRAA in the medium coastal hazard areas.	Concerned that development will intensify in the coastal hazard overlays that will be impossible for individuals or developers to mitigate because of the building risks as a result of tectonic subsidence, climate change and sea level rise, pushing up water table levels and impeding drainage of stormwater and pluvial flooding. This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1 and give effect to Policy 51 in the operative RPS.
149.117	Chapter 14H Policy 14H 1.9	Support with amendment	Amend as follows: <u>Provide for new residential units, commercial activities or retail activities, where the building platform is or will be within the Low Coastal Hazard Area, where it can be demonstrated that:</u> <u>1. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that reduce or do not increase minimise the risk to people and property from a tsunami;</u> <u>2. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building in case of a tsunami.</u>	Minimise provides useful and clear direction in managing environmental effects or risk from natural hazards. The focus on reducing to the smallest amount reasonably practicable is clearer and provides better outcomes than terms such as “reduce”. This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1.

149.118	Chapter 14H Policy 14H 1.10	Support with amendment	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><u>Manage new residential units, commercial activities or retail activities within the Medium Coastal Hazard Area or any subdivision where the building platform will be within the Medium Coastal Hazard Area by ensuring:</u></p> <p><u>1. The activity, building, or subdivision incorporates measures that reduce or do not increase minimise the risk to people and property from the coastal hazard, and</u></p> <p><u>2. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal hazard.</u></p>	<p>Minimise provides useful and clear direction in managing environmental effects or risk from natural hazards.</p> <p>The focus on reducing to the smallest amount reasonably practicable is clearer and provides better outcomes than terms such as “reduce”.</p> <p>This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.119	Chapter 14H Policy 14H 1.11	Support with amendment	<p>Clarity is needed on whether a residential unit would ever have a functional need to be located in the high hazard coastal overlay.</p>	<p>It will be very important to enforce point 1 in this policy; “The activity, has an operational and functional need to locate within the Stream Corridor....” Does Hutt City Council consider that a residential dwelling would have a functional need to be built in the high hazard coastal area? It is Greater Wellington expectation that this would not qualify. This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.120	Chapter 14H Policy 14H 1.12	Support	<p>Retain as notified.</p>	<p>Policy has regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.121	Chapter 14H Policy 14H 1.13	Support with amendment	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><u>Manage subdivision, development and use on sites within the Petone Commercial Activity Area and Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area and within any Coastal Hazard Overlay, where they involve the construction of new buildings which will be occupied by members of the public, employees or result in the creation of a vacant allotment by ensuring that</u></p> <p><u>1. The activity, building or subdivision incorporates measures that reduce or do not</u></p>	<p>Minimise provides useful and clear direction in managing environmental effects or risk from natural hazards.</p> <p>The focus on reducing to the smallest amount reasonably practicable is clearer and provides better outcomes than terms such as “reduce”.</p> <p>This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1.</p>

			increase <u>minimise</u> the risk to people, and property; and <u>2. There is the ability to access safe evacuation routes for occupants of the building from the coastal hazard.</u>	
149.122	Chapter 14H Rule 14H 2.1 Rule 14H 2.2 Rule 14H 2.3 Rule 14H 2.4 Rule 14H 2.5	Support	Retain as notified.	Provisions have regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1.
149.123	Chapter 14H Rule 14H 2.6 Rule 14H 2.7 Rule 14H 2.8	Support	Retain as notified.	Provisions have regard to Policy 29 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.124	Chapter 14H Rule 14H 2.9	Oppose	Delete this rule.	New residential units should not be allowed in the high hazard coastal overlay. This rule is contrary to 14H 1.11 (1) that states that development in this overlay needs to have a functional need to be located here. Allowing two units to be constructed is not limiting development as per the objectives and policies of this plan. Development in this zone should be limited to non-habitable structures or maintenance, upgrades or like for like replacements of residential structures. This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
149.125	Chapter 14H Rule 14H 2.10, Other Matters 14H 2.11	Support	Retain as notified.	Provisions have regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1.

149.126	Chapter 14H 14H 3 Anticipated Environmental Results	Support with amendment	<p>Insert new clauses as follows:</p> <p>(c) Increased resilience of the community, infrastructure and the built environment to the impacts from natural hazards and climate change:</p> <p>(d) Improved outcomes for the natural environment from the use of green infrastructure and nature-based solutions for natural hazard mitigation.</p>	<p>The District Plan needs to recognise the need to build resilience into the community and supporting emergency management goals, and that hazard mitigation measures can be damaging to natural processes and the ecosystem and that it is important to minimise this harm.</p> <p>This amendment would have regard to Policy 29 of proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.127	Chapter 14I Rule 14I 2.1.1	Amend	<p>Retain the 50m³ volume standards for permitted activity status in (b) and add a new requirement that earthworks do not occur within a 5m setback from waterbodies to be consistent with the regional plan. For example, insert a new permitted activity condition as follows:</p> <p>(e) Setback from waterbodies: Minimum of 5m.</p>	<p>Hutt City Council is required by clause 3.5(1)(c) of the NPS-FM 2020 to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems.</p> <p>Intensification will require earthworks for building foundations and ancillary infrastructure, which creates a risk from sediment runoff.</p> <p>Discharges of sediment from earthworks have demonstrable adverse effects on freshwater ecosystems and water quality.</p> <p>This amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(b) of the RMA.</p> <p>Provision would have regard to Policy 15 of proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.128	Chapter 14I Matters 14I 2.2.1	Amend	<p>Insert a requirement for erosion and sediment control measures to be effectively utilised to prevent sediment entering waterways and amend rules to insert a requirement for the provision of an erosion and sediment control plan with an application. For example:</p> <p>(v) Sediment Controls: The extent to which the proposed Earthworks will discharge sediment into waterways and the submission of an erosion and sediment control plan as part of the resource consent application.</p>	<p>Hutt City Council is required by clause 3.5(1)(c) of the NPS-FM 2020 to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems.</p> <p>Intensification will require earthworks for building foundations and ancillary infrastructure, which creates a risk from sediment runoff.</p> <p>Discharges of sediment from earthworks have demonstrable adverse effects on freshwater ecosystems and water quality.</p> <p>This amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(b) of the RMA.</p> <p>Provision would have regard to Policy 15 of proposed RPS Change 1.</p>

149.129	Chapter 14I Rule 14I 2.1.1	Amend	<p>Insert or amend a matter of control or discretion regarding the potential for adverse effects on water quality of any waterbody, wāhi tapu, wāhi taonga and habitat of any significant indigenous species. For example:</p> <p><u>(vi) Adverse effects on water quality: The extent to which the proposed earthworks will have adverse effects on the water quality of any waterbody, wāhi tapu, wāhi taonga and habitat of any significant indigenous species.</u></p>	<p>Hutt City Council is required by clause 3.5(1)(c) of the NPS-FM 2020 to manage effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and freshwater ecosystems.</p> <p>This amendment is a related provision under s80E(2)(b) of the RMA.</p> <p>Provision would have regard to Policy 15 of proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.130	Chapter 14L Policy 14L 1.1(a)	n/a	<p>No specific decision requested, but general support for the policy.</p>	<p>Recognises the benefits of renewable energy.</p> <p>Provision would have regard to Policy 39 of proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.131	Chapter 14L Policy 14L 1.1	Amend	<p>Include a policy to promote energy efficiency in development such as layout in design to maximise solar and renewable energy generation. For example:</p> <p><u>(j) Ensure urban design layout maximises to greatest extent practicable the potential for solar and other renewable energy generation.</u></p>	<p>Renewable energy microgeneration potential can be enhanced with good urban design, and this should be encouraged.</p> <p>These amendments are related provisions under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA.</p> <p>Provision would have regard to Policy 11 of proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
149.132	Chapter 14L Rule 14L 2.1.2, Rule 14L 2.1.3, Rule 14L 2.1.4	Amend	<p>Retain these rules that permit the installation of small-scale energy generation infrastructure such as solar and small wind power and delete height/height in relation to boundary controls. For example:</p> <p>For Rule 14L 2.1.2</p> <p><u>a) May exceed the permitted height for the Activity Area by no more than 1m.</u></p> <p>b) May exceed the recession plane standard for the Activity Area by no more than 1m (measured vertically).</p>	<p>Would serve to further encourage the development of renewable energy microgeneration.</p> <p>These amendments are related provisions under s80E(2)(a) of the RMA.</p> <p>Provision would have regard to Policy 11 of proposed RPS Change 1.</p>

			<p>c) Where located on a heritage building listed in Appendix Heritage 1 and 2, any solar panel shall:</p> <p>(i) be located on a roof plane which is not visible from any adjacent public areas;</p> <p>(ii) be aligned with the plane of the roof.</p> <p>For Rule 14L 2.1.3</p> <p>a) Shall comply with recession plane, yard and noise standards for the Activity Area in which the site is located.</p> <p>b) May exceed the permitted height for the Activity Area by no more than 2m.</p> <p>c) May not exceed more than one turbine per site.</p> <p>For Rule 14L 2.1.4</p> <p>a) Must comply with recession plane, yard and noise standards for the Activity Area that the site is located in.</p> <p>b) May exceed the permitted height for the zone by up to, but no more than, 2m.</p> <p>c) May not exceed more than one turbine per site.</p>	
149.133	Chapter 14L Matters of Discretion 14L 2.2	Support with amendment	<p>Include, as a matter of control or discretion for subdivision and comprehensive housing developments, how the development provides for solar orientation of buildings to achieve passive solar gain. For example:</p> <p>(x) Solar orientation</p> <p>(i) the extent to which the design provides for solar orientation of buildings to achieve passive solar gain.</p>	<p>Could help to make solar microgeneration more viable and increase uptake.</p> <p>Related provisions under s80(2)(a) of the RMA.</p> <p>Provision would have regard to Policy 11 of proposed RPS Change 1.</p>

DPC56/150 Annette Paterson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
150.1	Amendment 171 Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area 4G 5.2 – Residential Heritage Precinct	Support with amendment	Amend paragraph 2 of section 4G 5.2 as follows: <u>Several areas within the City contain a collection of buildings that, when considered together, hold significant heritage values. Development in these areas is restricted in order to preserve their distinct heritage values that provide connection, understanding or and appreciation of the history and culture in the City.</u>	Heritage values are very important now and for future generations.
150.2	Amendment 173 Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4G 5.2.1.1	Support	Retain this amendment.	The historic heritage of residential areas in the Residential Heritage Precinct needs to be protected from new development with inappropriate building heights and density.
150.3	Amendment 175 Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 5.2.2.1	Support	Retain this amendment.	Managing the impacts of new built development on the historic heritage of areas in the Residential Heritage Precinct by limiting building heights and density is very important.
150.4	Amendment 176 Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area Section 4G 5.2.3 Rules	Oppose	Ensure that all proposed residential heritage precincts are protected from demolition without consent.	All activities and development within the Residential Heritage Precinct having to comply with and be assessed against the provisions (including development standards) of the underlying Residential Activity Area unless specified otherwise below means that demolition without consent would be possible within the Petone Foreshore Heritage Area.

150.5	Amendment 177 Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area Rule 4G 5.2.3.1	Support	Keep the wording in all of this amendment.	Keeping the current building heights and numbers of dwellings on each site is a key way of keeping such precincts intact
-------	---	---------	--	--

DPC56/151 New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
151.1	Accessibility as part of a well-functioning urban environment Entire Plan Change	Support with amendment	Support with amendments and other consequential relief to ensure accessibility to active modes and public transport is considered as part of the plan change.	<p>Waka Kotahi generally supports the proposed plan change in implementing the increased urban densities required under the MDRS.</p> <p>However, Waka Kotahi requests that this plan change more fully recognise the need to also consider the role of ensuring accessibility to active and public transport within a well-functioning environment as per Policy 1 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>This is also consistent with the Wellington Regional Policy Statement Proposed Plan Change 1 (Objective 22, Policy 33 and 57) that encourages mode shift and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gasses.</p>
151.2	District plan maps and provisions Melling Road Infrastructure District Plan Maps	Amend	Recognise the relocated Melling railway station and pedestrian and cycle facilities within the proposed plan change and enable increased urban density within its walkable catchment.	<p>The transformative Riverlink project and Melling Transport Improvements will result in a new Melling/SH 2 interchange, river bridge, relocated railway station and pedestrian and cycle facilities to improve transport safety, reliability and transport choice. This is a wider partnership project that is included in the Regional Land Transport Plan and identified as a key project for Wellington in the 2021-24 National Land Transport Programme with consenting underway.</p> <p>In accordance with the NPS-UD and the MDRS it is important that district plans enable more people to live in areas well-served by</p>

				<p>existing or planned public transport, urban development near a centre zone, and enable building heights of at least 6 storeys within a walkable catchment of existing and planned rapid transit stops.</p> <p>Therefore, Waka Kotahi request that the planned relocated railway station at Melling is recognised as a planned rapid transit station within the proposed plan change and increased urban densities are enabled within the walkable catchment of this station as appropriate.</p>
151.3	<p>References to Hutt City Medium Density Design Guide</p> <p>Hutt City Medium Density Design Guide</p>	Amend	<p>Delete the reference to the Hutt City Council Medium Density Design Guide for High Density Residential Activity Areas.</p> <p>Alternatively, that the design guide is refreshed to better reflect the planned built environment of the High Density Residential Activity Area, with increased recognition of the important role of connectivity and enabling access to all modes of transport and references amended accordingly.</p>	<p>The Medium Density Design Guide is referred to as a restricted discretionary criteria/development guide for both medium density development and high density development.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi has concerns that it is unclear exactly which document to refer to or where to find it and that the guide is dated as does not reflect the increased density requirements of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi request that the design guide is updated to better reflect the increased density of the High Density Residential Activity Area and recognition of the important role of connectivity and access to all modes of transport within a well-functioning environment.</p>
151.4	<p>Chapter 1 Introduction and scope of the Plan</p> <p>Amendment 4, 1.10.1A Urban Environment, New Policy 1</p>	Support with amendment	<p>Support with amendment (or other consequential amendments to achieve relief sought):</p> <p>1.10.1A Policy 1</p> <p>(b) building heights of at least 6 storeys:</p> <p>(i) within the Petone Commercial Activity Area,</p> <p>(ii) within a walkable catchment of the Central Commercial and Petone Commercial Activity Areas,</p> <p>(iii) within the High Density Residential Activity Areas located within the a walkable catchment of rapid transit stops,</p>	<p>Waka Kotahi supports the implementation of the heights and densities in accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) and the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). However, Waka Kotahi also requests that this Policy clarifies where the medium and high residential activity areas apply and therefore what the planned built environments will be in these areas.</p>

			<p>(iv) within the Medium Density Residential Activity Areas in the suburban centres of Avalon, Eastbourne, Moera, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata, and</p> <p>(v) the Medium Density Residential Activity Areas adjacent to the suburban centres of Avalon and Moera</p> <p>(c) building heights of at least 4 storeys in the Medium Density Residential Activity Areas adjacent to the suburban centres of Eastbourne, Stokes Valley, and Wainuiomata, and</p> <p>(d) building heights of at least 3 storeys in the Medium Density Residential Activity Areas in the remainder of the urban environment, excluding Hill Residential and Landscape Protection Residential Activity Areas.</p>	
151.5	Chapter 1 Introduction and scope of the Plan Amendment 6, 1.10.1A Urban Environment, New Policy 3	Support with amendment:	Amendment 6, 1.10.1A Policy 4 Encourage development to achieve attractive, accessible and safe streets for all modes and users and public open spaces, including by providing for passive surveillance.	Waka Kotahi supports the provision of attractive, safe streets and urban areas and request an amendment to emphasise the need to provide an accessible design in accordance with the National Policy Statement of Urban Development (NPS UD).
151.6	Chapter 1 Introduction and scope of the Plan Amendment 21, 1.10.3 Residential Activity, New Policy 1 -Residential Activity	Support with amendments	Clarify the difference between the planned built environments of Medium and High Density Activity Areas.	Waka Kotahi support Policy 1 in principle as it implements the Medium Density Residential Standards. However, Waka Kotahi requests that Policy 1(a) is clarified to ensure that the difference in density between Medium and High Density Activity is understood.
151.7	Chapter 1 Introduction and scope of the Plan		Request amendments to clarify the sought outcome of Policy 2, suggested amendment:	The intended outcome of this policy is unclear in terms what “manage the rate at which land” is developed is seeking to achieve, i.e. if it is to increase or decrease the rate of land being

	Amendment 22, 1.10.3 Residential Activity, New Policy 2 -Residential Activity		Reduce Manage the rate at which land at the periphery of the urban area is developed for residential purposes.	developed at the periphery? Waka Kotahi requests an amendment to this policy to more explicitly align with Policy 3 of the NPS UD in terms of increasing densities around urban centres and therefore reducing the rate of development of land at the periphery.
151.8	Chapter 3 Definitions Amendment 40, New Definition Rapid Transit Stop	Support	Retain as notified.	Waka Kotahi supports the proposed definition of “Rapid Transit Stop” in that every train station (planned and existing) should be included within this definition as per the requirements of the National Policy Statement Urban Development (NPS UD).
151.9	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 53, Amend section 4F 1 Introduction / Zone Statement	Support with amendment:	4F 1 Introduction/Zone statement iv. achieve <u>accessible, attractive and safe streets and public space for all transport modes and users.</u>	Waka Kotahi generally supports this introductory statement but request minor amendments to recognise the importance of access in a well-functioning urban environment in accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD). Encouraging increased access to active and public modes encourages mode shift and has the potential to result in a reduction in greenhouse gases which is consistent with Wellington Regional Policy Statement Proposed Plan Change 1 (Objective 22, Policy 33 and 57).
151.10	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 58 Objectives, Amend Objective 4F.2.5	Support with amendment:	Objective 4F 2.5 iii a high level of amenity for the street <u>with access to active and public transport.</u>	Waka Kotahi generally supports Objective AF2.5 however also requests that the accessibility to active or public transport modes in accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD) minimum definition of a well functioning urban environment. Encouraging increased access to active and public modes encourages mode shift and has the potential to result in a reduction in greenhouse gases which is consistent with Wellington Regional Policy Statement Proposed Plan Change 1 (Objective 22, Policy 33 and 57).
151.11	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 70, Policies, New Policy AF 3.82B	Support with amendment:	Policy 4F 3.8 <u>Encourage development to achieve accessible, attractive, and safe streets and public open spaces for all transport modes and users, including by providing for public or active transport and passive surveillance.</u>	Waka Kotahi supports the general intent of this Policy and request that it is widened to also require consideration of accessibility, public and active transport in accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD). Encouraging increased access to active and public modes encourages mode shift and has the potential to result in a reduction in greenhouse gases which is consistent with

				Wellington Regional Policy Statement Proposed Plan Change 1 (Objective 22, Policy 33 and 57).
151.12	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 77, Add New Rule 4F 4.2.1aa Number Of Residential Units Per Site	Support with amendment:	Rule 4F 4.2.1AA Number of Residential Units per Site Discretion is restricted to: (iv) The capacity of the network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, stormwater and land transport to service the proposed development. Add new: <u>The effects on the safety and efficiency of the transport network (including pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles).</u> (v) The following design elements: 9. <u>Provision for access to active modes including</u> bBike parking, storage and service areas.	Waka Kotahi supports the 4F 4.2 Development Standards in principle. However, request amendments to ensure that the restricted discretionary activity criteria also consider the effects (rather than capacity) of the transport network and provision of access by active modes.
151.13	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 100, Precincts and Scheduled Sites, Rule 4F 5.2.1.1 Activities	Support with amendment:	Rule 4F 5.2.1.1(a) (ii) The following mixed use and medium density residential development design elements: 9. <u>Bike/mobility vehicle parking, storage and service areas.</u>	Waka Kotahi supports Rule 4F 5.2.1.1 in providing appropriate consideration of housing for the elderly. However, request minor amendments to ensure that due consideration is given to the multi-modal accessibility needs of elderly residents when assessing proposals.
151.14	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 105, Add New Section 4G 1 Introduction / Zone Statement	Support with amendment	4G 1 Introduction/Zone Statement <u>iv. achieve accessible, attractive, and safe streets and public space for all transport modes and users.</u>	Waka Kotahi generally supports this introductory statement but request a minor amendment to recognise the importance of access in a well-functioning urban environment in accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD).

151.15	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 110, Objectives) New Objective 4G 2.4	Support with amendment:	Objective 4G 2.4 (i) Any low to medium density form of up to three storeys, or	Waka Kotahi supports this objective in implementing high density urban form, however request that an amendment is made to Objective 4G 2.4(i) to reflect the aim of higher density in this area.
151.16	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 111, Objectives, New Objective 4G 2.5	Support with amendment:	Objective 4G 2.5 (iii) a high level of accessibility to active and public transport and amenity for the street.	Waka Kotahi supports the general intent of this Policy and request that it is widened to also require consideration of accessibility, public and active transport in accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD). Encouraging increased access to active and public modes is also consistent with Wellington Regional Policy Statement Proposed Plan Change 1 (Objective 22, Policy 33 and 57) that support mode shift and a decrease in transport related greenhouse gasses.
151.17	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 118, Policies, New Policy 4G 3.3	Support	Retain as notified.	Waka Kotahi supports enabling buildings of up to six storeys and more than six storeys in the High Density Residential Activity Area.
151.18	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 127, Policies, New Policy 4G 3.12	Support with amendment:	Policy 4G 3.12 Encourage development to achieve accessible, attractive, and safe streets and public open spaces for all transport modes and users, including by providing for public or active transport facilities and passive surveillance.	Waka Kotahi supports the general intent of this Policy and request that it is widened to also require consideration of accessibility, public and active transport in accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD). Additionally, encouraging increased access to active and public modes encourages mode shift and has the potential to result in a reduction in greenhouse gases which is consistent with Wellington Regional Policy Statement Proposed Plan Change 1 (Objective 22, Policy 33 and 57).
151.19	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area	Support with amendment:	Rule 4G 4.1.3 (ii) The effects on the safe and efficient movement of vehicle and pedestrian traffic and	Waka Kotahi supports the provision of care facilities, boarding houses, hostels and visitor accommodation. However, request that the provision of facilities to support multi modal accessibility and effects on the transport network are required to be

	Amendment 136, Rules, Add New Rule 4G 4.1.3 Care Facilities, Residential Facilities, Boarding Houses, Hostels, Visitor Accommodation		the provision of facilities to support access to active modes.	considered as part of the restricted discretionary activity criteria. Encouraging increased access to active and public modes encourages mode shift and has the potential to result in a reduction in greenhouse gases which is consistent with Wellington Regional Policy Statement Proposed Plan Change 1 (Objective 22, Policy 33 and 57).
151.20	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 137, Rules, Add New Rule 4G 4.1.4 Childcare Facilities	Support with amendment:	Rule 4G 4.1.4 (ii) The effects on the safe and efficient movement of vehicle and pedestrian traffic and the provision of facilities to support access to active modes.	Waka Kotahi supports the provision of childcare facilities. However, request that the provision of facilities to support multi modal accessibility and effects on the transport network are required to be considered as part of the restricted discretionary activity criteria. This is consistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD) and Wellington Regional Policy Statement PC 1.
151.21	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 138, Rules, Add New Rule 4G 4.1.5 Health Care Services Rule 4G 4.1.5 Health Care Services	Support with amendment:	Rule 4G 4.1.5 Health Care Services: Add additional matter of discretion (inferred) The effects on the safe and efficient movement of vehicle and pedestrian traffic and the provision of facilities to support access to active modes.	Waka Kotahi supports the provision of health care services. However, request that the provision of facilities to support multi modal accessibility and effects on the transport network are required to be considered as part of the restricted discretionary activity criteria. This is consistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD) and Wellington Regional Policy Statement PC 1.
151.22	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area	Support with amendment:	Rule 4G 4.1.6 Community Facilities, Marae, Education Facilities, Places of Assembly and Emergency Facilities	Waka Kotahi supports the provision of Community Facilities, Marae, Education Facilities, Places of Assembly and Emergency Facilities in the High Density Activity Area. However, request that the restricted discretionary activity criteria considers the effects on the transport network and the support access to active modes.

	Amendment 139, Rules, Add New Rule 4G 4.1.6 Community Facilities, Marae, Education Facilities, Places Of Assembly And Emergency Facilities		Add additional matter of discretion (inferred) The effects on the safe and efficient movement of vehicle and pedestrian traffic and the provision of facilities to support access to active modes.	This is consistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD) and Wellington Regional Policy Statement PC 1.
151.23	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 140, Rules, Add New Rule 4G 4.1.7 Retirement Villages	Support with amendment:	Rule 4G 4.1.7 Retirement Villages (iv) The capacity of the network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, stormwater and land transport to service the proposed development. Add new: The effects on the safety and efficiency of the transport network (including pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles). (v) The following design elements: 9. Provision for access to active modes including bike and mobility vehicle parking, storage and service areas.	Waka Kotahi supports the provision of retirement villages. However, request that the provision of facilities to support multi modal accessibility and effects (rather than capacity) on the transport network are required to be considered as part of the restricted discretionary activity criteria. This is consistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD) and Wellington Regional Policy Statement PC 1.
151.24	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 146, Rules, New Development Standards 4G 4. 2.1	Support with amendments:	Rule 4G 4.2.1 Number of Dwellings per Site: (b)(iv) The capacity of the network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, stormwater and land transport to service the proposed development. Add a new discretionary activity criteria into 4G.4.2.1(b): The effects on the safety and efficiency of the transport system (including pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles). Support with amendment to:	Waka Kotahi supports the provision of 4G 4.2.1 Number of Dwellings Per Site (Development Standards). However, request that the provision of facilities to support multi modal accessibility and effects (rather than capacity) on the transport network are required to be considered as part of the restricted discretionary activity criteria. This is consistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD) and Wellington Regional Policy Statement PC 1.

			4G 4.2.1 (v) The following design elements: 9. Provision for access to active modes including bike parking, storage and service areas.	
151.25	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area Amendment 146, Rules, New Development Standards 4G 4. 2.1	Amend	Request that the reference to the Hutt City Council Medium Density Design Guide for High Density Residential Activity Areas is deleted, or alternatively: That the design guide is refreshed to better reflect the planned built environment of the High Density Residential Activity Area, with increased recognition of the important role of connectivity and enabling access to all modes of transport and references amended accordingly.	Rule 4F 4.2(b)(vii) Development Standards states the Council will be principally guided by Hutt City Council's Medium Density Design Guide. Waka Kotahi has concerns that this guide does not appear to have been refreshed as part of Proposed Plan Change 56 process or redeveloped prior to the implementation of High Density Residential Activity Areas and the National Policy Statement Urban Development. Therefore, this Design Guide does not suggest appropriate measures that will facilitate a high quality and increased density High Density Residential Urban Development.
151.26	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Areas Amendment 211, Issues, Objectives and Policies, Amend policies of section 5A 1.1.1 Capacity of the Central Commercial Activity Area	Support	Retain as notified.	Waka Kotahi support the Amendment of Policy 5A.1.1.1 as it enables increased urban densities in accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Design (NPS UD)
151.27	Appendix Central Commercial 8 – Central Commercial Design Guide The entire Appendix Central Commercial 8 – Central Commercial Design Guide.	Amend	Make amendments to Appendix Central Commercial 8 – Central Commercial Design Guide to achieve the outcomes of the Central City Transformational Plan and provide increased recognition of the need for increased connectivity and access for all modes of transport.	Waka Kotahi supports the changes made to the Central Commercial Design Guide to realise as much development capacity as possible and maximise the benefits of intensification. However, request that the more recently developed City Transformation Plan is recognised and implemented within this design guide as it provides a partnership approach to the wider partnership Riverlink project and supports the Melling Transport Improvements.

151.28	Appendix Central Commercial 8 – Central Commercial Design Guide Amendment 239 Core Precinct, 240 Riverfront (Core) and Riverfront (Commercial) Precinct, 241 Commercial Precinct, Amend Central Commercial Design Guide – Section 1.7 Character and Context Description	Amend	Retain as notified.	Waka Kotahi supports the increased heights and urban densities enabled within these central commercial precincts in accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD).
151.29	Appendix Central Commercial 8 – Central Commercial Design Guide Amendment 247, Amend Central Commercial Design Guide – Section 1.7 Character and Context Description – Residential Transition Precinct – Table Residential Transition	Support with amendments:	Section 1.7 Residential Transition Precinct Table: Densities: Future Character - Medium Low to High	Waka Kotahi supports the increased heights and urban densities enabled within these central commercial precincts in accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD). However, as part of this increased density, Waka Kotahi request that the future character of this precinct is aligned with the higher density planned urban character of the area and stated to be of medium to high density.
151.30	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area	Support	Retain as notified.	Waka Kotahi supports the no height limitation in the central city areas as this enables increased urban density and is in

	Amendment 274, Rules, Amend Permitted Activity Condition 5B2.2.1.1(a) Maximum Height and Recession Plane of Buildings and Structures			accordance with the National Policy Statement Urban Development (NPS UD).
151.31	Appendix Petone Commercial 2- Petone Mixed Use Activity Area Design Guide Amendment 290, Amend Section 1.7 of Appendix Petone Commercial 2 – Character and Context Description - Summary Table	Support	Retain as notified.	Waka Kotahi supports the amendment to the future character description that enables buildings of any height, resulting in increased urban density in accordance with the National Policy Statement Urban Development (NPS UD).
151.32	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Amendment 307, Objectives, Amend Objective 5E 2.3	Support	Retain as notified.	Waka Kotahi supports the amendment to Objective 5E 2.3 enabling medium to high density mixed use development in accordance with the National Policy Statement Urban Development (NPS UD).
151.33	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Amendment 310, Policies, Amend Policy 5E 3.5	Support	Retain as notified.	Waka Kotahi supports the amendment to Objective 5E 2.3 enabling medium to high density mixed use development in accordance with the National Policy Statement Urban Development (NPS UD).

151.34	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Amendment 310, Policies, Amend Policy 5E 3.5	Support	Retain as notified.	Waka Kotahi supports the amendment to Objective 5E 2.3 enabling medium to high density mixed use development in accordance with the National Policy Statement Urban Development (NPS UD).
151.35	Chapter 12 Financial Contributions Amendment 367 - 369, Rules, Rules 12.2.1.1, 12.2.1.2 12.2.1.3	Support	<p>Chapter 12 Financial Contributions with amendments to allow financial contributions to be collected for access to, or provision for, all transport modes including walking, cycling and public transport.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi requests the following amendments are made as well as any other consequential amendments/relief to achieve similar result:</p> <p>12.2.1.1 Financial Contributions relating to roads, private ways, service lanes, accessways, footpaths and walkways <u>the transport system</u>:</p> <p>(a) The full and actual costs of providing all new roads, private ways, service lanes, accessways, footpaths, <u>facilities to access public transport</u> and walkways/<u>cycleways</u> within the land being developed or subdivided.</p> <p>(b) Where existing roads, service lanes, accessways, footpaths, <u>facilities to access public transport</u> and walkways/<u>cycleways</u> outside the development are adequate to serve the existing development but the proposed development will result in such reading transport facilities being inadequate in terms of specified performance standards the developer must pay the full and actual cost for all upgrading and/or any new facilities.</p> <p>(d) Where in (c) above Council has contributed to the cost of upgrading or the provision of new <u>reading transport</u> facilities developers of such development sites will pay the full and actual cost</p>	Waka Kotahi supports the use of financial contributions for transport infrastructure and requests amendments to enable the potential collection of financial contributions for access to and provision of the transport system and all transport modes rather than a more singular focus on roads. This is consistent with the National Policy Statement Urban Development (NPS UD) and the and Wellington Regional Policy Statement Proposed Plan Change 1.

		<p>involved based on the trips generated and taking into account the time value of money.</p> <p>(f) Where Council provides or contributes to the necessary roading transport facilities for vacant land in advance of land being subdivided either ...</p> <p>(g) Except where (f) above applies, where Council provides or contributes to the roading transport facilities for land being developed ...</p> <p>And to 12.2.1.2:</p> <p>(a) Where the existing roading network transport system is adequate to serve the current level of development but the proposed retail activity or place of assembly will result in the need to upgrade or provide new facilities due to an increase in pedestrian, cyclist or vehicular traffic generated the developer must pay the full and actual cost of the upgrading or the provision of new facilities.</p> <p>(b) Where the existing roading network transport system is below specified performance standards the developer shall pay for the upgrading or the provision of new facilities. The amount the developer shall pay will be determined in accordance with the following method:</p> <p>(iii) Determine the cost of upgrading the roading network transport system and/or the provision of new facilities for all transport modes and users.</p> <p>(v) Discounting the cost of upgrading the roading network transport system, by the cost of completion of any works required, to bring the roading transport infrastructure up to an appropriate well maintained level for the activity area.</p>	
--	--	--	--

151.36	Chapter 12 Financial Contributions Amendment 368 - New Rule 12.2.1.2, relocated from current Rule 12.2.2.1		12.2.1.2(c)(iii) The subsidies that council may receive from Transit New Zealand New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi) .	Waka Kotahi support 12.2.1.2 request a minor amendment to recognise the change in name of the New Zealand Transport Agency.
--------	--	--	--	---

DPC56/152 Marcel Podstolski				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
152.1	Plan change as a whole	Support	Approve the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, support all provisions of the District Plan Change 56. • Support the building height changes allowing as much capacity as possible within the central city area, and the six storey building heights within the specified areas and especially within the walkable catchments of train stations. • Increasing density will bring many benefits beyond land use, including better use of active and public transport, walkable neighbourhoods, better utilisation of public infrastructure, and energy and resource efficiency. • Opportunity to provide adequate and affordable housing to first home buyers. • Commend Hutt City Council for PC56, which will enable a great number of additional houses to be built, and will allow a transition to a resilient and land-use conscious future city.

DPC56/153 Transpower New Zealand Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
153.1	Amendment 3 Chapter 1 Introduction and scope of the plan Section 1.10.1A - Objective	Support	Retain the objective in section 1.10.1A Urban Environment.	Transpower supports the objective, and in particular the recognition of wellbeing and health and safety. The objective reflects Schedule 3A, Part 1, clause (6)(2)(a) of the RMA.
153.2	Amendment 4 Chapter 1 Introduction and scope of the plan Section 1.10.1A – Policy 1	Support	Retain Policy 1 in section 1.10.1A Urban Environment.	Transpower supports the policy, on the basis that Policy 2 sets out how qualifying matters modify the direction in Policy 1.
153.3	Amendment 5 Chapter 1 Introduction and scope of the plan Section 1.10.1A – Policy 2	Support	Retain Policy 2 in section 1.10.1A Urban Environment.	Transpower supports the clear reference to qualifying matters within the Policy, as it assists in plan interpretation and gives effect to the RMA. Transpower specifically supports clause d, noting the NPS-UD defines nationally significant infrastructure as including the national grid electricity transmission network.
153.4	Amendment 8 Chapter 1 Introduction and scope of the plan Section 1.10.1A – Explanations and Reasons	Requests amendment	Amend paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Explanation and Reasons in section 1.10.1A Urban Environment as follows: <u>Where the building heights and densities in Policy 1 are modified in response to qualifying matters, this will be through overlays, precincts and corresponding provisions that are specific to the qualifying matter areas in question rather than changes to the general height limits or</u>	Transpower supports the clear reference to qualifying matters within the explanation and reasons, as well as the explanation that it is through provisions that are specific to each qualifying matter that the height limits and density controls are modified. This assists in plan interpretation and gives effect to the RMA. However, Transpower is concerned that the wording of the third paragraph is confusing, and could be read as meaning that a qualifying matter only applies when a height or density standard is

			<p><u>density controls that apply in the Activity Area chapter. This means that resource consent applications for proposals that would otherwise be provided for by Policy 1 only consider the relevant qualifying matters when the building height and density controls are exceeded. These</u> <u>Within Chapter 14, these provisions are generally located in: Chapter 14—General Rules, including:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>14E Significant Natural, Cultural, and Archaeological Resources</u> • <u>14F Heritage Buildings and Structures</u> • <u>14H Natural Hazards</u> <p><u>Other limits on building height and density to protect qualifying matters that apply in more limited situations are found within other general rules chapters and the activity area chapters, and typically provide for assessment criteria and matters of discretion directing assessment to cover the qualifying matter. These include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Chapter 11 Subdivision in relation to the National Grid Corridor</u> • <u>Chapter 13 Network Utilities, including the National Grid, in relation to the National Grid Yard</u> • <u>(other qualifying matters to be listed)</u> 	<p>exceeded. As this is incorrect, Transpower seeks deletion of this sentence.</p> <p>Transpower also notes that in terms of identifying specific qualifying matters, only those in Sections 14E, 14F and 14H are noted. To avoid doubt, Transpower considers that it would be clearer to list all qualifying matters.</p> <p>A minor change is also sought to refer to qualifying matter areas, with a corresponding new definition (see further below) which lists all relevant areas, as this will provide greater clarity</p>
153.5	Amendment 21 Chapter 1 Introduction and scope of the plan Section 1.10.3 – Policy 1	Requests amendment	<p>Amend Policy 1 in section 1.10.3 Residential Activity as follows:</p> <p><u>Policy 1</u></p> <p><u>Except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant: Except within a qualifying matter area:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Apply the...</u></p>	<p>Transpower supports the clear reference to qualifying matters, and how they override the height and density standards that would otherwise apply within the relevant residential zones. The policy assists in plan interpretation and gives effect to the RMA.</p> <p>However, as this is the key policy direction which explicitly identifies how qualifying matters relate to the provisions otherwise applying in the Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential Activity Areas, Transpower considers it necessary to be explicit about what are the qualifying matters applied in the</p>

				<p>District Plan. This can be achieved by referring to 'Qualifying Matter Areas' with a new definition (see further below) which lists all relevant areas.</p> <p>As currently drafted, the reference to 'where relevant' infers the application of a qualifying matter is a matter of discretion. This is not the case as qualifying matters have been determined through the IPI.</p>
153.6	<p>Amendment 23 Chapter 1 Introduction and scope of the plan Section 1.10.3 – Explanation and Reasons</p>	Requests amendment	<p>Amend the 'Explanation and Reasons' in section 1.10.3 Residential Activity as follows:</p> <p><u>... This approach ensures that the District Plan enables an increase in housing supply to provide for sufficient residential development capacity through intensification in the existing urban environment. This approach also provides for a range of housing types and densities throughout Lower Hutt. It is important that the Plan not only enables an increase in the quantity of housing but also enables and supports the provision of a range of housing types. This ensures that there is housing choice for residents of Lower Hutt. Addressing the issues of housing supply and choice can support the provision of more affordable housing in Lower Hutt. In some areas however, intensification may be modified and/or limited by qualifying matters and this is reflected in provisions applying within qualifying matter areas.</u></p>	<p>Transpower agrees with amending the explanation and reasons to reflect the revised policy direction. However, there is currently no reference in the explanation to the new proposed Policy 1 (which is specific to qualifying matters)</p> <p>Transpower considers that it is necessary to include some explanation in relation to qualifying matters so it is clear to plan users reading the policy why the exception in Policy 1 has been applied.</p>
153.7	<p>Amendment 39 Chapter 3 Definitions Qualifying matter</p>	Requests amendment	<p>Amend the definition of qualifying matter as follows:</p> <p><u>Qualifying matter</u> <u>Has the same meaning in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.</u> <u>Means a matter referred to in section 77I or 77O of the RMA. The matters referred to in section 77I and 77O are listed below:</u></p>	<p>Transpower supports the definition of 'qualifying matter' as it highlights to plan users the existence of the matters. However, it is considered more appropriate to include the definition provided within the RMA. This is consistent with the approach for other RMA definitions within the DP.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <u>a matter of national importance that decision makers are required to recognise and provide for under section 6:</u> (b) <u>a matter required in order to give effect to a national policy statement (other than the NPS-UD) or the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010:</u> (c) <u>a matter required to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River:</u> (d) <u>a matter required to give effect to the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 or the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008:</u> (e) <u>a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure:</u> (f) <u>open space provided for public use, but only in relation to land that is open space:</u> (g) <u>the need to give effect to a designation or heritage order, but only in relation to land that is subject to the designation or heritage order:</u> (h) <u>a matter necessary to implement, or to ensure consistency with, iwi participation legislation:</u> (i) <u>the requirement in the NPSUD to provide sufficient business land suitable for low density uses to meet expected demand:</u> (j) <u>any other matter that makes higher density development as provided for by policy 3, as the case requires, inappropriate in an area, but only if section 77R is satisfied/any other matter that makes higher density, as provided for by the MDRS or policy 3,</u> 	
--	--	--	---	--

			inappropriate in an area, but only if section 77L is satisfied.	
153.8	Chapter 3 Definitions New definition – Qualifying matter area	Requests addition	<p>Insert a definition for ‘Qualifying matter area’ as follows:</p> <p>Qualifying matter area</p> <p>Means a qualifying matter listed below:</p> <p>(a) The National Grid Yard</p> <p>(b) The National Grid Corridor</p> <p>(c) (other qualifying matters to be listed)</p>	<p>The concept of Qualifying matters was introduced within the RMA.</p> <p>As outlined in Appendix C to this submission, as defined by section 771 and 77O of the RMA, the National Grid Corridor framework is considered a qualifying matter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a matter required to give effect to the NPSET being a national policy statement (other than the NPS-UD); and • It is a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure. <p>Given the role and importance of qualifying matter areas to the implementation of the RMA, while Transpower supports the definition of ‘qualifying matter’ within PC56, Transpower submits it would be of further benefit to plan users to provide a clear list as to what are qualifying matter areas in the DP, and specifically, provide explicit reference to the National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor as a qualifying matter area. This will make application of policies which refer to qualifying matters much clearer. This is particularly important where the provisions which implement the qualifying matters sit outside Chapter 4.</p> <p>To differentiate between the RMA provided definition of ‘qualifying matter’, a definition of ‘qualifying matter area’ is proposed.</p>
153.9	Amendment 53 Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Section 4F 1 – Introduction / Zone Statement	Requests amendment	<p>Amend 4F 1 Introduction / Zone Statement as follows:</p> <p>Within qualifying matter areas, built development may be modified and/or limited by qualifying matters. This includes within pPrecincts and scheduled sites which are listed under 4F 5 at the end of the chapter.</p>	<p>Transpower generally supports the Zone Statement but considers that it would be useful for it to note that the application of qualifying matters will impact the built development in some areas. This will also help tie in the reference to precincts and scheduled sites at the end of this section.</p>

153.10	Amendment 54 Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4F 2.1AA	Support	Retain Objective 4F 2.1AA.	Transpower supports the objective, noting it incorporates Objective 1 of the MDRS.
153.11	Amendment 56 Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4F 2.3	Support	Retain Objective 4F 2.3.	Transpower supports the objective, noting it incorporates Objective 2 of the MDRS.
153.12	Amendment 61 Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.2	Requests amendment	Amend Policy 4F 3.2 as follows: <u>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, while avoiding inappropriate locations, heights and densities of buildings and development within qualifying matter areas as directed by the relevant qualifying matter area provisions.</u>	Within the Medium Density Residential Activity Area, qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible on an allotment. While the policy directive within Policy 4F 3.2 is supported (and reflects Schedule 3A, Part 1, clause (6)(2)(a) of the RMA), Transpower supports reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence the capacity for intensification and residential development. This also ensures that the policy links back to the relevant direction in Chapter 1 of the DP.
153.13	Amendment 77 Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Section 4F 4.2 Development Standards	Support	Retain 4F 4.2 Development Standards.	Transpower supports the introduction of the development standards, as reflected in Schedule 3A Part 2 of the RMA, noting that where activities/development occurs within the National Grid Yard, Rules 13.4.1 and 13.4.2 will prevail.
153.14	HDRAA	Neutral	Should the HDRAA extent be amended such that existing National Grid assets traverse the zone, Transpower seeks that the relief sought in its	On the basis the extent of the HDRAA is not amended, Transpower is neutral on the extent (as notified) and nature of provisions on the HDRAA. However, should the zone extent be

			submission points to the MDRAA also apply to the HDRAA.	amended such that existing National Grid assets traverse the zone, Transpower seeks that the relief sought in its submission points to the MDRAA also apply to the HDRAA.
153.15	Amendment 355 Chapter 11 – Subdivision Section 11.2.3 – Restricted Discretionary Activities	Support	Retain operative rule	While not amended though the IPI, Transpower agrees with the retention of this rule, which is necessary to give effect to the National Grid Corridor being applied as a qualifying matter. The Section 32 (at section 7.2.3.1) notes 'The proposed plan change would continue the approach of the operative District Plan for these areas'.
153.16	Amendment 362 Chapter 11 – Subdivision Section 11.2.4.1 – Assessment Criteria	Support	Retain operative rule	While not amended though the IPI, Transpower agrees with the retention of this rule, which is necessary to give effect to the National Grid Corridor being applied as a qualifying matter. The Section 32 (at section 7.2.3.1) notes 'The proposed plan change would continue the approach of the operative District plan for these areas'.
153.17	Section 32 Evaluation	Support	Retain the Section 32 Evaluation and reference to the National Grid as a qualifying matter.	Although not forming part of the IPI, Transpower supports reference to the National Grid as a qualifying matter within the Section 32, in proximity to which building heights and density are modified to accommodate the qualifying matter.
153.18	Section 32 Evaluation	Support	Retain the Section 32 Evaluation and reference to the National Grid as a qualifying matter.	Although not forming part of the IPI, Transpower supports the s32 explicitly stating that the approach taken to development within the National Grid Yard and National Grid Corridor is continued.

DPC56/154 Ruth Gilbert and Terry Pinfold				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
154.1	General	Oppose	Exclude the Eastern Bays from intensification provisions, as the roading is inadequate and	This submission does not support PC56 as it applied to the Eastern Bays and Eastbourne. Medium density and the blanket

			protection of large areas of native bush should be priority.	approach taken with it is not appropriate given the specific nature of these properties. Reasoning:
154.2	General	Oppose	Exclude Eastbourne until a full assessment has been completed of hazard areas, individual sites, climate change mitigation (Marine Drive), and infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The properties at 20, 22, and 24 Taungata Rd, York Bay, and 1 Kaitawa Road have a stream running through them. They should be exempt from PC56 and zoned appropriately because of risk of “overland flowpath and inundation” of the stream corridor. • Intensification in the Eastern Bays and Eastbourne would put more people at risk during weather events or a natural disaster. Marine Drive is at risk from being damaged, inundated, or flooded, preventing people from leaving. Infrastructure in this area is also at risk of being damaged, which would impact more people with intensification. During 2022 this happened about once per month in a southerly storm. Marine Drive would be fully cut off in a 1 in 100 yr event. • There are significant stands of large old native trees in many of the properties in York Bay and also in other affected properties in Eastern Bays and Eastbourne. These well-established trees are home to increasing numbers of native birds. Allowing intensification in these areas will require the felling of these native trees and the consequent loss of fauna that lives within it. This is “a matter of national importance” as we need to retain trees to help mitigate the negative impacts of climate change. • Existing roading would not be able to sustain the level of use encountered with intensification. Taungata Road is narrow and does not have footpaths. There is a stream on one side and high banks in places on the other as well as sloping driveways which means it would be impractical to widen the road. Hutt City Council have previously informed 6 Taungata Road that a Pine Tree could not be felled, due to instability of the bank and risk to the road. • Further intensification on Taungata Road would result in more cars parked on the north side of the road. Currently this road is full of parked cars, which would be made worse by not have a requirement for off-street parking. No way for

				<p>charging EV's, which runs counter to reducing carbon emissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public transport in the Eastern Bays and Eastbourne is inadequate to deal with intensification of housing. The properties in York Bay that are zoned to allow intensification were previously zoned as "general residential" rather than "Hill residential". This is an error that was never rectified. Most of these properties are on steep land, not on flat land. This makes them inappropriate for intensification because of the steepness of the sections.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/155 Andrea Collings				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
155.1	Heritage	Oppose	<p>Amend the plan change to include the following statement:</p> <p><u>That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private residential properties in heritage areas should not be listed in the District Plan without the owner's consent. Restrictions on what a homeowner can do with a property in a heritage area. Impacts on privacy and access to sunlight for heritage homes. Cost implications of heritage listing, particularly if neighbouring property is 3 or 6 stories high.

DPC56/156 Noel Rostron				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
156.1	Development Standards	Amend	Regulated standards of construction and amenities provision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socially responsible regulated, medium density, high quality, environmentally friendly, community consulted housing is what is needed. • Concern around the loss of parking and green space. • Concern around poor quality development being enabled.
156.2	Density	Amend	Community and marae consulted housing no higher than two storey in residential areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-level high density projects are creating many new problems including loss of sunlight and loss of trees and green space.
156.3	Infrastructure	Amend	Infrastructure to support development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern around pressure on sewerage and water infrastructure. • Infrastructure and service provision has not kept up with the rate of population growth.
156.4	Consultation	Amend	Democracy regarding decisions affecting my community.	No specific reason provided.

DPC56/157 Hutt Voluntary Heritage Group				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
157.1	Heritage	Oppose	That no new heritage areas be scheduled until Hutt City Council has properly fulfilled the legislative requirements to do so.	There has been no direct consultation on PC56 by Hutt City Council with any of the property owners who are now subject to additional restrictions by being part of a new heritage precinct.

			<p>Amend the proposed 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>	<p>Nor has there been adequate consultation with those currently under heritage restrictions that the restrictions remain, and that they are not able to intensify their properties in the way that owners of other properties can in accordance with the RMA.</p> <p>Section 32 of the RMA requires a cost-benefit analysis of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects of the proposal and where “practicable” a quantification of this analysis. Hutt City Council has relied upon alleged impracticability to not have carried out a cost-benefit analysis. They stated that to do so would have added significant time and cost to the evaluation process and was not considered necessary.</p> <p>Section 77J(3)(c) of the RMA requires Hutt City Council to assess the costs and broader impacts of imposing restrictions on development. This is not limited by ‘reasonable’ or ‘practical’ tests. Hutt City Council has failed to do this analysis, nor even provided the base level of information. A factor for incorporation in this analysis would have been whether restraining these areas contributes to an overall need to preserve heritage.</p> <p>Consultation on PC56 fails to meet the legislative requirements for consultation.</p> <p>PC56 fails to meet the mandatory requirements for enhanced Section 32 analysis.</p> <p>PC56 inappropriately determines the incompatible development test by restricting development where there are no heritage values to protect and/or placing restrictions that would not protect the purported “values”.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

DPC56/158 Wellington Electricity Lines Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter’s reasons for decision requested
158.1	Density	New provision	Apply qualifying matters’ in relation to two substations sites (312 Oxford Tce, Naenae, and 5A The Strand, Wainuiomata) to the extent that	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning direction will ultimately require WELL to undertake significant works within the existing sections of distribution

			abutting High and Medium Density Residential Activity Area properties cannot develop (as a permitted activity) multi-unit housing only 1.0m setback for the boundary.	network that currently services the District - as well as to strategically plan for the required network expansion that will need to be sequenced to enable connections to the area's ensuing residential and commercial land use growth.
158.2	General	Not stated	That all activities and development must comply with the provisions of the underlying Residential Activity Area of the operative district plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through making this submission, WELL wishes to stress the importance that existing distribution assets in the rezoned medium and high-density areas will need to be protected; and secondly, that new infrastructure that will undoubtedly be required is appropriately considered and integrated into their respective plan variations.
158.3	Density	Not stated	That the two sites identified in the submission (312 Oxford Tce, Naenae, and 5A The Strand, Wainuiomata) are identified on the applicable district planning map overlays with appropriate annotations to the effect that either medium or high-density housing developments on abutting sites will require a land use consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity, enabling an effects assessment to be provided with appropriate reverse sensitivity mitigation being inherent to the development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following this context, this submission concentrates on how PC56 will affect WELL's effective supply of electricity to service current community needs, as well as across the district as a whole. • In particular – this submission seeks to ensure that the two key substation sites will not be unreasonably constrained through housing intensification on abutting residential land, and furthermore, that any such intensification will not result in the creation or exacerbation of Reverse Sensitivity effects.
158.4	Density	Not stated	Should Council consider the ISPP process unable to adopt the relief sought elsewhere in the submission, that the permitted activity performance standards contained within PC56 for High and Medium Density housing include reference to the potential effects of Regionally Significant Infrastructure, in particular linking the provisions to the Objective and Policies under section 13.1.2 of the District Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In this submission reverse sensitivity is taken to mean the vulnerability of an existing lawfully established activity to other activities in the vicinity which are sensitive to adverse environmental effects that may be generated by such existing activity, thereby creating the potential for the operation of such existing activity to be constrained. • Under the above meaning WELL's Wainuiomata Zone Substation and Naenae Zone Substation are examples of lawfully established activities. Intensifying sensitive residential land use on properties abutting these substation sites will increase the risk of reverse sensitivity – unless adequate recognition in PC56 is provided.

DPC56/159 Alan Smith				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
159.1	Plan change as a whole	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no plausible reason for a blanket 6-storey intensification provision across the valley, and no reason why areas outside the 800m and 1200m walkable catchments are included in PC56. • The proposed heritage zone are an academic, non-Hutt City notion of what heritage is (Moera Railway etc.).
159.2	Building height	Amend	Allow zone changes to enable six-storey equivalent structures [only] within 800m of train stations. [inferred]	
159.3	General	n/a	Ensure a fully resourced, adequately explained, and informed DP review from 2023 with the new incoming Council.	

DPC56/160 Rebecca Leask and Mike Stewart				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
160.1	Density	Amend	<p>To maintain the current zoning of Hill Residential to properties accessed via Rakeiora Grove and western side of London Road</p> <p>In the case that the above submission is not accepted, we seek:</p> <p>- To alter the proposed District Plan changes to ensure the current protections that are applied to Hill Residential properties - at 14H 1.1.1(c) in relation to risk of landslide, and at 14I 2.2.1(b)(i) and 14I 2.2.2(b)(ii) in relation to earthworks - will continue to be applied to the properties in Rakeiora Grove and western side of London Road.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rakeiora Grove does not fit the criteria of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, specifically it is not within Hutt City Council-defined walking distance of a rapid transport spot. • Certain properties within Rakeiora Grove (22, 24, 36, 38) would not be appropriate for High or Medium Density as they are subject to the overlay of Significant Natural Resource Area 27 and therefore should be protected as an important area of indigenous vegetation and habitat. • Several properties within Rakeiora Grove would not be appropriate for High or Medium Density due to the natural hazard risk of land slippage.

160.2	Density	Amend	<p>We also seek that specific properties are given special consideration in relation to concerns raised in this submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To maintain the current zoning of Hill Residential to properties with the Significant Natural Resource SNR27 overlay (22, 24, 38, 36 Rakeiora Grove). - To maintain the current zoning of Hill Residential to the heritage-listed property at 38 Rakeiora Grove and surrounding properties (to be determined based on expert input) that may impact the historical significance of that house. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage should be taken into consideration – High or Medium Density would impact on the heritage listed property at 38 Rakeiora Grove, Taumata. • The area is most suited to the current Hill Residential zoning rather than the proposed High Density Zone or application of a Medium Density Zone. • These risks could most easily be mitigated by removing the properties in Rakeiora Grove and western side of London Road altogether from the new zoning rules on the basis of not meeting the criteria for Policy 3, avoiding the need for qualifications.
-------	---------	-------	---	---

DPC56/161 Michael Basil-Jones				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
161.1	Heritage	Oppose	A property should only be designated as heritage in the District Plan with express written agreement with the owner.	<p>This submission is opposed to the proposed heritage provisions in PC56, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to the listing of private residential properties as heritage. • Submitter formerly owned a heritage building on Jackson Street, which had a pedestrian canopy. Immediately adjacent to the building was a bus stop, and the design of the gutter resulted in stopping buses hitting the canopy. It needed to be replaced with the exact same dimensions as the original, putting the public in continued danger. This had to be done at the cost of the owner. • Heritage listing impose unacceptable restrictions on what the homeowner can do with their property.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unfair escalating the costs to the homeowner for any improvements, by requiring them to obtain a heritage report at their cost. • Decisions made by heritage are sometimes patently wrong but there is no simple way of challenging this. They appear to be able to make decision without right of appeal or consequences.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/162 Design Network Architecture Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
162.1	Rule 4F 4.1.11 and Rule 4G 4.1.11 – Vegetation Removal Amend wording	Amend	We suggest that the wording of 'must be' and 'if' be reconsidered to read more clearly.	No specific reasoning provided by the submitter.
162.2	Rule 4F 4.2.4 and Rule 4G 4.2.5 – Setbacks	Oppose in part	Similar to the wording in the Operative District Plan Yards rule, we request that these rules host an exclusion for 'existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site'.	No specific reasoning provided by the submitter.
162.3	Rule 4F 4.2.6 and Rule 4G 4.2.8 – Outdoor Living Space	Amend	These rules state that above ground floor level units are to have outdoor living space that 'is at least 8m and has a minimum dimension of 1.8m'. We assume that this is meant to read as 8m ² .	No specific reasoning provided by the submitter.
162.4	Rule 4F 4.2.7 and Rule 4G 4.2.9 – Accessory Building	Amend	These rules state that construction of an accessory building is a permitted activity if certain development standards are complied with. We request that the wording of this standard be altered to more clearly reflect whether the entire proposed development is required to comply with	No specific reasoning provided by the submitter.

			<p>the development standards, or if these standards apply only to the accessory building itself.</p> <p>We also seek clarification as to whether this standard means that only a maximum of one accessory is a permitted activity, and if so whether it is one accessory building per overall development or one accessory building per unit.</p> <p>We also request that stormwater tanks be excluded from the definition for accessory building.</p>	
162.5	Rule 4F 4.2.12 and Rule 4G 4.2.14 – Windows to Street	Clarify	<p>These rules refer to glazing of ‘the street-facing façade’. Does the street-facing façade apply to the full front elevation, even say if part of the elevation was set back further from the front boundary?</p> <p>We request that this be clarified, potentially through a definition being given for ‘street facing façade’, or a set back dimension being highlighted for what counts as the façade for the purpose of these rules.</p>	No specific reasoning provided by the submitter.
162.6	Rule 4F 4.2.13 and Rule 4G 4.2.15 – Landscaped Area	Clarify	<p>If a site is being subdivided, how does this rule apply? Does the subdivision aspect mean that every proposed allotment then becomes a ‘developed site’, which would individually be required to comply with the 20% landscaped area? Or in cases of joint land use and subdivision applications would individual allotments be exempt from needing to comply provided the parent allotment (prior to subdivision) met the 20% landscape area standard?</p>	No specific reasoning provided by the submitter.
162.7	Rule 14H 2.2 – Additions to residential buildings in the Inundation Area	Amend	<p>Under point 2 reference is made to 14H 2.4(1)(a), and under point 3 reference is made to 14H 2.4(1)(b). We assume this is a typo in that these should read 14H 2.2(1)(a) and 14H 2.2 (1)(b) respectively.</p>	No specific reasoning provided by the submitter.

162.8	Rule 14H 2.8 and Rule 14H 2.9 – New residential units in Coastal Hazard Areas	Oppose in part	These rules state that a permitted activity allows for no more than two residential units. We suggest instead that up to three residential units can be a permitted activity provided that appropriate hazard mitigation is in place.	No specific reasoning provided by the submitter.
162.9	Rule 14H 2.10 – Commercial activities or retail activities that are within the Petone Commercial Activity Area and Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area and within the Medium or High Coastal Hazard Overlays	Clarify	This rule specifically refers to the Medium and High Coastal Hazard Overlays. Could clarification please be provided as to whether commercial and retail activities in these activity areas are permitted when they are within a Low Coastal Hazard Overlay?	No specific reasoning provided by the submitter.
162.10	Chapter 3 - Definition of 'Building/Structure'	Amend	As part of the plan change, we suggest amending the definition of Building/Structure to exclude stormwater tanks up to a certain height (i.e., up to fence height being 2.00m).	No specific reasoning provided by the submitter.

DPC56/163 Petone Historical Society				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
163.1	Amendment 4 New Policy 1 in 1.10.1A Urban Environment	Oppose in part	Modify (b)(i) by adding (except for the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct) Modify (b)(ii) by removing the words " and Petone Commercial Activity Areas "	The proposed 6 storey height within the heritage area of Jackson Street, and within its walkable catchment is unreasonable, and will undermine the character and well-functioning nature of the historic area.

			<p>Add the words “and the town centre of Petone Commercial Activity Areas” into (c)</p> <p>Add a new (e) “building heights no greater than provided for in Chapter 5B for the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct”</p>	<p>We seek that areas adjacent to the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct (Petone Commercial Activity Area 1) beyond 800m from Ava Station and Petone Station on the railway line) have a maximum height of 4 storeys. This would provide for development that is closer to the heritage building maximum height of 3 storeys in Jackson Street heritage precinct itself.</p>
163.2	Amendments 5, 6, 7 Policies relating to residential development	Support in part	Retain these policies.	Our support for Policy 2 is subject to acceptance of our submission relating to Amendment 4. Our support for Policy 3 and 4 is unconditional.
163.3	Amendment 15 Deletion of Explanation and Reasons	Oppose	Disallow Amendment 15.	We oppose the deletion of the explanation relating to the Historic Residential Activity Areas, as the replacement provisions are unsatisfactory.
163.4	Amendment 16 Explanation and Reasons, High Density Residential Activity Area	Oppose in part	<p>Modify the last sentence of the second paragraph as follows:</p> <p>As a result, low to high density development, including a mix of standalone houses, detached dwellings, terraced housing and low-rise apartments of up to at least six storeys, and in some areas up to 4 storeys, are provided for.</p>	In line with our submission on Amendment 4, we seek that the explanation recognises a lower maximum building height of no more than 4 storeys in the vicinity of the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.
163.5	Amendment 21 Policy 1 in 1.10.3 Residential Activity	Oppose in part	Add Central Petone into (b).	In line with our submission on Amendment 4, we seek that the high density residential area of central Petone is enabled at 4 storeys rather than 6 storeys.
163.6	Amendment 27 Policy 1.10.10 Heritage	Oppose in part	In new (c), add “and adjacent to” between “in” and “areas” in the first line.	We seek that there is a step-down provision from the 6-storey and 4-storey development adjacent to all heritage areas, so that the character and heritage values of these areas are not adversely affected by overshadowing and walls of development directly along their boundaries.
163.7	Amendment 46 Deletion of Historical Residential Activity Area	Oppose	Disallow Amendment 46	We oppose the deletion of the explanation relating to the Historic Residential Activity Areas, as the replacement provisions are unsatisfactory.

163.8	Amendment 49 Residential Area description	Support in part	Change “metropolitan centre” to “town centre” in the first paragraph.	<p>We oppose the classification of Petone’s commercial centre as a “metropolitan centre” and seek that it be reclassified as a town centre. The concept of a metropolitan centre has been provided for in the zone standards in the National Planning Standards as follows:</p> <p>Town centre zone</p> <p>Areas used predominantly for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in smaller urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities. • in larger urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. <p>Metropolitan centre zone</p> <p>Areas used predominantly for a broad range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities. The zone is a focal point for sub-regional urban catchments.</p> <p>Petone’s historic Jackson St has been carefully managed for over three decades so that it has been able to retain its vitality and it does attract visitors regionally, but that is because of its heritage character. Again, due to careful planning over 3 decades, some large-format retailing has come to occupy the adjacent Mixed Use and Industrial Zones. This “centre” however remains primarily small-scale and heritage-based and does not have the range of activities that is found in other “metropolitan” centres that have been identified in the region (or in other regions).</p>
163.9	Amendment 52 Deletion of Historical Residential Activity Area	Oppose	Disallow Amendment 52	<p>We oppose the deletion of the Historic Residential Activity Areas, as the replacement provisions are unsatisfactory. This was an option to recognise a qualifying matter which has been effective for over 3 decades, and it remains an option should our other submissions not be successful.</p>
163.10	Amendment 92 Precincts and Scheduled Sites	Support in part	<p>Remove list of areas that are within the High Density Residential Activity Area.</p> <p>Delete “may” in the second to last sentence in this Amendment.</p>	<p>Although this section applies under the heading of Medium Density Residential Area, it lists areas which are in the High Density Residential Activity Area as well. This is confusing and those proposed areas that are within the High Density Residential</p>

				Activity Area should be removed from this section. We also seek a small wording change.
163.11	Amendments 93 to 98 Policy and Rules for Residential Heritage Precinct	Support in part	Retain these provisions.	These provisions do little to protect heritage values and fabric in the identified areas, but they do restrict the intensity of development that may otherwise occur, thereby maintaining some of the existing character.
163.12	Amendment 105 High Density Residential Area – Zone Statement	Oppose in part	<p>Replace “metropolitan centre” with “town centre” in the last line of the first paragraph.</p> <p>Add “Petone” after “Eastbourne” in the second to last line of the fourth paragraph and “parts of Petone” after “Eastbourne” in the seventh paragraph.</p> <p>In the 7th paragraph, replace “at least” with “up to” (3x).</p> <p>Delete reference to “Petone metropolitan centre” in the seventh paragraph.</p> <p>Add a paragraph that states that some parts of the High Density Residential Activity Areas are subject to qualifying matters, including natural hazards and this may reduce their development capacity.</p>	<p>In line with earlier submissions, we seek removal of mention of Petone as a metropolitan centre, and its replacement with reference to Petone town centre. Along with this we seek mention of four storey development in its vicinity.</p> <p>We do not understand why there is reference to “at least” number of storeys. It makes no sense that this is not a maximum to indicate as the planned urban built character in the zone description. An alternative would be to say “up to 22m high” or any other maximum height that allows for 6 storeys.</p> <p>We also consider that the zone statement should indicate that parts of the High Density Residential Activity is subject to qualifying matters such as natural hazards and that other provisions in the Plan may also apply. Otherwise the plan is not providing for integrated management, as the RMA requires. That ties into the mention of health and safety in the first new Objective.</p>
163.13	Amendment 107, 111, 112, 113 Various objectives in the High Density Residential Activity Area	Support	Retain as notified	These are basic requirements for any residential areas.
163.14	Amendment 108 Objective 4G2.2	Support in part	Add “Some” or “A limited range of” at the start of the second sentence.	There seems to be a problem in the wording of this objective. The second sentence suggests that all non-residential activities are compatible with the zone, when most are strictly limited under the rules.
163.15	Amendment 109 Objective 4G2.3	Support in part	Add “in some areas” at the end of ii.	It should be made clear that not all areas of the Activity Area are suited to six-storey buildings.

163.16	Amendment 114 Objective 4G2.8	Support in part	Add “parts of Petone” after Eastbourne in the first line.	Add reference to the parts of Petone that are around the Jackson St heritage precinct (and beyond 800m from Petone and Ava Stations on the Railway line) to this objective.
163.17	Amendments 115 to 129 Policies	Support	Retain as notified	These are basic requirements for any residential areas.
163.18	Amendment 130 Policy 4G 3.15 + new Policy request	Support in part	Add a new Policy 4G 3.15A that reads along the lines of “Manage development on sites adjoining sites within Residential Heritage Precincts (see amendment 171) and Jackson Street Heritage Precinct to avoid visual dominance on items of heritage value.”	We fully support this policy relating to the Community Iwi Activity Area, and seek an additional policy relating to developments in proximity to areas of heritage value.
163.19	Amendment 148 Rule 4G 4.2.3 + Map change request	Support in part	Change the Plan Maps to show the whole of Petone High Density Residential Activity Area beyond 800m of the Ava and Petone Stations on the Railway line as a Specific Height Control Overlay with a maximum height of 14m, therefore being covered by Rule 4G 4.2.3 (a)(i).	This rule refers to building height overlays in the Plan maps. Consistent with our earlier submission points we request a Plan Map change to show the whole of Petone High Density Residential Activity Area beyond 800m of the two stations – Ava and Petone on the Railway line as a maximum height of 14m. This respects the relationship of adjacent residential areas with the Jackson Street and Patrick St heritage areas.
163.20	Amendment 151 Rule 4G 4.2.6 + new Rule request	Support in part	Add a new rule - Rule 4G 4.2.6A that applies to all sites which abut a heritage precinct (including the Jackson St Heritage Precinct) on boundaries shared with the precinct to the same effect as in Rule 4G 4.2.6. Matters of discretion would be limited to the effects of overshadowing and visual dominance on the values of the heritage precinct.	We fully support this rule relating to Marae in the Community Iwi Activity Area, and seek a new rule which repeats this rule in relation to the Jackson St Heritage Precinct and all other heritage precincts. This would also give effect to Objective 4G 5.3.1.2 in terms of the two older historic precincts as part of integrated management.
163.21	Amendments 152, 153, 154, 155, 157, 158, 159, 160, Various rules, High Density Residential Activity Area	Support	Retain as notified	These are basic requirements for any residential areas.
163.22	Amendment 171 Residential Heritage Precinct	Support in part	Retain the Hutt Road Railway Heritage Area as a heritage precinct. Add no’s 1, 2, 2A Mill Road and 105 Hutt Road to the Precinct Area (this	This precinct (overlay within Residential Activity Areas) limits height and number of dwellings within these precincts. PHS has no view on most of these new precincts (they were mostly not

			<p>involves a Map change). Include a description that better explains the variety of development and heritage within the precinct.</p> <p>In the second to last paragraph, remove the word “may” as it is clear that this is what the objective, policy and rules do.</p>	<p>identified by PHS when we were requested for our suggestions back in early 2021 – note that few of our suggestions were accepted by Council Officers, and of those that were, most have not been progressed further). The one area that we did suggest, and do support, is the Hutt Road Railway Heritage Area. This extends considerably beyond the actual Railway Cottages (well beyond the area requested by PHS), and we note that some of the Railway Cottages themselves have been omitted from the area, although included in our recommended list. The description of the area needs to be improved to fully describe the development encompassed, and the area extended to include omitted properties.</p>
163.23	Amendment 178 Heretaunga Settlement and Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precincts		<p>Reinstate the full extent of the existing Historic Residential Activity Areas in the operative Plan as the Residential Historic Precinct. Show this on the Plan maps.</p> <p>Correct the terminology to refer to “precinct” rather than “activity area”.</p> <p>Change “acceptable” to “appropriate”.</p> <p>Add a reference to the relevant Design Guide.</p> <p>Ensure that the rules cover the management of front fences.</p>	<p>These two Precincts have been in the District Plan since 1989 and 1994 respectively. PHS supports their continuation, but seeks that their extent in the operative Plan is carried over through this Plan Change. The reasons for their original extent were carefully worked out and these reasons have not changed.</p> <p>They have been in statutory Plans and administered as heritage precincts for so long that they should be regarded as having “settled” or “accepted” heritage values (e.g., most properties are either original owners or have changed hands with new owners being aware of the heritage status). One excluded property in Patrick St has a relatively new house which has been built under the current design guide for the precinct. Two of the others predate the Workers Dwelling Act houses (i.e., were part of the environment within which the Workers Dwelling Act houses were built. Modifying the extent of the Precinct does not recognise the importance of Patrick Street as a whole, or the RMA’s definition of “historic heritage” which includes the surroundings of natural and physical resources. This is an area of probable international significance, and it should not be changed.</p> <p>In a number of places, the introduction refers to “activity area”. We understand this is incorrect, and should be replaced with precinct. The introduction also refers to “acceptable” conditions. As the RMA seeks to protect historic heritage from “inappropriate” development any conditions should be referred to as “appropriate”.</p> <p>There is no reference to the management of development through a Design Guide. This needs to be added to the introduction, as it</p>

				is an essential management tool. In Patrick Street (and possibly in Riddlers Crescent) there has been a problem with the council being unable to control fences. We seek that the rules for the Precinct include control of fences in accordance with the Design Guide.
163.24	Amendments 179 to 189 Objectives and Policies, Heretaunga Settlement and Riddlers Cres Heritage Precincts	Support	Retain all provisions and add reference to front fences in Policy 5.3.2.4.	We support these provisions, with one small change. We seek that reference to front fences is included with accessory buildings in Policy 5.3.2.4. The lack of control of height of fences (along with the current trend to much higher fences) has begun to adversely affect the character of historic streets. This has been raised with the Council, which promised to look at it. Nothing has been done.
163.25	Amendment 191 Rule 4G 5.3.3.1	Support in part	<p>Add after “structure” “, including front fences” in (a).</p> <p>Add a new rule “(vi) Maximum height of front fences: 1.4m. This rule does not apply to side fences or, for a corner site, one frontage.”</p> <p>Remove the word “redecorating” from the paragraph following the standards.</p> <p>For the restricted discretionary provisions, add “and structures” after buildings in (i).</p> <p>Retain (b) as notified.</p>	<p>We seek that front fences are included as structures under (a), and a new rule is added after (vi). This will enable the height and design of fences to be controlled, as is necessary to protect the historic character of the Precincts. At present, fences cannot be controlled as they are excluded from the definition of structures elsewhere in the Plan.</p> <p>We also seek removal of reference to redecoration in the words which follow the standards. As currently worded, an internal redecoration that can be seen from the street could be subject to control. This, along with exterior painting has never been controlled by the council under current rules, and the opportunity should be taken to bring the wording of the rules into line.</p> <p>Matters of discretion in (i) should not be limited to buildings.</p>
163.26	Amendment 192 Rule 4G 5.3.3.2	Support	Retain as notified.	These requirements are appropriate to retain the heritage character of the precincts.
163.27	Amendment 206 Anticipated Environmental Results	Oppose	Add a comprehensive list of AERs.	The content of this section consists of a single item, which appears to be in error. There should be a comprehensive list of expected AERs.
163.28	Amendment 253, 254, 255 Petone Commercial Activity Area	Support in part	In these three amendments, wherever they occur, replace the crossed out words “Historic Retail Precinct” with the words “Heritage Precinct”. Add “in and” in front of “around”.	The description of Petone Commercial Activity Area – Area 1 is not correct. This area is not “around” the whole length of Jackson St, but it is “around” the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct, as sought to be fully retained in a later submission. If mention is

			In the 6th line of the second to last paragraph in Amendment 255, reinstate reference to “within and around the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct”.	reinstated of the Precinct and the description of the Commercial 1 area as “in and around”, and one further change made, we support the remainder of the wording changes. The further change we seek relates to the assessment to be done for small commercial activities in the Petone Mixed Use Area. At present an analysis only need look at the Area 1 opportunities. The change made requires an applicant to provide a much wider assessment which could stretch to other locations within the Mixed Use Zone or anywhere else in the city.
163.29	Amendment 258, 259 Jackson Street Heritage Precinct	Support in part	Reinstate the full length of the Jackson Street Precinct as in the operative Plan on the Plan maps. Replace the 22m height control applied to this area with a height of 10m.	The Petone Historical Society fully supports the stated objective and policies in these two amendments. However, the extent of the heritage precinct as mapped has been reduced from that in the operative Plan, and no longer reaches to Cuba St (despite the correct heading being retained). The Jackson Street frontage between approximately Tory and Cuba St has been removed from the precinct. We oppose this change, which has not been discussed with PHS, nor the Jackson Street programme to our knowledge. We seek a map change to reinstate the full length of the precinct, and to reduce the heights which apply to these blocks (and the two areas of commercially zoned land which effectively continue the precinct, to the east of Cuba Street). The reason for the submission is that these blocks are an essential part of historic Jackson Street, and have always been part of the recognised precinct. While there has been some redevelopment, this has been done under the rules and design guides that apply to the Precinct. It is inappropriate to apply such controls and then take the area out of heritage recognition and protection. There are several remaining historic buildings within this area which require protection. The area proposed to be removed remains as part of Heritage New Zealand’s recognised Jackson Street Heritage Area.
163.30	Amendment 260 Petone Commercial Activity Area, Explanation and Reasons	Support	Retain as notified.	This is an appropriate addition

163.31	Amendment 261 Petone Commercial Activity Area, Explanation and Reasons	Oppose in part	Retain the lead-in and the second bullet-point in (d).	The changes in this amendment fail to recognise that the Jackson Street frontage has had a height control which was put on at the same time that the heritage precinct was incorporated in the Plan, as part of heritage recognition of the full length of Jackson Street and the view to the Korokoro and Horokiwi hills. The western end of Jackson Street was the first part of Petone which was substantially developed, and Jackson Street was developed progressively to the east, at times needing widening and straightening. Retention of this sight-line to the hills and sunlight to the street is an important qualifying matter which justifies retention of the height control along this frontage.
163.32	Amendment 264, 265 Petone Commercial Activity Area - Area 1 Rules	Support in part	Remove “ Redecoration ” from (f). Reword (g) to read: “ Minor repair, alterations, and maintenance to the exterior of a building or structure ”.	<p>These two new permitted activity rules are intended to be complementary to the existing restricted discretionary rule. However, given that this is a street where shop fronts are required, it is inappropriate to include “redecorating” that is not visible from the road or the road frontage. It is inevitable that some redecoration will be visible from the road. We seek removal of this reference.</p> <p>It is also unreasonable in (g) to make alterations that do not require a building consent a permitted activity in a heritage precinct, or where heritage is sought to be protected. Significant change to the character of a building can be made by changing windows, doors or replacing cladding, none of which requires a building consent. Further, by referring to the façade of a building or structure (i.e. the principal face), it appears that minor repairs, alterations and maintenance to other sides of the building’s exterior are not permitted. This would not seem to be the intention of the rule. We suggest a rewording here.</p> <p>The submission we are making here also apply throughout the heritage rules in other parts of the Plan. It would be appropriate, and is necessary to meet RMA s6 requirements to bring these outdated and confusing rules into line with better and more up-to-date provisions. We suggest that WCC’s rules should be looked at. However, the suggestions we have made will achieve a workable rule framework that is in line with the RMA and Plan policy.</p>
163.33	Amendment 268 Petone Commercial	Support in part	In (b)(ii), replace “22m” with “14m”.	Consistent with PHS’s other submissions, we seek that the part of Petone Commercial Area 1 which is outside the Jackson Street

	Activity Area - Area 1 Rules			Heritage Precinct has a height limit which is 14m. This is appropriate in relation to the 10m height of the heritage area. The 22m proposed would allow buildings that are more than twice the height of buildings within the precinct to the north of the heritage area, causing overshadowing and adversely affecting the heritage values of the area.
163.34	Amendment 271 Petone Commercial Activity Area - Area 1 Rules	Support	Retain as notified.	Changes proposed here are complementary to the changes in Amendment 264 and 265.
163.35	Amendment 274 Petone Commercial Activity Area - Area 2 Rules	Support in part	Add after “that overlay applies...” the following “except that along the road front boundary of Jackson Street the maximum height is 12.0m, with a recession plane of 45 degrees sloping inwards to a depth of 50m from the road frontage.”	We seek reinstatement of the 12m height limit and angle plane control along the Jackson St frontage in Area 2 for the reasons set out in an earlier submission
163.36	Amendments 293, 294 Jackson St Area 2 Design Guide	Oppose	Reinstate item 8 in Amendment 293 and the diagram and description in Amendment 294.	These are retrograde proposals. As we seek reinstatement of height and angle plane controls along the Jackson Street frontage in Area 2, we seek the reinstatement or relevant guidance.
163.37	Amendments 342, 343, 344 Chapter 11 Subdivision	Support in part	Modify the wording in Amendment 344 to refer to Heretaunga Settlement Heritage Precinct and Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precinct. Formulate additional policy to relate to subdivision of sites which have individually listed heritage items throughout the city, for heritage protection, regardless of zoning.	We support the addition of an Objective and Policy that relates to subdivision of properties with heritage values. The reference in policy (b) needs to be corrected. In addition, we seek that these provisions are extended to individually listed properties with heritage values, as without this, they will be able to be subdivided without consideration of the impacts on the heritage values. This change sought is consistent with a later submission relating to the subdivision rules. Policy wording will be an essential guide for the subdivision of land containing built heritage as a discretionary activity.
163.38	Amendment 347 Chapter 11 Subdivision	Support in part	Modify the heading to read “...Riddlers Crescent heritage Precinct, and Historic Residential Precinct, and all sites containing items listed in Appendix 14F, Appendix Heritage 1 and 2. ”	We support the exclusion of heritage precincts from these minimum subdivision requirements. We seek that these provisions are extended to individually listed heritage items in all activity areas.

163.39	Amendment 360 Chapter 11 Subdivision	Support in part	<p>Modify the wording in Amendment 360 (da) to refer to Heretaunga Settlement Heritage Precinct and Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precinct.</p> <p>Add at the end of (da) “all sites containing items listed in Appendix 14F, Appendix Heritage 1 and 2.”</p>	<p>We support the requirement that all subdivision in heritage precincts are discretionary activities. The reference in (da) needs to be corrected.</p> <p>In addition, we seek that this provision is extended to individually listed properties with heritage values, as without this, they will be able to be subdivided without consideration of the impacts on the heritage values.</p>
163.40	Amendment 391 Chapter 14F	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As we are seeking reinstatement of the properties in Jackson Street that are currently part of the Patrick St Historic Residential Activity Area, reference to a small number of Jackson Street properties within this precinct needs to be added. • Items (b) and (c) are poorly structured. The first sentence of (c) should be added to (b). • The remainder of (c) should be reworded to recognise that exterior work which is controlled is not just limited to work on facades, but changes to the whole exterior of the building. As our earlier submissions have sought control of fences in Patrick Street Precinct and Riddlers Crescent this should perhaps be mentioned. • A general item should also relate to subdivision. As we have sought control of subdivision of items listed in Appendix Heritage 1 and 2, and the Council has provided such provisions in relation to Appendix 3 items, this also needs to be captured. This provision excludes the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct. 	-
163.41	Amendment 392 Chapter 14F	Support in part	<p>Add at the end of the section, a further sentence which reads: “However their setting also have heritage values”.</p>	<p>We support the Explanation and Reasons under Retention of Heritage Values. However, this is a very architectural statement. Often the setting of the items contributes to the heritage value of an item. This is particularly relevant for precincts, but it also applies to individual items. We ask that this is recognised.</p>

163.42	Amendment 393 Rule 14F 2.1	Support in part	<p>Remove “Redecoration” from (i). Reword (ii) to read: “Minor repair, alterations, and maintenance to the exterior of a building or structure”. Modify the rule so that it is clear that “structure” includes fences in relation to the Heretaunga Settlement Heritage Precinct and all items in Appendix Heritage 1 and 2.</p>	<p>As in earlier submissions, there are problems with the rules that apply here. We seek the same changes as sought in relation to </p>
163.43	Map Changes	Oppose Map Changes Proposed	<p>Reinstate the full extent of the Historic Residential Activity Area in the current operative plan for the Patrick Street and Riddlers Crescent Areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate the full extent of the Jackson Street Heritage Area. Reinstate the 10 m height limit for this area. • In all areas of Petone which are more than 800m from Ava Station and Petone station on the Railway Line, show a maximum Specific Height Control Overlay of 14 m (this includes the High Density Residential Activity Area, Petone Commercial Area 1 (where a lower Height is not already shown) and Petone Commercial Area 2, as well as General Business and Suburban Commercial. • Along the full length of the Jackson Street frontage from Victoria Street to the Hutt Road, show a Specific Height Control Overlay, rising from 12 m at the frontage on the basis of an angle plane control to a maximum height 50 m from the frontage. • Extend the Railway Area Heritage Precinct (HA3) to take in all the railway cottages, as explained earlier in this submission. 	<p>The Planning Maps for the Lower Hutt territorial area have been substantially changed. These are not identified as amendments that people can make submissions on. PHS is seeking the following changes (this may not be a complete list, but we have tried to capture all the matters shown on the maps which are covered earlier in this submission).</p>

DPC56/164 Kathryn MacKay				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
164.1	General	Oppose	Reject the plan change.	Lower Hutt is defined by its leafy streets, green areas, and vegetation on private property. It was considered a highly desirable place to raise a family. Allowing developers to build 3 to 6 storey buildings on any property as of right will destroy the character and charm of Lower Hutt and the lives of many people.
164.2	Density	Oppose	Reject any central government directive regarding housing intensification.	
164.3	Special Character	Oppose	Retain Woburn and Boulcott's special character designation.	
164.4	Car parking	New provision	Provisions for at least 1 car park per dwelling.	

DPC56/165 Anne Tindle				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
165.1	Density	Oppose	Reject the intensification proposal in suburbs.	This submission is opposed to the proposed density provisions in PC56, for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High rise buildings are not appropriate in suburbs. • Risk that the intensification policy could lead to slum areas.
165.2	Density	Oppose	Reject central government interfering in local housing issues.	
165.3	Density	New provision	Hutt City Council should require every new building to have car parking for each unit.	

DPC56/166 Fiona Christeller				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
166.1	Design Guides	New provision	<p>Create a medium density residential design guide. Provide these for all developments, both the permitted 3-house activity sites and for all other and larger developments which require resource consent.</p> <p>Adopt the Wellington City Council Design Guides suite, which would then simplify compliance across Territorial Authority boundaries.</p>	<p>Excellent work has been undertaken by, for example Wellington City Council and Kainga Ora, to identify the basic conditions which create placemaking with the goal of making good communities. These design guides, aimed at providing good housing for mixed communities, equally applies to both publicly funded and private developments.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://isoplاندocs.s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/figures/wellingtonProposed/64/02_00_Design_Guides_Residential_V05.pdf • https://kaingaora.govt.nz/assets/Publications/Design-Guidelines/Simple-Guide.pdf • https://kaingaora.govt.nz/assets/Publications/Design-Guidelines/180730-HLC-AHPDG-Part-3-3a-Small-Homes-REV-A2.pdf • https://kaingaora.govt.nz/assets/Publications/Design-Guidelines/Part-1b_The-Built-Environment_2021-06-03.pdf
166.2	Design Guides	Amend	Make the design guide a statutory part of the District Plan rather than an optional extra.	
166.3	Design Guides	New provision	Make compliance with the design guide a requirement for all projects which require a resource consent process.	
166.4	Design Guides	n/a	Undertake an active publicity campaign to inform and encourage all developers and designers to use the design guide as an aide-memoire to create adaptable and live-able housing groups.	
166.5	Urban Design Panel	Not stated	Create an urban design panel to assist developers and designers to produce good outcomes and encourage consultation as early as possible in the design process. This could possibly be done in conjunction with other nearby Territorial Authorities, to consider the urban design impact of all development trends and projects. This will better ensure quality and consistency within the built environment according to the 5 design principles.	

			Make this consultation a resource consent requirement.	
166.6	Urban Design Panel	n/a	Offer this consultation process as a free option to all developments, whether requiring Resource consent or not.	
166.7	Density	New provision	All applications for encroachment licences require resource consent. Council set up objectives for retaining street and public space amenity as densification takes place.	The visual amenity and community use of street edges and communal spaces in our cities will become increasingly more important as outdoor living/open space and the amount of vegetation within sites decrease. With the removal of car-parking requirements in PC56, there is a high probability that developers will apply to Council for encroachment licences to provide car-parking and garages on road reserve. This will adversely impact on the quality and amenity of the streetscape, remove trees (climate change degradation) and reduce pedestrian and cycleways safety. To promote mode-shift, the environments we walk or cycle through or wait for a bus in, are a critical factor in making the decision which transport mode to use. Good edges and interfaces are essential in creating well-functioning communities.
166.8	Density	Not stated	Encourage on site planting of trees with an expected height over 3m.	
166.9	Natural Hazards	Amend	Create additional restrictions/special areas within the DP medium and high density zones close to Wellington Harbour and the Hutt River which are within or adjacent to areas identified in the Hutt City Hazard Maps for inundation, flood, tsunami, EQ fault and liquefaction.	
166.10	Natural Hazards	Amend	Limit building heights and densities based on likely long term risk within the identified Hazard Map areas, by nominating these as special zones.	Government is working on a strategy of managed retreat of coastal properties and as demonstrated by recent storms, the edge of Wellington Harbour is already susceptible to inundation and this will increase in the future. Potential flooding of the river and Tsunami are also real threats. The areas shown to be potentially affected on the Hazard Maps cover a large part of Petone and Alicetown, Seaview and parts of various Eastbourne Bays, yet with few exceptions the Plan Change allows full densification. Plan Change 56 – Section14H discusses this – with recommendations being lenient and therefore with potential liability for the Council.
166.11	Natural Hazards	Amend	In the process of improving the infrastructure of the city, prioritise upgrading infrastructure and public transport routes to encourage densification away from Hazard zones.	

166.12	Natural Hazards	n/a	Include an active publicity campaign to property owners in Natural Hazard affected areas, so that owners of these sites can make informed decisions about the risk of densification in the medium and long term - e.g. that managed retreat will be required at owner rather than public cost, insurance risk, etc.	
166.13	Natural Hazards	n/a	In the immediate future, raise the height of the proposed Tupua Horo Nuku shared path to match the predicted sea-level rise over the next 2-3 decades. The additional capital cost would quickly be off set by reduced storm inundation maintenance costs.	

DPC56/167 Dawn Becker				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
167.1	Density	Oppose	Stop six storey dwellings in residential areas. Keep 6 storeys for commercial Central Business District area.	<p>The submitter expresses concern on the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on trees/vegetation • Impacts on privacy for adjoining properties • Street congestion from tenants having to find parks on the street. • Need more green spaces due to climate change. • Strain on services.
167.2	Car parking	New provision	Require new dwellings to have at least 1 off-street park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking congestion creates danger for cyclists and difficulty for residents trying to get to their property. • Limited street parking available currently.

167.3	Vegetation	New provision	Require replanting of trees/shrubs in new dwellings where existing trees have been removed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific reason provided.
-------	------------	---------------	---	--

DPC56/168 Sylvia and Bill Allan				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
168.1	Coastal Hazard Overlay – Amendment 403	Support	No specific decision requested.	<p>The submitter supports the mapping of coastal inundation and their recognition as qualifying matters, but has the following concerns about the provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That it is not a 'low' risk hazard. Don't accept that the items listed in Amendment 403 are realistic means of mitigation.
168.2	Coastal Hazard Overlay – Amendment 410 and 420	Amend	Amend PC 56 to prevent intensification of residential development above the current intensity in the medium and high coastal hazard areas.	<p>The submitter supports amendment 410 but considers Policy 14H 1.1.1 and 2 in Amendment 411 inappropriate for the medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays. They also consider Amendment 420 managing/reducing risks through building and subdivision inappropriate in the context of sea level rise.</p> <p>They consider them inappropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NZ Coastal Policy Statement gives very clear direction that "increasing the risk of social, environmental and economic harm from coastal hazards" must be avoided, and "redevelopment, or changes in land use, that would increase the risk of adverse effects from coastal hazards" must also be avoided. This is very clear and strong direction from an instrument of national direction which is the equivalent of the NPSUD, yet the policy in the proposed plan change (Amendment 411) suggests that mitigation "for subdivision, use and development" may be acceptable.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New subdivision and development within areas of predictable inundation from sea level rise is extremely likely to involve buildings with a life that well exceeds the 50 years of a building consent. The increase in resident population in these areas, along with the infrastructure and individual and community investment made in achieving any new development, will increase the harm that our society will eventually have to deal with. • Sea level rise will not go away and will affect access and buildings.
168.3	Coastal Hazard Overlay – Amendment 430, 432 and 430	Amend	The submitter requests that any increase in dwelling numbers in the medium exposure areas should be non-complying and prohibited in the high coastal hazard area.	<p>The submitter supports Amendment 430 but disagrees with enabling further density in Amendments 432 and 433 in vulnerable areas as permitted activities.</p> <p>They request amendments for the following reasons:</p> <p>Permitted activities should not increase the number of dwellings exposed to risk.</p>
168.4	Coastal Hazard Overlay/Subdivision – Amendment 340	Amend	Subdivision in the medium and high coastal hazard areas should be a prohibited activity.	<p>The submitter requests amendments for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendment 340 requires subdivision in the medium and high coastal hazard areas “include mitigation measures to avoid any increase in risk to people or property, including neighbouring property.” For sea level rise, any type of mitigation which may be promoted at the time of subdivision will be ineffective. • The risk cannot be managed.

DPC56/169 Hayley Bird				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
169.1	Off-street parking	New provision [inferred]	Make sure all new housing has at least 1 private parking space.	The submitter requests amendments for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern around loss of street parking spaces. • Concern that parking spaces are hard to find currently (particularly at kindy and school drop-offs).
169.2	Density	Oppose	Limit houses to 2 storeys only.	The submitter opposes the intensification of residential housing for the following reasons: Concerns about over population, noise and change in character of existing environment.

DPC56/170 Anthony Phillip Dee Smith				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
170.1	Density (particularly Petone)	Oppose	Withdraw proposals for intensification in northern Petone, pending the development of climate change adaptation options for the area.	The submitter opposes the intensification of northern Petone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasingly severe hazards from the effects of climate change (such as increased frequency and severity of storm events) and greater vulnerability. • The combined effects of climate change and land subsidence will cause rising sea levels in Petone. • The plan change does not recognise the severity of predicted future hazards from climate change in areas of Petone • Lack of adaptation policies and strategies, or standardised methods to deal with medium-high hazards.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earthquake and liquefaction risk. • Flood risk. • Land instability. • Potential insurance retreat and economic loss as a result. • Lack of time to consider natural hazard data in this plan change.
170.2	Climate Change Adaptation/Natural Hazards	Amend	<p>Develop climate change adaption options for Petone, ahead of any substantive decisions on intensification.</p> <p>In developing such options, consider policies and practices being developed in the South Dunedin Future programme.</p>	<p>Nationally, Petone and South Dunedin are among the most vulnerable areas to increasing flood hazards from climate change. In both areas, scientists anticipate a combination of rising sea levels, rising ground water, and increased frequency and severity of rainfall events. These changes will likely contribute to a growing flood risk for parts of both areas. Both are relatively densely populated, have many businesses, and have large areas between 0.5-1.5 metres above mean sea level. In both areas there is a need to plan for these changes and act now to avoid the worst of the impacts. Planning has begun for the changes in South Dunedin by way of the South Dunedin Future programme (a joint initiative of the Dunedin City Council and the Otago Regional Council). I submit that such systematic, coherent planning is also needed for the changes in Petone.</p>

DPC56/171 Maria Biedermann				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
171.1	Intensification – residential and commercial areas	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money making venture for council and developers. • Impact on current owners. • Impacts on aging services and surrounding sites, including plumbing/sewerage systems. • Impacts on character.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts on carparking and need for better public transport system.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/172 Sarah Poole				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
172.1	Medium Density Residential Activity Area	Amend	Do not extend medium density zones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes encouraging urban sprawl. Will discourage people from using public transport Will become too difficult to catch multiple forms of transport to get somewhere. Will create a lack of cohesiveness within the outer suburbs. Will dramatically alter the outer suburbs neighbourhoods. Lack of accessible public facilities in outer areas. Excessive pressure on existing amenities that are already struggling with current population growth. Impacts on access to sunlight. Impacts on neighbours space and privacy. Will create an un-planned mess and create problems in the future when amenities, such as water and facilities are over-loaded.
172.2	Development Standards	Amend	Do not increase the permitted building heights in outer suburbs.	
172.3	High Density Residential Activity Area/Intensification	Support	Allow high density housing in central Lower Hutt and Petone	Supports high density housing in central Lower Hutt and Petone areas, along with selected commercial areas because it will encourage development where there is good access, services and amenities, including public transport. There are also areas where it is possible to walk or cycle to most services. It would also encourage more communal facilities that everyone can benefit from.

DPC56/173 Megan Drayton				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
173.1	Amendment 171 [Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area (Precincts and Scheduled Sites)]4G 5.2	Amend	Replace 'or' after understanding with 'and' and then retain the rest of the amendment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage values are very important now and for future generations. Maintenance and enhancement of existing amenity and character values. Appropriate character retention is good for the social and economic wellbeing of Petone and Lower Hutt
173.2	Amendment 173 173 [Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area (Precincts and Scheduled Sites)] Add new Objective 4G 5.2.1.1	Support	Retain this amendment	The historic heritage of residential areas in the Residential Heritage Precinct need to be protected from new development with inappropriate building heights and density.
173.3	Amendment 175 [Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area (Precincts and Scheduled Sites)] Add new Policy 4G 5.2.2.1	Support	Retain this amendment	Managing the impacts of new built development on the historic heritage of areas in the Residential Heritage Precinct by limiting building heights and density is very important
173.4	Amendment 176 [Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area (Precincts and Scheduled Sites)]	Amend	Ensure that all proposed residential heritage precincts are protected from demolition without consent	All activities and development within the Residential Heritage Precinct having to comply with and be assessed against the provisions (including development standards) of the underlying Residential Activity Area unless specified otherwise below means

	Add new section 4G 5.2.3 Rules			that demolition without consent would be possible within the Foreshore Precinct
173.5	Amendment 177 [Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area (Precincts and Scheduled Sites)] Add new Rule 4G 5.2.3.1	Support	Keep the wording in all of this amendment.	Keeping the current building heights and numbers of dwellings on each site is a key way of keeping such precincts intact

DPC56/174 Laura Gaudin				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
174.1	* Objective 4F 5.1.1.1, Objective 4G 5.2.1.1, Objective 4G 5.3.1.1, Objective 4G 5.3.1.2, Policy 4F 5.1.2.1, Policy 4G 5.2.2.1, Policy 5.3.2.1, and Policy 5.3.2.2	Support	Support heritage areas and precincts where particular heritage values are maintained through objectives, policies, rules and design guides.	<p>Supports the inclusion of heritage areas and precincts, and requests minor amendments to support this for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important to maintain historic heritage values through objectives, policies, rules, and design guides. • These areas offer visual amenity and a point of connection to local history. • Ensure heritage buildings are easily identifiable in maps.
174.2	(relating to residential heritage precincts)	Amend	Rule 4G 4.2.11 – replace “Chapters 14E and 14G”, “ with “Chapters 14E and 14F”	

174.3	Maps (heritage overlay)	Amend	Update Proposed District Plan map to highlight heritage buildings with a star icon (or other icon), similar to the Operative Planning maps	
-------	-------------------------	-------	--	--

DPC56/175 Brain Boyer

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
175.1	Heritage Areas	Amend	A decision which achieves the essential protection of heritage, but does not penalise the current owners.	<p>Generally supports the new historic heritage areas, but requests amendments for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Character of properties and areas identified should be protected from change driven by profit or decided hastily. • Character areas and properties should be protected from nearby development which will overshadow the heritage values. • Doesn't want current owners to be penalised by heritage protection requirements. • Feels there is insufficient detail in respect of the proposed new historic heritage precincts. • The information provided by HCC does not give owners sufficient detail about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ proposed or possible future specific rules under the District Plan, in relation to alterations, additions, maintenance, etc; ○ the cost to owners of ongoing compliance; ○ impact on property values ○ the additional cost of maintenance/alterations ○ protection from negative aspects of development of properties adjoining or close by;

- the impact on insurability or the cost of insurance.

DPC56/176 Fire and Emergency New Zealand				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
176.1	1.10.1A Urban Environment - Objective	Support	Retain as drafted.	FENZ supports this objective insofar as it promotes a well-functioning urban environment that provides for the health and safety of people and communities.
176.2	1.10.1A Urban Environment Policy 2	Amend	Retain as drafted.	FENZ supports Policy 2 insofar as it allows for the modification of building heights and density to the extent necessary to recognise and provide for the management of significant risks from natural hazards. Subject to the relief sought in Chapter 3 'Definitions', Policy 2 shall allow the modification of urban form when providing for management of significant fire risk.
176.3	Chapter 3: Definitions	Amend	<p>New definition as follows:</p> <p>Natural Hazard has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA (as set out in the box below):</p> <p>means any atmospheric or earth or water related occurrence (including earthquake, tsunami, erosion, volcanic and geothermal activity, landslip, subsidence, sedimentation, wind, drought, fire, or flooding) the action of which adversely affects or may adversely affect human life, property, or other aspects of the environment.</p>	FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new definition for 'Natural Hazard', which expressly includes fire, to ensure reference to natural hazards throughout the plan prompt the consideration of fire risk.

176.4	1.10.11 Lessening Natural Hazards Objective	Support	Retain as drafted.	FENZ supports this objective insofar as it seeks to avoid or reduce the risk to people, property, and infrastructure from natural hazards. Subject to the relief sought in Chapter 3 'Definitions', this Objective shall provide for the mitigation of fire risk.
176.5	1.10.11 Lessening Natural Hazards Policy	Support	Retain as drafted.	FENZ supports this policy insofar as it does not prohibit development within areas subject to hazard overlays. FENZ notes it has several stations located within flood hazard overlays. Therefore, allowing for activities in these areas, providing the hazard risk is appropriately mitigated, is supported by FENZ. Further, FENZ may have an operational and functional need to locate new stations within areas subject to hazard overlays, this can help reduce response times to fire events and protect the community more efficiently.
176.6	Medium Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4F 2.1AA	Support	Retain as drafted.	FENZ supports Objective 4F 2.1AA insofar as it promotes a well-functioning urban environment that provides for the health and safety of people and communities.
176.7	Medium Density Residential Activity Area	Amend	Add a new objective as follows: <u>Objective X Infrastructure</u> <u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u>	FENZ seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Medium Density Residential Activity Area. Further, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new policy that promotes all land use activities in the Medium Density Residential Activity Area being adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply and a water supply for firefighting purposes. This will give better affect to Objective X and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.
176.8	Medium Density Residential Activity Area	Amend	Add a new policy as follows: <u>Policy X Servicing</u> <u>All development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u>	

176.9	Rule 4F 4.1.7 Retirement Villages	Amend	<p>Add a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><i>x. An adequate firefighting water supply is provided in accordance with NZS 4404:2010 and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</i></p>	<p>FENZ supports Rule 4F 4.1.7 insofar as retirement villages are a restricted discretionary activity, and the matters of discretion allow for the consideration of the capacity of network infrastructure for water supply to service the proposed development.</p> <p>However, a reference to the provision of firefighting water supply has not been included. Therefore, adequate consideration for the provision of a firefighting water is not covered.</p> <p>As such, FENZ seeks to extend the matters of discretion to expressly prefer to firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, in accordance with NZ Fire Service Firefighting 9Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</p>
176.10	Rule 4F 4.1.11 Vegetation Removal	Amend	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>a) <i>The removal of indigenous vegetation:</i></p> <p><i>x. Where it poses a risk to the environment and health and safety of people</i></p> <p>b) <i>The removal of exotic vegetation is a permitted activity if:</i></p> <p><i>x. It poses a risk to the environment and health and safety of people</i></p>	<p>FENZ supports Rule 4F 4.1.11 insofar as it permits the removal of vegetation in many circumstances. Furthermore, the rule permits the removal of indigenous vegetation to prevent loss of life, injury, damage to property.</p> <p>However, FENZ seeks to amend Rule 4F 4.1.11 to allow the removal of indigenous and exotic vegetation where the vegetation poses a fire risk to the environment and the health and safety of people.</p> <p>It is important that property owners and occupiers are able to remove flammable vegetation, as required, to provide sufficient clearance to mitigate the potential of fire risk/spread between flammable vegetation and property.</p>
176.11	Rule 4F 4.2.1 AA Number of Residential Units per Site	Amend	<p>Add a permitted activity standard as follows:</p> <p>a) <i>Up to three dwellings per site are a permitted activity where:</i></p> <p><i>x. Compliance is achieved with Rule 4G 4.2.X Firefighting Water Supply and Rule 4G 4.2.X Fire Appliance Access.</i></p>	<p>FENZ supports Rule 4F 4.2.1 AA insofar as four or more residential units per site are a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>However, a reference to the provision of firefighting water supply has not been included. Therefore, adequate consideration for the provision of a firefighting water is not covered.</p> <p>As such, FENZ seeks to extend the matters of discretion to expressly consider the provisions of firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, in accordance with NZ Fire Service</p>

176.12	Rule 4F 4.2.1 AA Number of Residential Units per Site	Amend	<p>Add a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><u>x. An adequate firefighting water supply is provided in accordance with NZS 4404:2010 and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u></p>	<p>Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</p> <p>Furthermore, the establishment of up to three residential units is a permitted activity. However, the permitted activity standards do not require that these activities are sufficiently serviced. Furthermore, FENZ seeks that these activities are accessible to fire appliances.</p> <p>As such, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a permitted activity standard which requires compliance with proposed development standards Rule 4G 4.2.X Firefighting Water Supply and Rule 4G 4.2.X Fire Appliance Access.</p> <p>Furthermore, the establishment of up to three residential units is a permitted activity. However, the permitted activity standards do not require that these activities are sufficiently serviced. Furthermore, FENZ seeks that these activities are accessible to fire appliances.</p> <p>As such, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a permitted activity standard which requires compliance with proposed development standards Rule 4G 4.2.X Firefighting Water Supply and Rule 4G 4.2.X Fire Appliance Access.</p>
176.13	Rule 4F 4.2.2 Building Height	Amend	<p>Add a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><u>Rule 4F 4.2.2 does not apply to hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u></p>	<p>Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally.</p> <p>FENZ however seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, 1communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.</p>

176.14	Rule 4F 4.2.3 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support with amendment	Amend as follows: <u>Rule 4F 4.2.3 does not apply to hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>	As per the points raised in relation to building height standards, FENZ seeks an exemption for hose drying towers regarding height in relation to boundary standards.
176.15	Rule 4F 4.2.7 Accessory Building	Support with amendment	Amend as follows: <i>a) Construction or alteration of an accessory building is a permitted activity if:</i> <i>i. Development standards ... <u>4F 4.2.X (Firefighting Water Supply), <u>4F 4.2.X (Fire Appliance Access)</u> and are complied with.</u></i>	FENZ supports Rule 4F 4.2.7 insofar as it permits the construction or alteration of an accessory building if the provided list of development standards is complied with. FENZ seek to include compliance with the proposed firefighting water supply and fire appliance access standards. Therefore, subject to the relief sought regarding the inclusion of development standards for firefighting water supply and access for fire appliances, FENZ supports Rule 4F 4.2.7.
176.16	Chapter 4F - New Rule	Amend	Add a new rule as follows: <u>Rule 4F 4.2.X Servicing</u> <u>1. Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u> <u>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</u> <u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the</u>	FENZ seeks a new development rule that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced in relation to firefighting water supply. It is vital that a sufficient water supply, and access to that supply, is provided onsite to ensure FENZ are enabled to effectively respond to a fire emergency.

			<u>New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u>	
176.17	Chapter 4F - New Rule	Amend	<p>Add a new rule as follows:</p> <p><u>Rule 4F 4.2.X Fire Appliance Access</u></p> <p><u>Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u></p> <p><u>a) a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u></p> <p><u>b) a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u></p> <p><u>c) a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u></p> <p><u>d) a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u></p> <p><u>e) a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u></p> <p><u>f) The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u></p>	<p>The existing and proposed rules and standards do not guarantee that adequate site access is provided for fire appliances in scenarios where the driveway length exceeds hose run distances, or sites are located outside of reticulated areas.</p> <p>FENZ considers this would pose an unacceptable risk to any new buildings, its occupiers, and any surrounding vegetation, as well as neighbouring properties and occupiers.</p> <p>It is requested that driveways which would be used to access buildings more than 50m from the nearest legal road, or accessways to sites located outside of the reticulated area, be constructed to provide fire appliance access in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. This will help ensure that FENZ has the ability to efficiently and effectively respond to emergencies on all sites within the district.</p>
176.18	Rule 4F 5.1.3.1 Building height and density in the Residential Heritage Precinct	Support with amendment	Retain as drafted.	FENZ notes that other all activities and development within the Residential Heritage Precinct must comply with the underlying rules of the Residential Activity Area. Therefore, subject to the relief sought in the Residential Activity Area chapter, FENZ supports Rule 4F 5.1.3.1.

176.19	Rule 4F 5.2.1.1 Activities	Support with amendment	Retain as drafted.	FENZ notes that other all activities and development within the Scheduled Site 39 Fitzherbert Road, Wainuiomata Housing for the Elderly must comply with the underlying rules of Residential Activity Area. Therefore, subject to the relief sought in the Residential Activity Area chapter, FENZ supports Rule 4F 5.2.1.1.
176.20	Objective 4G 2.1	Support	Retain as drafted.	FENZ supports objective 4G 2.1 insofar as it promotes a well-functioning urban environment that provides for the health and safety of people and communities.
176.21	Objective 4G 2.6	Support	Retain as drafted.	FENZ supports objective 4G 2.6 insofar as it promotes built development that is adequately serviced by infrastructure.
176.22	Policy 4G 3.1	Amend	Amend as follows: <i>Provide for residential activities, and those non-residential activities that support the community's social, economic and cultural wellbeing and manage any adverse effects on residential amenity. Emergency facilities are provided for where the activity has an operational or functional need to locate in the zone.</i>	FENZ supports Policy 4G 3.1 insofar as it provides for non-residential activities within the High Density Residential Activity Area providing the activity supports the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community. However, FENZ seeks to amend Policy 4G 3.1 to provide for the establishment of emergency facilities where there is an operational or functional need to locate within the zone.
176.23	Chapter 4G - New policy	Amend	Add new policy as follows: Policy 4G 3.X Servicing Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.	Fire and Emergency seeks a new policy that all land use activities in the High Density Residential Activity Area are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply. This will provide a better policy framework for the new development standard requiring the adequate provision of firefighting water supply.

176.24	<p>Rule 4G 4.1.1 Residential Activities</p> <p>Rule 4G 4.1.2 Home Occupations</p> <p>Rule 4G 4.1.3 Care Facilities, Residential Facilities, Boarding Houses, Hostels, Visitor Accommodation</p> <p>Rule 4G 4.1.4 Childcare Facilities</p> <p>Rule 4G 4.1.5 Health Care Facilities</p>	Amend	<p>Add a permitted activity standard as follows:</p> <p>... are permitted activities where:</p> <p><u>x. Compliance is achieved with Rule 4G 4.2.X Firefighting Water Supply and Rule 4G 4.2.X Fire Appliance Access.</u></p>	<p>FENZ supports rules 4G 4.1.1 to 4G 4.1.5 insofar as they permit the establishment of a range of facilities within the High Density Residential Activity Area. However, the permitted activity standards do not ensure these activities are sufficiently serviced upon establishment within the zone. Furthermore, FENZ seeks to ensure these activities are accessible to fire appliances in certain circumstances.</p> <p>As such, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a permitted activity standard which requires compliance with proposed development standards Rule 4G 4.2.X Firefighting Water Supply and Rule 4G 4.2.X Fire Appliance Access.</p>
176.25	<p>Rule 4G 4.1.6 Community Facilities, Marae, Education Facilities, Places of Assembly and Emergency Facilities</p>	Amend	<p>Add a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><u>x. An adequate firefighting water supply is provided in accordance with NZS 4404:2010 and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>x. The extent to which the activity has an operational and functional need to locate within the area.</u></p>	<p>FENZ supports Rule 4G 4.1.6 insofar as community facilities, marae, education facilities and emergency facilities are a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>However, a reference to the provision of firefighting water supply has not been included. Therefore, adequate consideration for the provision of a firefighting water is not assured.</p> <p>As such, FENZ seeks to extend the matters of discretion to expressly consider the provision of firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, in accordance with NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</p> <p>Furthermore, FENZ seeks a matter of discretion to allow council to consider the operational and functional need for the activity to locate within the area.</p> <p>New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in stations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that FENZ is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. FENZ considers</p>

				that adding a new matter of discretion for Emergency Facilities will better provide for health and safety of communities by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations
176.26	Rule 4G 4.1.7 Retirement Villages	Amend	<p>Add a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><i>x. An adequate firefighting water supply is provided in accordance with NZS 4404:2010 and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</i></p>	<p>FENZ supports Rule 4G 4.1.7 insofar as retirement villages are a restricted discretionary activity, and the matters of discretion allow for the consideration of the capacity of network infrastructure for water supply to service the proposed development.</p> <p>However, a reference to the provision of firefighting water supply has not been included. Therefore, adequate consideration for the provision of a firefighting water is not covered.</p> <p>As such, FENZ seeks to extend the matters of discretion to expressly consider the provisions of firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, in accordance with NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</p>
176.27	Rule 4G 4.1.11 Vegetation Removal	Amend	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><i>a) The removal of indigenous vegetation:</i> <i>x. Where it poses a risk to the environment and health and safety of people</i></p> <p><i>b) The removal of exotic vegetation is a permitted activity if:</i> <i>x. It poses a risk to the environment and health and safety of people</i></p>	<p>FENZ supports Rule 4G 4.1.11 insofar as it permits the removal of vegetation in many circumstances. Furthermore, the rule permits the removal of indigenous vegetation to prevent loss of life, injury, damage to property.</p> <p>However, FENZ seeks to amend Rule 4G 4.1.11 to allow the removal of indigenous and exotic vegetation where the vegetation poses a fire risk to the environment and the health and safety of people.</p> <p>It is important that property owners and occupiers are able to remove flammable vegetation, as required, to provide sufficient clearance to mitigate the potential of fire risk/spread between flammable vegetation and property.</p>

176.28	Rule 4G 4.2.1 Number of Dwellings per Site	Amend	<p>Add a permitted activity standard as follows:</p> <p><i>a) Up to three dwellings per site are a permitted activity <u>where:</u></i> <i><u>x. Compliance is achieved with Rule 4G 4.2.X Firefighting Water Supply and Rule 4G 4.2.X Fire Appliance Access.</u></i></p>	<p>FENZ supports Rule 4G 4.2.1 insofar as four or more residential units per site are a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>However, a reference to the provision of firefighting water supply has not been included. Therefore, adequate consideration for the provision of a firefighting water is not covered.</p> <p>As such, FENZ seeks to extend the matters of discretion to expressly consider the provisions of firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, in accordance with NZ Fire Service</p>
176.29			<p>Add a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><i><u>x. An adequate firefighting water supply is provided in accordance with NZS 4404:2010 and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u></i></p>	<p>Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</p> <p>Furthermore, the establishment of up to three residential units is a permitted activity. However, the permitted activity standards do not ensure these activities are sufficiently serviced with firefighting water supply. Furthermore, FENZ seeks to ensure these activities are accessible to fire appliances in certain circumstances.</p> <p>As such, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a permitted activity standard which requires compliance with proposed development standards Rule 4G 4.2.X Firefighting Water Supply and Rule 4G 4.2.X Fire Appliance Access.</p>
176.30	Rule 4G 4.2.3 Building Height	Amend	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><i><u>Rule 4G 4.2.3 does not apply to emergency facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u></i></p>	<p>Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally.</p> <p>Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.</p> <p>FENZ seeks an exemption for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and</p>

				safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.
176.31	Rule 4G 4.2.4 Height in Relation to Boundary	Amend	Amend as follows: <i>Rule 4G 4.2.4 does not apply to hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</i>	As per the points raised in relation to building height standards, FENZ seeks an exemption for hose drying towers regarding height in relation to boundary standards.
176.32	Rule 4G 4.2.9 Accessory Building	Amend	Amend as follows: a) Construction or alteration of an accessory building is a permitted activity if: i. Development standards ... <u>4G 4.2.X (Firefighting Water Supply), 4G 4.2.X (Fire Appliance Access)</u> and are complied with.	FENZ supports Rule 4G 4.2.9 insofar as it permits the construction or alteration of an accessory building if the provided list of development standards is complied with. FENZ seeks to include compliance with the proposed firefighting water supply and fire appliance access standards. Therefore, subject to the relief sought regarding the inclusion of development standards for firefighting water supply and access for fire appliances, FENZ supports Rule 4G 4.2.9.
176.33	4.2 Development Standards - New rules	Amend	Add a new rules as follows: <u><i>Rule 4G 4.2.X Servicing</i></u> <u><i>1. Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</i></u> <u><i>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</i></u> <u><i>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to</i></u>	FENZ seeks a new development standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced in relation to firefighting water supply. It is vital that a sufficient water supply, and access to that supply, is provided onsite to ensure FENZ is able to effectively respond to a fire emergency. The existing and proposed rules / standards do not guarantee that adequate site access is provided for fire appliances in scenarios where the driveway length exceeds hose run distances, or sites are located outside of reticulated areas. FENZ considers this would pose an unacceptable risk to any new buildings, its occupiers, and any surrounding vegetation, as well as neighbouring properties and occupiers. It is requested that driveways which would be used to access buildings more than 50m from the nearest legal road, or accessways to sites located outside of the reticulated area, be constructed to provide fire appliance access in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice

			<p><u>that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p> <p><u>Rule 4G 4.2.X Fire Appliance Access</u></p> <p><u>Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u></p> <p><u>a) a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u></p> <p><u>b) a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u></p> <p><u>c) a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u></p> <p><u>d) a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u></p> <p><u>e) a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u></p> <p><u>f) The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u></p>	<p>SNA PAS 4509:2008. This will help ensure that FENZ has the ability to efficiently and effectively respond to emergencies.</p>
176.34	Rule 4G 5.2.3.1 Building height and density in the Residential Heritage Precinct	Amend	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><u>Rule 4G 5.2.3.1 does not apply to emergency facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u></p>	<p>Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally.</p> <p>Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.</p>

				FENZ seeks an exemption for emergency facilities and hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.
176.35	Rule 4G 5.3.3.1 Redevelopment, Alterations, Repair or Modification of Buildings or Structures in the Heretaunga Settlement Heritage Precinct and Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precinct	Amend	Amend as follows: <i>iii. Maximum Height in Relation to Boundary</i> ... Note: Emergency facilities up to 9m and hose drying towers up to 15m are excluded from this rule <i>iv. Maximum Height of Buildings and Structures:</i> <i>does not apply to emergency facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</i> Note: Emergency facilities up to 9m and hose drying towers up to 15m are excluded from this rule	FENZ supports Rule 4G 5.3.3.1 insofar as it permits the repair or modification of buildings or structures. However, the permitted activity height standards would be restrictive for emergency facilities. Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. As such, FENZ seeks to exclude emergency facilities and house drying towers from the relevant height standards set out in Rule 4G 5.3.3.1.
176.36	Rule 4G 5.6.2.1 Activities	Amend	Add a new matter of discretion as follows: x. The extent to which the activity complies with Rule 4G 4.2.X Firefighting Water Supply and Rule 4G 4.2.X Fire Appliance Access	FENZ supports Rule 4G 5.6.2.1 insofar as activities within are a restricted discretionary activity. However, a reference to the provision of firefighting water supply has not been included. Therefore, adequate consideration for the provision of a firefighting water is not covered. As such, FENZ seeks to extend the matters of discretion to expressly consider the provisions of firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, in accordance with NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.

176.37	Chapter 5A - New objective	Amend	<p>Add a new objective as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Objective X Infrastructure</i></u> <u><i>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</i></u></p>	<p>FENZ notes that while PC56 mainly relates to the deletion of sections from Chapter 5A, there is a notable lack of an objective / policy framework to ensure development is sufficiently serviced, particularly regarding water supply, including firefighting water supply.</p> <p>As such, FENZ seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Central Commercial Activity Area.</p>
176.38	Chapter 5A - New policy	Amend	<p>Add a new objective as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Policy X Servicing</i></u> <u><i>All development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</i></u></p>	<p>Further, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the Central Commercial Activity Area are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply and a water supply for firefighting purposes. This will give better effect to Objective X and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.</p>
176.39	Chapter 5A – New rules	Amend	<p>Add a new rule as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Rule 5A 2.1.X Servicing</i></u> <u><i>1. Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</i></u> <u><i>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</i></u></p>	<p>FENZ seeks a new rule that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced in relation to firefighting water supply.</p> <p>It is vital that a sufficient water supply, and access to that supply, is provided onsite to ensure FENZ are enabled to effectively respond to a fire emergency.</p>

			<u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u>	
176.40	Chapter 5A – New development standard	Amend	<p>Add a new development standard as follows:</p> <p><u>Rule 5A 2.1.X Fire Appliance Access</u></p> <p><u>Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u></p> <p><u>a) a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u></p> <p><u>b) a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u></p> <p><u>c) a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u></p> <p><u>d) a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u></p> <p><u>e) a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u></p> <p><u>f) The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u></p>	<p>The existing and proposed rules and standards do not guarantee that adequate site access is provided for fire appliances in scenarios where the driveway length exceeds hose run distances, or sites are located outside of reticulated areas.</p> <p>FENZ considers this would pose an unacceptable risk to any new buildings, its occupiers, and any surrounding vegetation, as well as neighbouring properties and occupiers.</p> <p>It is requested that driveways which would be used to access buildings more than 50m from the nearest legal road, or accessways to sites located outside of the reticulated area, be constructed to provide fire appliance access in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. This will help ensure that FENZ has the ability to efficiently and effectively respond to emergencies.</p>
176.41	Appendix 8 Design Guide	Support	Retain as drafted.	Provides for 'any height' in regard to the future character of the area, which would enable the establishment of emergency service facilities.

176.42	Chapter 5B - New objective	Amend	<p>Add a new objective as follows:</p> <p><u>Objective X Infrastructure</u> <u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u></p>	<p>FENZ notes that while PC56 mainly relates to the deletion of sections from Chapter 5B, there is a notable lack of an objective / policy framework to ensure development is sufficiently serviced, particularly regarding water supply and a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>As such, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Petone Commercial Activity Area. Further, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the Petone</p>
176.43	Chapter 5B - New policy	Amend	<p>Add a new policy as follows:</p> <p><u>Policy X Servicing</u> <u>All development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u></p>	<p>Commercial Activity Area are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply and a water supply for firefighting purposes. This will give better effect to Objective X and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.</p>
176.44	Chapter 5B - New rule	Amend	<p>Add a new development standard as follows:</p> <p><u>Rule 5B 2.1.1.X Servicing</u></p> <p><u>1. Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply</u></p>	<p>FENZ seeks a new development standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced in relation to firefighting water supply.</p> <p>It is vital that a sufficient water supply, and access to that supply, is provided onsite to ensure FENZ is able to effectively respond to a fire emergency.</p>

			<p><u>and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>	
176.45	New Rule	Amend	<p>Add a new development standard as follows:</p> <p><u>Rule 5B 2.1.X Fire Appliance Access</u></p> <p><u>Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u></p> <p><u>a) a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u></p> <p><u>b) a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u></p> <p><u>c) a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u></p> <p><u>d) a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u></p> <p><u>e) a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u></p> <p><u>f) The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u></p>	<p>The existing and proposed rules and standards do not guarantee that adequate site access is provided for fire appliances in scenarios where the driveway length exceeds hose run distances, or sites are located outside of reticulated areas.</p> <p>FENZ considers this would pose an unacceptable risk to any new buildings, its occupiers, and any surrounding vegetation, as well as neighbouring properties and occupiers.</p> <p>It is requested that driveways which would be used to access buildings more than 50m from the nearest legal road, or accessways to sites located outside of the reticulated area, be constructed to provide fire appliance access in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. This will help ensure that FENZ has the ability to efficiently and effectively respond to emergencies.</p>

176.46	Appendix Petone Commercial 2	Support	Retain as drafted	Buildings of any height are provided for except for limited areas around Te Puni Urupā. This would enable the establishment of emergency facilities within most areas of the Petone Commercial 2 area, which is supported by FENZ.
176.47	Chapter 5E - New objective	Amend	Add a new objective as follows: <u><i>Objective X Infrastructure</i></u> <u><i>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</i></u>	FENZ seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area. Further, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply and a water supply for firefighting purposes. This will give better affect to Objective X and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.
176.48	Chapter 5E - New policy	Amend	Add a new policy as follows: <u><i>Policy X Servicing</i></u> <u><i>All development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</i></u>	
176.49	Rule 5E 4.2.1 Building Height	Amend	Amend as follows: <u><i>Rule 5E 4.2.1 does not apply to emergency facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</i></u>	Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ seeks an exemption for emergency facilities and hose drying towers associated with emergency facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.

176.50	Chapter 5E - New Rule	Amend	<p>Add a new development standard as follows:</p> <p><u>Rule 5E 4.2.X Servicing</u></p> <p><u>1. Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>	<p>FENZ seeks a new development standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced in relation to firefighting water supply.</p> <p>It is vital that a sufficient water supply, and access to that supply, is provided onsite to ensure FENZ are enabled to effectively respond to a fire emergency.</p>
176.51	Chapter 5E - New Rule	Amend	<p>Add a new development standard as follows:</p> <p><u>Rule 5E 4.2.X Fire Appliance Access</u></p> <p><u>Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u></p>	<p>The existing and proposed rules and standards do not guarantee that adequate site access is provided for fire appliances in scenarios where the driveway length exceeds hose run distances, or sites are located outside of reticulated areas.</p> <p>FENZ considers this would pose an unacceptable risk to any new buildings, its occupiers, and any surrounding vegetation, as well as neighbouring properties and occupiers.</p> <p>It is requested that driveways which would be used to access buildings more than 50m from the nearest legal road, or accessways to sites located outside of the reticulated area, be constructed to provide fire appliance access in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. This will help ensure that FENZ has the</p>

			<p><u><i>a) a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</i></u> <u><i>b) a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</i></u> <u><i>c) a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</i></u> <u><i>d) a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</i></u> <u><i>e) a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</i></u> <u><i>f) The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</i></u></p>	<p>ability to efficiently and effectively respond to emergencies on all sites with the district.</p>
176.52	Chapter 6A - New objective and policy	Amend	<p>Add a new objective as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Objective X Infrastructure</i></u> <u><i>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</i></u></p>	<p>FENZ seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the General Business Activity Area. Further, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the General Business Activity Area are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply and a water supply for firefighting purposes. This will give better effect to Objective X and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.</p>
176.53	Chapter 6A - New objective and policy	Amend	<p>Add a new policy as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Policy X Servicing</i></u> <u><i>All development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</i></u></p>	
176.54	Permitted Activity Condition 6A 2.1.1	Support with amendment	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Rule 6A 2.1.1 does not apply to emergency facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</i></u></p>	<p>Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally.</p> <p>Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.</p>

				FENZ seeks an exemption for emergency facilities and hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.
176.55	Chapter 6A - New Rule	Amend	<p>Add a new development standard as follows:</p> <p><u>Rule 6A 2.1.X Servicing</u></p> <p><u>1. Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>	<p>FENZ seeks a new development standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced in relation to firefighting water supply.</p> <p>It is vital that a sufficient water supply, and access to that supply, is provided onsite to ensure FENZ are enabled to effectively respond to a fire emergency.</p>
176.56	Chapter 6A - New Rule	Amend	Add a new development standard as follows:	The existing and proposed rules / standards do not guarantee that adequate site access is provided for fire appliances in

			<p><u>Rule 6A 2.1.X Fire Appliance Access</u></p> <p><u>Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u></p> <p><u>a) a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u></p> <p><u>b) a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u></p> <p><u>c) a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u></p> <p><u>d) a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u></p> <p><u>e) a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u></p> <p><u>f) The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u></p>	<p>scenarios where the driveway length exceeds hose run distances, or sites are located outside of reticulated areas.</p> <p>FENZ considers this would pose an unacceptable risk to any new buildings, its occupiers and any surrounding vegetation, as well as neighbouring properties and occupiers.</p> <p>It is requested that driveways which would be used to access buildings more than 50m from the nearest legal road, or accessways to sites located outside of the reticulated area, be constructed to provide fire appliance access in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. This will help ensure that FENZ has the ability to efficiently and effectively respond to emergencies.</p>
176.57	Chapter 9A – New objective	Amend	<p>Add a new objective as follows:</p> <p><u>Objective X Infrastructure</u> <u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u></p>	<p>FENZ seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Community Health Activity Area. Further, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the Community Health Activity Area are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply and a water supply for firefighting purposes. This will give better effect to Objective X and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.</p>
176.58	Chapter 9A – New policy	Amend	<p>Add a new policy as follows:</p> <p><u>Policy X Servicing</u> <u>All development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u></p>	

176.59	Permitted Activity Condition 9A 2.1.1	Support	Retain as drafted.	<p>Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally.</p> <p>Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station.</p> <p>These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.</p> <p>As such, FENZ supports Permitted Activity Condition 9A 2.1.1.</p>
176.60	Chapter 9A - New Rule	Amend	<p>Add a new development standard as follows:</p> <p><u>Rule 9A 2.1.X Servicing</u></p> <p><u>1. Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>	<p>FENZ seeks a new development standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced in relation to firefighting water supply.</p> <p>It is vital that a sufficient water supply, and access to that supply, is provided onsite to ensure FENZ is able to effectively respond to a fire emergency.</p>
176.61	Chapter 9A - New Rule	Amend	<p>Add a new development standard as follows:</p> <p><u>Rule 9A 2.1.X Fire Appliance Access</u></p>	<p>The existing and proposed rules / standards do not guarantee that adequate site access is provided for fire appliances in</p>

			<p><u>Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u></p> <p><u>a) a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u> <u>b) a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u> <u>c) a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u> <u>d) a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u> <u>e) a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u> <u>f) The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u></p>	<p>scenarios where the driveway length exceeds hose run distances, or sites are located outside of reticulated areas.</p> <p>FENZ considers this would pose an unacceptable risk to any new buildings, its occupiers, and any surrounding vegetation, as well as neighbouring properties and occupiers.</p> <p>It is requested that driveways which would be used to access buildings more than 50m from the nearest legal road, or accessways to sites located outside of the reticulated area, be constructed to provide fire appliance access in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. This will help ensure that FENZ has the ability to efficiently and effectively respond to emergencies.</p>
176.62	<p>Rules for Community Iwi Activity Area 1 10A 2.1.1.1</p> <p>Permitted Activity – Conditions</p>	Support in part	Retain as drafted.	FENZ notes activities within the Community Iwi Activity Area must comply with all provisions of the underlying zones. As such, subject to relief sought in other chapters, FENZ supports these rules and permitted activity conditions.
176.63	Chapter 11 Subdivision -11.2.2 Controlled Activities	Amend	<p>Add a new permitted activity standard as follows:</p> <p><u>x. New allotments are supplied with a sufficient water supply for firefighting purposes, and</u></p>	FENZ notes there are currently provisions within the subdivision chapter (11.1.2 Engineering Standards) that require subdivisions to be appropriately serviced, including the provision of a water supply. Water supply standards and terms (11.2.2.1) require the

			<p><u>access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u></p>	<p>provisions of a firefighting water supply that complies with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. Compliance with these standards is a matter of control for the activities listed under 11.2.2. This is strongly supported by FENZ.</p> <p>However, there is a risk that where subdivision is provided for as a permitted activity, that firefighting water supply matters are not appropriately considered. Therefore, FENZ seeks the inclusion of permitted activity standard that ensures all subdivisions are appropriately provided with a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</p>
176.64	11.2.2.3(b) Standards and Terms	Amend	<p>Add a new access standard as follows:</p> <p><u>Any access to new allotments located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u></p> <p><u>a) a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u></p> <p><u>b) a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u></p> <p><u>c) a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u></p> <p><u>d) a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u></p> <p><u>e) a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u></p> <p><u>f) The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u></p>	<p>The new NPS-UD encourages higher residential densities, more varied housing typologies such as larger multi-unit development as well as a more compact urban form. These changes will create new challenges for emergency services. FENZ considers it vital for the health, safety and wellbeing of communities that the access needs of emergency services are taken into account as new urban development is being planned.</p> <p>Adequate access to both the source of a fire (or other emergency) and a firefighting water supply is essential to the efficient operation of Fire and Emergency.</p> <p>As such, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new standard requiring sufficient access for fire appliances to be provided for all new allotments where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The length of the accessway exceeds hose run distances • The site is located outside of the reticulated area.

176.65	<p>Chapter 14C Noise -14C 2.1.3 Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area (except Station Village and Boulcott Village)</p> <p>14C 2.1.4 Suburban Mixed use Activity Area (Station Village and Boulcott Village)</p>	Oppose	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><i>Noise associated with the operation of emergency facilities, subject to appropriate controls, are exempt.</i></p>	<p>Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within the suburban mixed use environment.</p> <p>Noise will be produced on site by operational activities such as cleaning and maintaining equipment, training activities and noise produced by emergency sirens. Training may take place anywhere between 7:00am and 10:00pm. Cleaning and maintenance will generally take place during the day; however, it can take place after a call out which can occur at any time. Generally, FENZ has assessed that a fire station will be capable of meeting the standards set out in 14C 2.1.3 and 14C 2.1.4 with the exemption of noise created by emergency sirens.</p> <p>It is not possible for emergency sirens to comply with the relevant noise standards. Sirens play a crucial role in facilitating a prompt emergency response and can be the most effective means of communication in alerting volunteers who generally live and work in close proximity to fire stations. Sirens also provide assurance to the people who have made the call and the general public that help is on its way. Allowing noise associated with the operation of emergency services provides for the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency and enables it to meet its statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the on-going health and safety of people and communities.</p> <p>As such, Fire and Emergency has a locational, functional, and operational need to be exempt from noise generated by emergency sirens.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency therefore also seeks the addition of an exemption from noise standards under these rules to ensure that emergency service operations are enabled to meet its statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the on-going health and safety of people and communities.</p>
176.66	<p>Chapter 14H Natural Hazards - Policy 14H 1.2 Structures and</p>	Support	<p>Retain as drafted.</p>	<p>FENZ supports Policy 14H 1.2 insofar as it provides for structures and buildings within the Wellington Fault Overlay where there is</p>

	Buildings within the Wellington Fault Overlay			an operational or functional need to locate within the area, and appropriate mitigation measures are implemented.
176.67	<p>Policy 14H 1.3 Additions to Buildings in an identified Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay</p> <p>Policy 14H 1.4 Additions to Buildings within the Overland Flowpaths and Stream Corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays</p> <p>Policy 14H 1.8 Additions to buildings within the Medium Coastal Hazard Area and High Coastal Hazard Area</p>	Support	Retain as drafted.	<p>FENZ notes it has existing stations located within identified Inundation Areas and Overland Flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay. Furthermore, FENZ may have an operational and functional needs to locate within any are subject to a natural hazard overlay within the district.</p> <p>Therefore, FENZ supports Policy 14H 1.3, 14H 1.4, and 14H 1.8 insofar as they provide for additions to buildings within the natural hazard overlays providing appropriate mitigation measures are implemented.</p>
176.68	Rule 14H 2.6 Additions to Buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays	Support	Retain as drafted.	<p>FENZ may have an operational and functional needs to locate within any are subject to a natural hazard overlay within the district.</p> <p>Therefore, FENZ supports Rule 14H 2.6 insofar as it provides for additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlay, providing appropriate mitigation measures are implemented.</p>
176.69	General – Development	Amend	Require pedestrian only developments to include the following requirements:	To support effective and efficient access and manoeuvring of crew and equipment for firefighting, medical, rescue and other

	Standards/Design Guides		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> pedestrian accessways designed to be clear and unobstructed, pedestrian accessways with a minimum width of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3m on a straight accessway. 6.2m on a curved or cornered accessway, and a 4.5m space to position the ladder and perform operational tasks. wayfinding for different properties on a development are clear in day and night developments give effect to the guidance provided in Fire and Emergency's 'Designer's Guide' to Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access' (December 2021) (Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide). Matters of discretion consider emergency service vehicle access. Urban design guidelines provide good examples of unobstructed paths for sufficient firefighter access to the site/buildings. 	<p>emergency response to pedestrian only access developments across Hutt City require the amendments in the column to the left.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency are concerned that the requirements of PC56 for pedestrian only access developments will not be adequate for responders to efficiently access properties in event of a fire or emergency or to use tools and equipment effectively if required. This has the potential to significantly increase the risk to life and property.</p> <p>Until such time as there is a review of the NZBC to 'catch up' with the changing urban environment, Fire and Emergency consider that the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) needs to address this matter up front in order to manage the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being, and for their health and safety in accordance with Section 5 of the RMA.</p>
176.70	General – Development Standards/Design Guides	Amend	Consider how emergency vehicle access will be provided for within new residential developments – including through voluntary measures such as “best practice” recommendations.	<p>Adequate provision for emergency access will enable Fire and Emergency to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Get into the building and to move freely around their vehicles. Gain access to rear dwellings on long sites where hose run lengths become an issue. Ensure the safety of firefighters and enable firefighters to deal quickly to smaller undeveloped fires before they develop and endanger members of the public and the firefighters who may need to assist them in either rescues and/or firefighting.

176.71	General – Development Standards/Design Guides	Amend	<p>Consider including the following regarding assessing the wider effects of car parking supply and demand in resource consent applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where on-site car parking is provided voluntarily that any such car parking is provided with dimensions that the spaces do not protrude onto footpaths or otherwise create obstructions, • Retaining a policy framework to enable conditions to be imposed on a case by case basis. 	<p>Fire and Emergency is already encountering new development where emergency vehicle access along the roading corridor has been challenging. Issues with emergency vehicle access in these locations can be caused by narrow roads / laneways, higher density typologies and a lack of off-street parking available resulting in cars parking along both sides of already narrow residential streets. Implications for emergency services include on-road obstructions, meaning emergency vehicles have difficulty or are unable to manoeuvre, as well as an inability to access buildings and locate fire hydrants in an emergency. Inadequate parking lengths along frontages also have been encountered generally from vehicles parking over footpaths in driveways, blocking access.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency acknowledges that, where no off-street parking is required, there may also be no requirement to provide for vehicular access to a property. In these situations, emergency service staff would need to enter a property on foot and/or remove fences and other structures to provide access. Regardless, there needs to be sufficient clearance to access properties with heavy emergency equipment.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to the requirements of a transportation assessment to determine the impact of development of the roading network. It could also be necessary to use a condition of consent to tie a development application to preparing or updating a comprehensive parking management plan.</p>
176.72	General – Development Standards/Design Guides	Amend	Integrate NZBC Clause 3 into PC56 (whereby buildings must be designed and constructed so that there is a low probability of fire spread to other property vertically or horizontally across a relevant boundary) through the use of an advice note with the relevant side and rear boundary setback rules, and prompt developments to consider fire risk mitigations early on in design.	The minimum building setbacks from boundaries and between buildings in the Medium Density Residential Standards to 1m on side boundaries from buildings on all sides increase the risk of fire spreading and can inhibit Fire and Emergency personnel from getting to the fire source. The difficulty of access may also increase the time for fire to burn, thereby increasing the heat radiation in a confined area.

176.73	General – Development Standards/Infrastructure	Amend	All subdivision and development should be subject to development standards within the district plan requiring applicants to demonstrate by way of providing evidence (i.e. hydrant flow testing) that their development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice across all zones.	<p>Fire and Emergency consider it essential that urban development does not occur out of sequence with the delivery of key strategic infrastructure (network extensions or upgrades), or development is not enabled where there is potential or known infrastructure capacity constraints in relation to the Three Waters, in particular the water supply network (unless the urban development itself includes necessary upgrades).</p> <p>If this does not become part of the consenting regime, there will likely be development with inadequate firefighting water supply with potentially serious consequences for life and property. Particular consideration should be given to high rise buildings and the network's capacity to maintain pressures.</p>
--------	--	-------	--	--

DPC56/177 Nick Beswick				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
177.1	Extent of Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	Do not extend medium density zones.	<p>The submitter opposes the extension of the medium density zone and enabling three storey housing in the outer suburbs for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will encourage spread to areas that are not well serviced by facilities (including public transport). • Concerns around loss of space, privacy and sunlight. • It will encourage sprawl and is un-planned, putting pressure on already struggling amenities.

177.2	Extent of Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	Do not allow three storey housing in the outer suburbs or increase building heights beyond current limits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only benefits developers and the council, not residents.
177.3	High Density Residential Area	Support	Allow high density housing in central Lower Hutt and Petone.	<p>The submitter supports high density housing in central Lower Hutt and Petone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will encourage development where there is good accessibility, and are services and amenities, including public transport. Allowing high density in central areas will accommodate the population growth expected in Hutt City.

DPC56/178 Design Network Architecture Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
178.1	Amend zoning maps	Amend	<p>Amend the District Plan zoning maps so that the following sites in Naenae are re-zoned from Hill Residential to Medium Density Residential:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 452 Cambridge Terrace (Lot 7 DP 451628) * 33 Kowhai Street (Lot 2 DP 443511) * 35 Kowhai Street (Lot 1 DP 443511) 	<p>The submitter requests amendments to the zoning maps for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sites immediately south-west of the properties are proposed to be rezoned High Density Residential Activity Area, and the sites to the south-east are proposed to be rezoned Medium Density Residential Activity Area.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the sites close proximity to the General Business Area, as well as to public transport and local shops, this warrants a change in zoning. Changing the zone would allow for more development to occur in this popular suburb, aligning with the increased need for housing across the city.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/179 Oyster Management Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
179.1	AMENDMENT 211 Amend policies of section 5A 1.1.1 Capacity of the Central Commercial Activity Area	Support	Retain as notified.	<p>Oyster supports the removal of the current Policy (d) because it removes consideration of character, qualities, and amenity which may inhibit the development potential of certain sites.</p> <p>Oyster supports the insertion of the new Policy (d) because it provides for maximising development potential and supporting a quality urban environment, which gives effect to the direction in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) to provide for well-functioning urban environments.</p>
179.2	AMENDMENT 223 Delete Permitted Activity Condition 5A 2.1.1(a) Maximum Height of Buildings and Structures	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the removal of the maximum height for buildings and structures. Removing the maximum permitted height limit enables development as anticipated in a tier 1 urban environment under the NPS-UD.
179.3	AMENDMENT 235 Delete Appendix Central Commercial 2 - Maximum Height	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the deletion of Appendix Central Commercial 2.

179.4	AMENDMENT 239 Amend Central Commercial Design Guide – Section 1.7 Character and Context Description – Core Precinct – Table	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the amendment to the Core Precinct table. The amendment is necessary to provide consistency with the removal of height limits in AMENDMENT 223 above.
179.5	AMENDMENT 261 Amend policies of section 5B 1.2.3 Area 2 - Character and Building Form and Quality within Area 2 - Petone Mixed Use	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the removal of Policy (d). Removing Policy (d), which provides for the management of building height, enables development as anticipated in a tier 1 urban environment under the NPS-UD.
179.6	AMENDMENT 273 Amend Permitted Activity Rule 5B 2.2.1(l)	Oppose	Delete AMENDMENT 273.	Oyster opposes the amendment to Rule 5B 2.2.1(l). Oyster considers that the 5% increase in gross floor area is sufficient to control additions that increase the height of a building and therefore the amendment is unnecessary.
179.7	AMENDMENT 274 Amend Permitted Activity Condition 5B 2.2.1.1(a) Maximum Height and Recession Plane of Buildings and Structures	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the removal of the maximum permitted height limit and recession plane. Removing the maximum permitted height limit and recession plane enables development as anticipated in a tier 1 urban environment under the NPS-UD.
179.8	AMENDMENT 280 Delete Restricted Discretionary Activity Rule 5B 2.2.2(b)	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the deletion of Rule 5B 2.2.2(b) as it will allow alterations and certain additions to buildings as a permitted activity under Rule 5B 2.2.1(l) (see above).

179.9	AMENDMENT 288 Delete Appendix Petone Commercial Appendix Petone Commercial 8	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the deletion of Appendix Petone Commercial 8. The deletion is necessary to provide consistency with the removal of height limits in AMENDMENT 274 above.
179.10	AMENDMENT 290 Amend section 1.7 of Appendix Petone Commercial 2 – Character and Context Description - Summary Table	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the amendment to section 1.7 of Appendix Petone Commercial 2. The amendment is necessary to provide consistency with the removal of height limits in AMENDMENT 274 above.
179.11	AMENDMENT 294 Delete image and caption from section 2.4 of Appendix Petone Commercial 2 – Jackson Street Design Objective – Guidelines	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the deletion of the image and caption from section 2.4 of Appendix Petone Commercial 2. The deletion is necessary to provide consistency with the removal of height limits in AMENDMENT 274 above.
179.12	AMENDMENT 323 Amend Permitted Activity Condition 6A 2.1.1(c)	Oppose in part	Amend Permitted Activity Condition 6A 2.1.1(c) as follows: (ii) In any other case, is <u>422</u> metres. Alternatively, apply a specific height control overlay of 22m to 75 Wainui Road and neighbouring properties in the General Business Activity Area.	Oyster opposes the amendment to Permitted Activity Condition 6A 2.1.1(c) to the extent that it provides that a 12m height limit will apply to sites in the General Business Activity Area where there is no specific height control overlay applying to the site. The 12m height limit will apply to Oyster's property at 75 Wainui Road because there is no specific height control overlay applying to the site under the District Plan. Oyster considers that the maximum permitted height limit at 75 Wainui Road should be 22m. Increasing the height limit for the General Business Activity Area to 22m is necessary and appropriate to enable efficient use of business land to give effect to the NPS-UD. It is also noted that the 22m height would be consistent with the proposed height limit for the High Density Residential Activity

				<p>Area. The High Density Residential Activity Area and the General Business Activity Area have a similar interface with the proposed Medium Density Residential Activity Area.</p> <p>75 Wainui Road also has a natural buffer from surrounding residential properties due to Waiwhetū Stream. This natural buffer will mitigate any effects on surrounding residential properties from increased height at 75 Wainui Road and the surrounding General Business Activity Area.</p>
179.13	<p>AMENDMENT 401</p> <p>Add opening paragraphs of introduction for Chapter 14H Natural Hazards</p>	Support in part	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the addition of the Introduction to the Chapter 14H Natural Hazards to the extent it provides for the introduction of natural hazard overlays relating to fault lines and flooding.
179.14	<p>AMENDMENT 402</p> <p>Add Coastal Hazards section of introduction for Chapter 14H Natural Hazards</p>	Support in part	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the addition of the Introduction to the Chapter 14H Natural Hazards to the extent it provides for the introduction of coastal hazard overlays relating to tsunami and coastal inundation.
179.15	<p>AMENDMENT 405</p> <p>Add Qualifying Matters section of introduction for Chapter 14H Natural Hazards</p>	Support in part	<p>Retain AMENDMENT 402 as notified but correct the numbering as follows:</p> <p>“Policies 14H 1.3 – 1.13 and Rules 14H 2.2 – 4<u>2</u>.10”</p>	Oyster supports the addition of the Qualifying Matters section to the Introduction for Chapter 14H Natural Hazards to the extent it provides that Policies 14H 1.3 – 1.13 and Rules 14H 2.2 – 1.10 will only apply to listed Activity Areas. Oyster supports Policies 14H 1.3 – 1.13 and Rules 14H 2.2 – 1.10 not applying to the General Business Activity Area.
179.16	<p>AMENDMENT 411</p> <p>Add new Policy 14H 1.1</p>	Support in part	<p>Retain AMENDMENT 411 with the following amendment (or words to similar effect):</p> <p>1. Limiting <u>Managing</u> the scale of subdivision, use and development on sites within the medium and high Natural Hazard Overlays and the medium</p>	<p>Oyster supports the addition of Policy 14H 1.1 to the extent that it provides for subdivision, use, and development that <i>does not increase the risk</i> to people, property, or infrastructure.</p> <p>Oyster considers that “<i>Limiting</i> the scale of subdivision, use, and development” is not appropriate where sufficient mitigation is provided. “<i>Managing</i> the scale of subdivision, use, and</p>

			and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays.	development” is more appropriate as it anticipates that risks to people, property, or infrastructure can be mitigated.
179.17	AMENDMENT 412 Add new Policy 14H 1.2	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the addition of Policy 14H 1.2 to the extent that it provides for structures and buildings within the Wellington Fault Overlay where the risk to people and property is not increased.
179.18	AMENDMENT 413 Add new Policy 14H 1.3	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the addition of Policy 14H 1.3 to the extent that it provides for additions to buildings within identified Inundation Areas where the <i>risk to people and property is not increased</i> .
179.19	AMENDMENT 415 Add new Policy 14H 1.5	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the addition of Policy 14H 1.5 to the extent that it provides for new residential units, commercial activities, or retail activities within the identified Inundation Areas within identified Inundation Areas where the <i>risk to people and property is not increased</i> .
179.20	AMENDMENT 418 Add new Policy 14H 1.8	Oppose in part	Amend Policy 14H 1.8 as follows: Enable additions to buildings within the Medium Coastal Hazard Area and High Coastal Hazard Area, where 1. They enable the continued use of the existing building; and 2. The risk from the coastal hazard is low <u>not increased or is reduced</u> due to either: • proposed mitigation measures; or • the size and the activity of the addition.	Oyster opposes the addition of Policy 14H 1.8 to the extent that it only provides for additions to buildings within the Medium and High Coastal Hazard Area where the risk from the coastal hazard is low. Oyster considers that Policy 14H 1.8 should provide for additions where the <i>risk is not increased</i> to be consistent with other policies in the Natural Hazards chapter. It is appropriate to enable additions to existing investment where the risk is not increased.
179.21	AMENDMENT 422 Add new Policy 14H 1.12	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the addition of Policy 14H 1.12 to the extent that it provides for the development of existing buildings that are within the Petone Commercial Activity Area and any Coastal Hazard Overlay.
179.22	AMENDMENT 423	Oppose in part	Amend Policy 14H 1.13 as follows: 1. The activity, building or subdivision incorporates	Oyster opposes the addition of Policy 14H 1.12 to the extent that it requires construction of a new building that will be occupied and

	Add new Policy 14H 1.13		measures that reduces or <u>does</u> not increase the risk to people, and property.	is in the Petone Commercial Activity Area and any Coastal Hazard Overlay to incorporate measures to not increase the risk to people or property. Oyster considers that this policy is too narrowly framed as the construction of a new building may not require the implementation of measures to prevent an increase of risk to people or property.
179.23	AMENDMENT 425 Add new Rule 14H 2.1 Structures and buildings within the Wellington Fault Overlay	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the restricted discretionary activity status for structures and buildings within the Wellington Fault Overlay that do not comply with the relevant standards.
179.24	AMENDMENT 427 Add new 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.	Oyster supports the restricted discretionary activity status for new residential units, commercial activities or retail activities that are within the Inundation Area that do not comply with the relevant standards.
179.25	AMENDMENT 430 Add new Rule 14H 2.6 Additions to buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays	Support in part Oppose in part	Amend Rule 14H 2.6 as follows (or words to similar effect): 1. Additions to Buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays are a permitted activity where: a. The additions are to a building in the Low Coastal Hazard Area; or b. The additions are to buildings for any of the following in either the Low Coastal Hazard Area , Medium Coastal Hazard Area or High Coastal Hazard Area:	Oyster supports the addition of new Rule 14H 2.6 to the extent that 1(a) provides that additions to a building in the Low Coastal Hazard Area are permitted. Oyster opposes the inclusion of "Low Coastal Hazard Area" in 1(b). It is unnecessary to provide for specified additions to buildings as permitted in the Low Coastal Hazard Area under 1(b) because 1(a) already provides that <i>all</i> additions to buildings Low Coastal Hazard Area are permitted.
179.26	AMENDMENT 434 Add new Rule 14H 2.10 Commercial	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the restricted discretionary activity status for commercial activities or retail activities that are within the Petone

	activities or retail activities that are within the Petone Commercial Activity Area and Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area and within the Medium or High Coastal Hazard Overlays			Commercial Activity Area and the Medium or High Coastal Hazard Overlays that do not comply with the relevant standards.
179.27	AMENDMENT 446 Add new Rules 14M 2.1(a) and 14M 2.1(b) as restricted discretionary activities	Support	Retain as notified.	Oyster supports the restricted discretionary activity status for the construction, alteration of, and addition to buildings and structures with a height greater than that specified in Table 14M 2.1.1 and for alterations to or removal of existing off-site wind mitigation measures required by a resource consent.
179.28	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area, Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area, Chapter 6A General Business Activity Area, Chapter 14H Natural Hazards, and Chapter 14M Wind	Support	No specific changes requested.	The submitter supports the proposed changes to these provisions in PC56 where those changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD • will contribute to well-functioning urban environments • are consistent with the sustainable management of physical resources and the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) • will meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the RMA • will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and • are consistent with sound resource management practice.

DPC56/180 EQC (Toka Tū Ake)				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
180.1	AMENDMENT 30 [Chapter 1 (1.10.11 <i>Lessening Natural Hazards</i>)]	Amend	Amend chapter to include liquefaction and slope stability as qualifying matters and implement policies and rules to restrict intensification and development in areas where the risk of these hazards is greatest.	<p><u>Liquefaction:</u></p> <p>The Hutt Valley is at high risk of earthquake shaking due to the proximity of the Wellington Fault and other active faults in the region. While the Hutt City proposed district plan change limits development close to the Wellington Fault to reduce risk to life and property close to the fault, the plan does not consider further-field effects of ground shaking. Liquefaction and earthquake induced landslides are of particular concern in Lower Hutt due to soft, liquefaction-prone soils in the southern part of the Hutt Valley, and the steep slopes at the edges of the Hutt Valley and in Wainuiomata.</p> <p>Most of Petone, Alicetown, Moera, and Seaview, and parts of Melling, Woburn and Wainuiomata have soils which are classified as being at high risk of liquefaction in the Greater Wellington Regional Council liquefaction hazard map. Several of these areas overlap with the high-density residential development zones in the proposed plan change.</p> <p>A regulatory Liquefaction hazard overlay, such as that available from the Greater Wellington Regional Council should be included in the planning maps. Liquefaction risk should be included in the Natural Hazards section of the plan, with rules implemented to restrict development in high-risk areas. Guidance from MBIE/MFE on planning and engineering for potentially liquefaction-prone land should be used as a basis to develop policies and rules.</p> <p><u>Slope stability:</u></p> <p>Lower Hutt is at risk of both earthquake and rain-induced landslides, due to the high rainfall, earthquake risk, and high density of slopes steeper than 20°. As demonstrated by the</p>
180.2	AMENDMENT 404 [Chapter 14H Natural Hazards (Introduction)] - <i>Add Overlays section</i>	Amend	Add Overlays section and planning maps to include liquefaction and slope stability hazard overlays.	

				<p>numerous recent storm-induced landslides in the Wellington and Nelson regions, climate change is likely to increase the frequency and intensity of rainfall events likely to trigger landslides. A rupture of the Wellington Fault is also likely to trigger landslides on slopes close to the fault, including suburbs of Lower Hutt on the eastern and western hills of the Hutt Valley.</p> <p>The proposed district plan currently only considers slope instability in rules for earthworks. We recommend a Landslide Hazard overlay is included in the Plan, with policies restricting development within high-hazard areas to preclude inconsistent application of earthworks rules and prevent subdivision and development on slopes prone to failure.</p>
180.3	AMENDMENT 49 [Chapter 4 Residential] - (g) <i>High Density Residential Activity Area</i>	Oppose	Do not rezone Petone and Eastbourne High Density Residential.	<p>Petone and Eastbourne are at risk from multiple natural hazards and high-density residential zones should be avoided in these areas.</p> <p>Several of these hazards are likely to increase in risk with the impact of climate change. Sea level rise will increase the extent of coastal inundation during a storm, and there is likely to be an increase in the frequency and intensity of storms which cause coastal and river flooding. Increased sea levels may also raise the ground water level, increasing the liquefaction potential. Additionally, an earthquake on the Wellington Fault is expected to cause up to 1.9 m of subsidence in Petone, leaving part of the suburb below current sea level and greatly increasing flooding risk.</p> <p>As the suburb of Petone is largely contained within Greater Wellington Regional Council's orange tsunami evacuation overlay, increasing residential density in Petone will increase the number of people at risk and potentially impact congestion and deaths in the event of an evacuation.</p> <p>We encourage the use of natural hazards as a qualifying matter to avoid intensification within areas subject to natural hazard risk.</p>

180.4	AMENDMENT 412 [Chapter 14H Natural Hazards (Issue, Objective and Policies)] – <i>Add new policy 14H 1.2</i>	Support	Retain as notified.	Toka Tū Ake EQC supports exclusion zones of 20m or more around the Wellington Fault, wherein development is restricted, and residential buildings are not permitted.
180.5	AMENDMENT 427 [Chapter 14H Natural Hazards (Rules)] – <i>Add new Rule 14H 2.3 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay</i>	Amend	Specify the freeboard requirements of buildings within Flood Hazard Areas in line with National Planning Standard 4404:2010, and include flood hazard information within LIMs.	<p>Toka Tū Ake EQC supports the use of freeboard specifications to minimize property damage from flooding in at-risk areas. However, it is important to specify the amount of freeboard allowance required to minimize risk from flooding. New Zealand Planning Standard 4404:2010 requires that habitable buildings have 0.5 m of freeboard above the 1% AEP flood level, commercial and industrial buildings have 0.3 m freeboard, and uninhabited structures such as garages have 0.2 m freeboard. The Lower Hutt district plan should specify the level of freeboard required for different building types, to avoid confusion and inconsistent application of rules.</p> <p>Those properties within the Flood Hazard Overlay should have the flood risk included in Land Information Memorandums, rather than primarily relying on the District Plan to communicate this risk. Warning systems should also be in place for those living in the Flood Hazard Overlay, so they can understand the hazard, plan for evacuation, and know what to do when a warning is provided.</p>
180.6	AMENDMENT 433 [Chapter 14H Natural Hazards (Rules)] - <i>Add new Rule 14H 2.9 New residential units in the High Coastal Hazard Area</i>	Amend	Remove Rule 14H 2.9 New residential units in the High Coastal Hazard Area. Intensification and further development within high hazard areas should be avoided. Replace with New Residential units in the High Coastal Hazard Area are prohibited.	The Hutt City Proposed Plan Change 56 contains some areas of proposed high density residential zone which overlap with the mapped High Coastal Hazard zone. Rule 14H 2.9 specifies that within the High Coastal Hazard Zone only two residential buildings are allowed instead of three, but this does not adequately reduce the risk to lives and property from coastal surges and tsunami.

180.7	High Coastal Hazard Zone - extent	Amend	The High Coastal Hazard Zone is extended as shown in Figures 5 and 6 so that future development (intensification) of this area is avoided to reduce the future risks that climate change will bring.	<p>Sea level rise and potential seismically induced subsidence in these areas will increase the risk of coastal inundation from storm surges and tsunamis. Intensification of these high-risk areas will put more peoples' lives, wellbeing, and property at risk from coastal hazards in the future.</p> <p>Due to the fragility of the road and lack of alternative access to Eastbourne and other bays, we recommend further development in this area is avoided to reduce future access issues.</p> <p>For further detail, see original submission as it contains map references to support this submission point.</p>
-------	-----------------------------------	-------	--	--

DPC56/181 Paul Rowan				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
181.1	Density	Oppose	<p>Only allow up to 2 to 3 storeys on any new build on Nile Street and surrounding areas.</p> <p>Do not allow 6 storey development with or without resource consent.</p>	<p>This submission is opposed to the proposed density provisions in PC56, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns regarding a potential increase in noise pollution. • Lack of parking provisions will result in on-street car parking, making an already narrow road more dangerous. • Concerns regarding shading on neighbouring 1 storey dwellings. • Potential for a wind tunnel to be formed with high density, and creation of excessive noise.

DPC56/182 Blair Bennett				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
182.1	Density	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<p>This submission is opposed to the proposed density provisions in PC56, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding 6 storey residential development. Specific concerns regarding 3 and 6 storey residential development within 1.2km of the city centre and railway stations.

DPC56/183 Donna Tairua				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
183.1	Density	Not stated	<p>A budgeted infrastructure plan which clearly shows how years of underspending will be overcome.</p> <p>Provide timeframes on when this work will commence and be completed by, as an indication to residents and businesses.</p>	<p>This submission notes the following concerns regarding the proposed provisions in PC56:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intensification is required to support population growth, but there seems to be a lack of information relating to how infrastructure will be supported. The understanding is that developers will be required to financially contribute to HCC infrastructure, however there is a lack of transparency regarding how these funds will be used and what level of accountability will be applied. There needs to be a strategy in place to increase public transport, walkways, local community services, etc. It is not appropriate for the existing residents to have to fund others who will financially benefit. The increase in density will have significant impact on local areas which have not been developed with intensification in mind.
183.2	Density	Not stated	Ensure accountability and transparency regarding funds received from developers on new builds.	
183.3	Density	Not stated	Undertake studies on population growth (demographic specific) to ensure that service, sports, aged care facilities, libraries, and community services can accommodate the local needs.	

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter's property has 2 sewers pits that service a large part of the community. This frequently overflows into the submitters yard and floods into the neighbouring stormwater system. The LIM report shows this has been an ongoing issue for years, which will only be heightened by intensification and insufficient infrastructure to service it. This has the potential to cause health issues for residents in the immediate vicinity, but also the wider community. It is not acceptable that this is happening to a ratepayer.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/184 Anna Williams				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
184.1	Hazards	Oppose	Reject PC56.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Hutt Valley has several natural hazard areas including earthquake faults, liquefaction, flooding, tsunami, slope failure. • 6 storey buildings located in a hazard area presents a high risk of injury and death. Low rise buildings constructed with lighter materials have a significantly lower risk. • High density development presents a risk to the Hutt Valley Aquifer. Most foundations for 6 storey buildings will consist of deep piles or deep basements, which will extend into the aquifer zone. Raft foundations for 6 storeys is unlikely due to the depth of the water table. • As PC56 covers a wide area, the risk of aquifer intrusions over time and contamination of this source is very high.
184.2	Density	Oppose	Reject PC56.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over the last 20-30 years, the Hutt Valley has seen a major resurgence of native birds and flora. Intensification of human activities on the scale of PC56 will degrade the natural environment, compromising the rehabilitation that has occurred.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC56 will be a big step backwards in the preservation of natural environment throughout Hutt Valley. • Intensification will have negative effects on the quality of life of current and future residents of Lower Hutt (living, working, playing, bringing up a family). • Concerns regarding loss of sunlight, air, views to the eastern and western hills, increased wind speeds around tall buildings, increased traffic, on-street parking, rubbish ending up in the Hutt River and Wellington Harbour. • Extensive and expensive infrastructure upgrades will be required to service intensification. Three waters are already under strain with the existing population. Almost all infrastructure will need to be rebuilt and future-proofed considering the geology of Lower Hutt and rising sea levels. • Unlikely that the government, ratepayers, or developers will be able to afford the infrastructure upgrades which are required for intensification.
DPC56/185 Chris Cornford				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
185.1	Density	Oppose	Do not accept PC56 or include consultation and require off-street parking for each unit/section.	<p>This submission is opposed to the proposed density provisions in PC56, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation should be undertaken with affected neighbours, to ensure checks and balances have been undertaken. • Allowance/requirement for off-street parking for every unit, to ease street congestion for safety.

DPC56/186 Rachel Inglis				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
186.1	Onehuka Road, Tirohanga, density provisions.	Oppose	Onehuka Road, Tirohanga, be zoned a Medium Density Residential Area.	<p>This submission opposes the specific provisions for Onehuka Road, Tirohanga, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road is very narrow and operates as a one way street. • There is already limited/restricted access to residential dwellings and many long, shared driveways. Very little on-street parking. • The area is adjacent to native bush, with many birds, weta, and geckos present. Intensification would encroach on the bush and impact biodiversity, which was only brought back through extensive trapping on surrounding properties. • Increase in the risk of landslides, impacting accessibility for existing residents. Adverse effects due to an increase of shading on existing properties. • Onehuka Road is also located close to the Wellington Faultline. • Submitter thinks that Medium Density Residential would be the most suitable zoning for Onehuka Road, Tirohanga.

DPC56/187 M Playford				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
187.1	PC56 General	Support	n/a	Support PC56 in general and particularly as it enables intensification and greater housing supply.

187.2	High Density Residential Zone	Support	Retain the high density residential zoning as notified.	Support the high density residential zoning as it applies to 8 Aurora Street.
187.3	High Coastal Hazard Area	Oppose	Remove the High Coastal Hazard Area from 8 Aurora Street. Amend to a Medium Coastal Hazard Area.	8 Aurora Street is identified as a High Coastal Hazard Area due to the identification of the 1 in 100 year Tsunami event including 1m sea level rise. Amend this to a Medium Coastal Hazard Area, which more appropriately reflects the lower probability of a tsunami event. As notified the approach to Tsunami Hazard is inconsistent with the approach to High Coastal Inundation Hazard Area, which represents the modelled coastal inundation extent during a 1-in-100 year storm-tide event at current (2022) sea level. The High Coastal Hazard Area should only be applied to the 1 in 100 year Tsunami event excluding 1m sea level rise.
187.4	Policy 14H 1.8	Support in part	n/a	Support this policy to the extent that it enables additions to building in the medium and high coastal hazard areas.
187.5	Rule 14H 2.6 Additions to Buildings within the Coastal Hazard Overlays	Oppose	Amend Rule 14H 2.6 to provide for Additions in the Medium and High Coastal Hazard overlays as a Permitted activity.	Opposed to requiring resource consent for additions in the Coastal Hazard Overlays. Additions to an existing dwelling do not increase risk and therefore should be provided as a permitted activity.
187.6	Rule 14H 2.8 New residential units in the Medium Coastal Hazard Area	Support	Retain as notified.	Support providing for up to two residential units on a site as a Permitted activity and support the Restricted Discretionary activity status for three or more dwellings.
187.7	Rule 14H 2.9 New residential units in the High Coastal Hazard Area	Support in part	Amend to provide for three or more dwellings as a Restricted Discretionary activity.	Support providing for up to two residential units on a site as a Permitted activity. Seek amendments to provide for three or more dwellings as a Restricted Discretionary activity in the High Coastal Hazard Area.

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
188.1	Medium Residential Activity Area Rule 4F 4.2.4(a)	Amend	<p>(i) The building is not located within the following yard setbacks:</p> <p>Front yards: 2m</p> <p>Side yards: 1m</p> <p>Rear yards: 1m</p> <p>(ii) One accessory building may be located in a side and/or rear yard, provided that the building does not extend more than 6m along the length of any boundary and is not located in a yard that is directly adjoining the rail corridor.</p> <p>No yard requirements apply along side or rear boundaries where there is an existing or proposed common wall between two buildings.</p> <p>No yard requirements apply along existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site.</p> <p>Eaves may encroach into any yard by up to 0.6m.</p> <p><u>(i) Buildings are set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed below</u></p> <p><u>Front yard: 1.5m</u></p> <p><u>Side yard: 1m</u></p> <p><u>Rear yard: 1m</u></p> <p><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></p> <p><u>Eaves may encroach into any yard by up to 0.6m.</u></p>	KiwiRail seek an amendment to the medium density residential standards to increase the minimum setback from the rail corridor from 1m to 5m.

			<p>(ii) Buildings and structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a boundary with a rail corridor.</p>	
188.2	<p>Medium Residential Activity Area</p> <p>Rule 4F 4.2.4(b)</p>	Amend	<p>(b) Construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the yard setback requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <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>(iii) The effect from any building bulk and its proximity to the main internal and external living areas of adjoining residential properties.</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 <p>(v) The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</p> <p>Note: When addressing or assessing potential effects in relation to matters (i) and (ii) (iaa) to (iv) above, applicants and the Council can be informed by the relevant outcomes identified in the Medium Density Design Guide.</p> <p>Public notification is precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4F 4.2.4(b).</p>	<p>KiwiRail seek a new matter of discretion for activities that do not comply with the amended standard requiring buildings and structures to be setback at least 5m from the rail corridor.</p>

188.3	High Residential Activity Area Rule 4G 4.2.5(a)	Amend	<p><u>(a) Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Buildings are set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed below</u></p> <p><u>Front yard: 1.5m</u></p> <p><u>Side yard: 1m</u></p> <p><u>Rear yard: 1m</u></p> <p><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></p> <p><u>Eaves may encroach into any yard by up to 0.6m.</u></p> <p><u>(ii) Buildings and structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a boundary with a rail corridor.</u></p>	KiwiRail seek an amendment to the high density residential standards to increase the minimum setback from the rail corridor from 1m to 5m.
188.4	High Residential Activity Area Rule 4G 4.2.5(b)	Amend	<p><u>(b) Construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the setback requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to:</u></p> <p><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></p> <p><u>(ii) The effects on the privacy of adjoining sites.</u></p> <p><u>(iii) The effects on the amenity of the surrounding residential area, the streetscape and adjoining public space.</u></p> <p><u>(iv) The effect from any building bulk and its proximity to the main internal and external living areas of adjoining residential properties.</u></p>	KiwiRail seek a new matter of discretion for activities that do not comply with the amended standard requiring buildings and structures to be setback at least 5m from the rail corridor.

			<p>(iv) <u>The following design elements:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Building height</u> 2. <u>Recession Planes</u> 3. <u>End / side wall treatment</u> 4. <u>Privacy and safety</u> <p>(v) <u>The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u></p> <p><u>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.</u></p> <p><u>Public notification is precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4G 4.2.5(b).</u></p>	
188.5	High Residential Activity Area Rule 4G 5.3.3.1(a)	Amend	<p><u>(a) New buildings or external alterations, external repair or external modification of an existing building or structure in the Heretaunga Settlement Heritage Precinct and Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precinct is a restricted discretionary activity where the following standards are met:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Minimum Net Site Area per Permitted Activity (excluding home occupations and accessory buildings):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>(1) Patrick Street, Adelaide Street, The Esplanade, Jackson Street 370m².</u> <u>(2) Riddlers Crescent and Hutt Road 300m².</u> <p><u>(ii) Minimum Yard Requirements:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>(1) Patrick Street, The Esplanade, Adelaide Street, Jackson Street</u> 	KiwiRail seek an amendment to the high density residential standards within the Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precinct to increase the minimum setback from the rail corridor to 5m, including a new matter of discretion.

			<p><u>Front Yard 6.0m</u></p> <p><u>South Side 1.0m</u></p> <p><u>North Side 2.0m</u></p> <p><u>Rear Yard 3.0m</u></p> <p><u>(2) Riddlers Crescent, Hutt Road</u></p> <p><u>(i) Front Yard 3.0m</u></p> <p><u>(ii) Side Yard 1.5m</u></p> <p><u>(iii) Rear Yard 3.0m</u></p> <p><u>(iv) Buildings and structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a boundary with a rail corridor.</u></p> <p><u>[...]</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Design and External Appearance of Buildings:</u></p> <p><u>(ii) For those buildings individually listed in Chapter 14G, the matters of discretion listed in section 14G 2.2.1.</u></p> <p><u>(iii) The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u></p> <p><u>In assessing proposals Council will be guided by the extent to which any external additions or alterations to existing buildings, or the construction of new buildings, accessory buildings and structures meets the relevant design performance standards specified in the Residential Heritage Precinct Design Guide.</u></p>	
188.6	Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Rule 5E 4.2.3(a)	Amend	(a) Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if the following yard requirements are being met:	KiwiRail seeks amendment to the density standards to increase the minimum setback from the rail corridor from 1m to 5m.

			<p>(i) For sites adjoining a residential activity area the building is not located within the following yard setbacks:</p> <p>Side yards: 3m <u>1m</u> along the shared side boundary</p> <p>Rear yards: 3m <u>1m</u> along the shared side boundary</p> <p>(ii) Buildings and structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a boundary with a rail corridor.</p> <p>No yard requirements apply along road boundaries, boundaries within the Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area and existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site.</p>	
188.7	Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Rule 5E 4.2.3(b)	Amend	<p>(b) Construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the yard requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>(i) The effects on the amenity of adjoining residential sites.</p> <p>(ii) The effects on the privacy of adjoining residential sites.</p> <p>(iii) The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</p> <p>Note: When addressing or assessing potential effects in relation to matters (i), and to (iii) above, applicants and the Council can be informed by the relevant outcomes identified in the Medium Density Design Guide.</p>	KiwiRail seek a new matter of discretion for activities that do not comply with the amended standard requiring buildings and structures to be setback at least 5m from the rail corridor.
188.8	General Business Activity Area	Amend	New permitted activity condition:	Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin the GBAA. This chapter does not currently include boundary setbacks for buildings or structures

	Rule 6A 2.1.1(b)		(b) Setback Requirements: [...] Buildings and structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a boundary with a rail corridor.	from the rail corridor. Consistent with the amendment to the MDRS in the MDRAA, HDRAA, and SMUAA, KiwiRail seek a new permitted activity condition requiring all buildings and structures be setback 5m from the rail corridor in the GBAA. This is necessary to appropriately manage potential safety impacts of further intensification on the rail corridor.
188.9	General Business Activity Area Rule 6A 2.3	Amend	Restricted Discretionary Activities x. Any building or structure within 5m of a boundary with a rail corridor.	KiwiRail seek that non-compliance with the 5m setback be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity.
188.10	General Business Activity Area Rule 6A 2.3.1	Amend	Matters in which Council has Restricted its Discretion and Standards and Terms [...] x. Any building or structure within 5m of a boundary with a rail corridor. (i) The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.	KiwiRail seek a new matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in the GBAA.
188.11	Chapter 14 – General Rules – 14A Transport	Amend	Standard 6 – Development within the State Highway and adjacent to the railway corridor Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays Within the 40-metre wide State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays and within 60m or 100m (as applicable) from the railway corridor , all new buildings containing noise sensitive activities, or existing buildings with new noise sensitive activities*, must be designed, constructed and maintained (at the level of installation) to meet the following standards: (a) Vibration Buildings within the 40m wide State Highway Overlay or 60m from the boundary of any railway	KiwiRail seek that the district-wide provisions for rail noise and vibration be increased to apply within 100m (noise) and 60m (vibration) from the rail corridor.

corridor must comply with class C of Norwegian Standard 8176:~~E:2017~~95 (Vibration and Shock – Measurement of Vibration in Buildings from Land-based Transport and Guidance to Evaluation of Its Effect on Human Beings).

(b) Noise

(i) ...

(ii) Indoor design noise level as a result of noise from rail traffic must not exceed the following levels:

<u>Building type</u>	<u>Occupancy/activity</u>	<u>Maximum railway noise level</u> <u>level_{L_{Aeq}(1hr)}</u>
<u>Residential</u>	<u>Sleeping spaces</u>	<u>35 dB</u>
	<u>All other habitable rooms</u>	<u>40 dB</u>
<u>Edutation</u>	<u>Lecture rooms / theatres, music studios, assembly halls</u>	<u>35 dB</u>
	<u>Teaching areas, conference rooms, drama studios, sleeping areas</u>	<u>40 dB</u>
	<u>Library</u>	<u>45 dB</u>

			<table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Health</u></td> <td><u>Overnight medical care, wards</u></td> <td><u>40 dB</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><u>Clinics, consulting rooms, theatres, nurses' stations</u></td> <td><u>45 dB</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Cultural</u></td> <td><u>Places of worship, marae</u></td> <td><u>35 dB</u></td> </tr> </table> <p>Residential activities, Visitor Accommodation, Boarding Houses or other premises providing residential accommodation for five or more travellers:</p> <p>Bedrooms: 35 dB LAeq (1h)</p> <p>Other habitable spaces: 40 dB LAeq (1h)</p> <p>Childcare Facility: All spaces: 40 dB LAeq (1h)</p>	<u>Health</u>	<u>Overnight medical care, wards</u>	<u>40 dB</u>		<u>Clinics, consulting rooms, theatres, nurses' stations</u>	<u>45 dB</u>	<u>Cultural</u>	<u>Places of worship, marae</u>	<u>35 dB</u>	
<u>Health</u>	<u>Overnight medical care, wards</u>	<u>40 dB</u>											
	<u>Clinics, consulting rooms, theatres, nurses' stations</u>	<u>45 dB</u>											
<u>Cultural</u>	<u>Places of worship, marae</u>	<u>35 dB</u>											
188.12	Rule 14A.5.1	Amend	<p><u>X Any activity that does not comply with the noise and vibration standards listed in Appendix Transport 1, Standard 6 is a Restricted Discretionary Activity:</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>(i) the effects generated by the standard(s) not being met.</u></p> <p><u>(ii) location of the building;</u></p> <p><u>(iii) the effects of any non-compliance with the activity specific standards;</u></p>	KiwiRail seek that the matters of discretion be updated to specifically direct consideration of noise and vibration effects from the railway network.									

			<p>(iv) special topographical, building features or ground conditions which will mitigate vibration impacts;</p> <p>(v) the outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.</p>	
188.13	Definition of "noise sensitive activity"	Amend	<p>Noise Sensitive Activity means any lawfully established:</p> <p>(a) residential activity;</p> <p>(b) visitor accommodation or Retirement Village, boarding houses, residential Visitor Accommodation and Papakāinga Housing or other premises where residential accommodation for five or more travellers is offered at a daily tariff or other specified time; or</p> <p>(c) childcare facility;</p> <p>(d) educational activity;</p> <p>(e) Health Care Services, including hospitals;</p> <p>(d) congregation within any place of worship; and</p> <p>(e) activity at a Marae.</p>	KiwiRail seek a related amendment to the definition of "noise sensitive activity"

DPC56/189 Argosy Property No. 1 Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
189.1	General Business Activity Area Permitted Activity Condition 6A 2.1.1(c)	Support	Retain Permitted Activity Condition 6A 2.1.1(c) as notified.	Argosy supports the 12m height limit being retained, with identified areas which are subject to a higher specific height control.

189.2	GBAA maps	Amend	<p>Amend maps to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply a 22m height limit to 39 Randwick Road; and • Apply the High Density Residential Area to the area currently located in the Medium Density Residential Area in Moera. 	<p>Argosy seeks for greater intensification to be enabled in Moera, and in particular a 22m height limit to be applied to its property at 39 Randwick Road. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The broader area surrounding 39 Randwick Road now enables an increased density of development as part of Plan Change 56. The High Density Residential Activity Area applies up to Barber Grove (one block from the site) and across the river from the site. • It is unclear why the High Density Residential Area has not been applied to the Medium Density Residential Area immediately surrounding the site, given that that the higher density zoning would be consistent with the broader area and appropriate in light of the amenities in the area. The area already consists of small lot sizes, an adjacent General Recreation Activity Area (Hutt Park) and public transport links along Randwick Road. <p>In relation to 39 Randwick Road in particular, this site is already spot-zoned in the General Business Activity Area. Plan Change 56 already recognises that in some areas it will be appropriate to apply a 22m height limit in the General Business Activity Area. There are other areas in Hutt City where a 22m height limit has been applied to the existing General Business Activity Area.</p>
189.3	Special Business Activity Area Permitted Activity Condition 6B 2.1.1(b)	Amend	<p>Amend Permitted Activity Condition 6B 2.1.1(b) as follows:</p> <p>Maximum Height of Buildings and Structures: 20m22m.</p>	<p>The Special Business Activity Area is currently not affected by PC56. However, it would be appropriate to increase the maximum height limit in this activity area to be consistent with other parts of Hutt City.</p> <p>As a tier 1 urban environment, it is appropriate that a 22m height limit is provided for in the Special Business Activity Area. This is an industrial hub for Hutt City, and the HCC has already recognised that 22m is an appropriate height limit for other parts of the city which are appropriate for tall development, and so it should do so in this area too. The land in the Special Business Activity Area is concentrated in Seaview and adjoins the General Business Activity Area and Recreation Activity Areas, and so there is an appropriate buffer for residential amenity.</p>

189.4	Natural Hazards Introduction	Amend	Delete the hazard rankings, or alternatively reduce the hazard ranking for all tsunami hazards to 'low' to reflect that it is difficult to mitigate the risk of a tsunami.	<p>Argosy supports the Introduction to the extent that it takes an adaptation approach to natural hazards. Retreat from the existing Hutt City commercial and business areas is unlikely to occur, and therefore it would be more appropriate for PC56 to anticipate a protection or adaptation approach to climate change hazards.</p> <p>The Introduction includes a proposed Coastal Hazard Overlay Hazard Ranking table. Argosy opposes hazard rankings being attributed to the various natural hazards. It does not have a practical implication to attribute hazard rankings to the natural hazards and is inappropriate.</p> <p>For example, the Coastal Hazard Tsunami Overlay covers a large part of the Hutt City, including most of Petone, Moera and Seaview. Due to the nature of a tsunami, with high impact but low probability, it is considered that it should not have a rating, but if it does, the greatest risk rating should be 'Low'.</p>
189.5	Introduction – Qualifying matters	Support	Retain “Introduction – Qualifying matters” (i.e. amendment 405) as notified.	<p>Argosy supports policies (14H 1.3 – 1.13) and rules (14H 2.2 – 1.10) only applying to the following zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium Density Residential Activity Area; • High Density Residential Activity Area; • Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area; • Central Commercial Activity Area; and <p>Petone Commercial Activity Area.</p>
189.6	Objective 14H 1.1: Risk from Natural Hazards	Amend	<p>Amend Objective 14H 1.1 as follows:</p> <p>To avoid or reduce <u>or not increase</u> the risk to people, property, and infrastructure from natural hazards and coastal hazards</p>	<p>Argosy seeks for the Plan to recognise that it will not always be possible to avoid or reduce risk. It is appropriate to recognise that it can also be acceptable that risk is not increased. In particular, it is difficult to provide mitigation measures in relation to tsunami risk, because of the remoteness of tsunami risk and inability to mitigate. Amending this objective as proposed would provide a more workable objective, and would also be consistent with Policy 14H 1.1.</p> <p>This also appropriately recognises the social and economic benefits of existing development.</p>

189.7	Policy 14H 1.1: Levels of Risk	Amend	<p>Amend Policy 14H 1.1 as follows:</p> <p>Subdivision, use and development reduce or do not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limiting Managing the scale of subdivision, use and development on sites within the medium and high Natural Hazard Overlays and the medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays; and 2. Requiring mitigation where practical 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 Natural Hazard and Coastal Hazard Overlays. 	<p>Argosy seeks amendments to this policy to recognise that it may not be appropriate to limit subdivision, use and development in the medium and high hazard areas. There is significant existing investment in parts of Hutt City subject to these overlays, such as Petone and Seaview, and the position of these areas is fixed. As Hutt City responds and adapts to climate change and other hazard risks, decisions will be made on where retreat occurs and what is protected, but it is anticipated that retreat from these areas is unlikely to occur. Instead, Argosy proposes that these risks should 'managed'.</p> <p>Further, as noted above, it is unrealistic to provide that mitigation can address the impacts from coastal hazards. It is not appropriate or practical to require mitigation for tsunami risk based on the likelihood of an event occurring, and the inability to mitigate this type of event.</p>
-------	--------------------------------	-------	--	---

DPC56/190 Stephen Taylor				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
190.1	Heritage	Oppose	<p>Collaborate with other Councils to fight these proposals as they are currently written and seek a change in Government approach to one that sets targets to meet and gives Councils discretion as to how these are met rather than by forcing this change as currently proposed.</p> <p>At a minimum these provisions need to be amended (or implemented) to require a property owner to consent to having their property listed for heritage purposes.</p>	<p>The focus for these reform's should be on generating the desired outcome - an improvement in housing supply. The Council should collaborate with other councils to have the proposed changes amended so that each Council has a target to meet and discretion as to how these are met rather than by forcing this change as currently proposed.</p> <p>At a minimum these provisions need to be amended to require a property owner to consent to having their property listed for heritage purposes</p>

DPC56/191 Ian Cassidy – IPC Family Trust				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
191.1	Heritage	Amend	More protection for heritage precincts, as specified in my submission, this includes keeping the Riddlers Crescent and Heretaunga Settlement Heritage precincts and further information and consultation with regard to the reduction in size of the Jackson Street Precinct.	<p>1. Heritage Areas</p> <p>I believe protecting our heritage areas is extremely important since once they are gone they are essentially gone forever therefore</p> <p>(1) I support the creation of the 6 new residential heritage precincts but believe there should be specific rules introduced regarding demolition and additions/alterations in order to protect the unique heritage character of these areas. With regard to demolition I believe there should be incentives to relocate rather than demolish. This not only protects heritage but is a more sustainable option. Why demolish a house when it can be reused.</p>
191.2	Whole plan change	Not stated	Council needs to send a clear and strong message to the government that they will take back control and implement intensification in their own way, as appropriate to their area, and not just on the basis of impose blanket zoning based on arbitrary distances.	<p>(2) I have concerns about the reduction in the size of the Jackson Street Heritage precinct. I am unsure what the statement "Properties removed from the area" means. If it means they will be relocated I am less concerned but if they will be demolished I have concerns. If they are to be removed I would like to see a specific condition that requires them to be relocated (see (1) above). Without knowing which houses will be allowed to be removed I can't comment on the appropriateness of this change. I feel there should be more information and public consultation on this change.</p>
191.3	Density	Amend	<p>A dramatic reduction in the size of the High Density Zoning by reclassifying some of this as Medium Density so as to get a better balance of different density levels in proportion to the total residential area and thereby protecting the unique character of the city and the rights of it's existing residents. I would suggest that the total amount of High Density zoning be limited to 20% of the existing residential area. Some further suggestions with this regard are</p> <p>(1) Incentives and encouragement for retail developments that have apartment complexes on upper levels.</p> <p>(2) A requirement for developers to consult with adjoining properties about potential developments. Height restrictions based on the</p>	<p>(3) I do not support the Heretaunga Settlement Heritage precinct (Patrick Street) being zoned as High Density Residential. This is a significant heritage site of national importance and therefore must be preserved. New Zealand's first state rental houses were opened in Patrick Street, Petone, in 1906.</p> <p>(4) I am opposed to the rezoning of the Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precinct as High Density Residential Activity. Petone has huge significant as an area of early heritage housing and so I believe it is important to preserve as much of it as possible.</p>

		<p>dwelling height of adjoining properties that would protect the light and privacy of the existing neighbours. I would suggest no more than one story higher than the existing neighbour with set backs to allow for light. Such a process would allow for sustained, gradual and planned intensification.</p> <p>(3) Identify specific areas as special housing areas where the whole area would be suitable for a planned intensification redevelopment. I am thinking of areas where there might be old apartment blocks or areas of run down housing of poor quality that doesn't have heritage significance.</p>	<p>(5) I used to live in Lower Hutt and it is my understanding that in a major earthquake much of the Petone area would be subject to Liquefaction and therefore I believe High Density Residential is not appropriate in this area. It is also my understanding that older wooden buildings will withstand an earthquake better than many of the more modern concrete or brick ones.</p> <p>2.The process/proposed activity areas</p> <p>(1) This plan has been developed in response to an ideology that has been imposed on the council by central government and I believe as such it is undemocratic. I am not opposed to intensification but I am opposed to the government dictating how councils should do it. Christchurch City Council has sent a strong message to the government about this and I believe the Hutt City Council should do the same. The Council should be fighting to get back local governance and democracy for it's people and not let some bureaucrat in Wellington dictate what our community should look like.</p> <p>(2) There needs to be an overall intensification strategy which this plan seems to lack. We have had hodge-podge intensification with cross leasing so don't need a repeat of that with this latest round of intensification. What this plan does is effectively classify almost all of the city as High Density Residential. Doing this essentially puts intensification in the hands of developers who are only concerned about making as much money as possible with little concern for the aesthetics of the design and the context of the area in which the development takes place. Such an approach leads to a hodgepodge development that neither looks nice or serves the community well.</p> <p>(3) The level of intensification that this plan allows for is far beyond our current housing needs so why are we doing this? We need planned and sustained gradual intensification that the associated infrastructure can deal with or grow to accommodate rather than uncontrolled random intensification as is likely to happen as a result of this plan.</p> <p>(4) We need to consider what we want our city to look like in the future. Do we want it to be a sea of 6 story apartment blocks.</p>
--	--	--	---

				<p>If everyone is going to live like this you need parks, playing fields and schools. Would there be enough of these for the projected increase in population and if not would will we have any space left to create them. The city has a unique character but this current plan will dramatically change that if fully implemented, as developers would love to do. Is this what we want or can we grow our city in a managed way that will retain the essential elements of the unique character of our city.</p> <p>(5) This plan is an infringement of the rights of the residents that live in this city. A developer can come along and surround them with 6 story apartments so they have little light or privacy. There needs to be some provision in the plan to require the developer to take into consideration the rights of the existing individuals living in the neighbourhood. This could be achieved through gradual sustained development. I feel there needs to be protection in the plan for existing residents and more certainty with regard to what can be built for future residents. I feel this can be achieved by a wider range of height limits, specific to individual areas, within the High Density zoning rather than a blanket allowance for 6 story buildings.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/192 Bryan Gillies				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
192.1	Special Residential Areas	Oppose	Preserve Special Character Areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that the urban development mandates will mean all "Special Residential Areas" (Woburn, Boulcott, etc.) will automatically become "High Density Residential Areas". <p>Concerned for the amount of green space and trees left in suburbs such as Woburn, Boulcott, etc.</p>

DPC56/193 Lesley Haines				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
193.1	Walking catchments	Support	Support larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs, so long as they are not within areas prone to natural hazards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tsunami risk • Evacuation risk management.
193.2	Permeable standard	Amend	Add a permeability standard, -such as that minimum 30-40% of sites should be permeable (incl. permeable pavers/ gravel etc).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So we better manage run off in our increasingly variable climate, and that we protect biodiversity to at least some extent. • As areas become more dense it will be very important to provide neighbourhood green space to support a greater number of people with little of their own. • The Council needs to be proactive in setting aside such areas in the plan if possible or alternatively buying suitable sites.
193.3	Public transport access		Developers must be able to demonstrate developments have good access to public transport.	No specific reason provided.
193.4	Universal design	Amend	Requirement for a portion of developments to have universal design, making them suitable for those with disabilities.	No specific reason provided.

DPC56/194 Clifford George				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
194.1	Density	Oppose	HCC should reject these plans and follow the lead of CCC.	<p>This submission is opposed to the proposed density provisions in PC56, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central government housing failure over several decades has led to a panicked response which has not gone through proper processes. • Intensification is required in all cities, but for medium density housing to be effective it needs to be coordinated with infrastructure (transport, road, parking, EV charging) and well planned to retain adequate light, outdoor amenity etc. • Allowing development of 3 and 6 storey developments without resource consent, could result in recession planes being ignored and inadequate setbacks from surrounding properties. • Concerns regarding sunlight, privacy, parking, noise control. Potential impact on the value of surrounding houses. • Potential to lead to poor living conditions, similar to what was experienced in the 60's (which have now been demolished). Lead to people moving away, as the qualities of Lower Hutt have been degraded. • These changes will affect most ratepayers, but not the investors and politicians writing the legislation. These are generational decisions and require more planning before being rushed through the process with little thought of the consequences.

DPC56/195 Anne Smith				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
195.1	Density	Oppose	Allow no form of housing intensification in Petone.	
195.2	Natural Hazard – sea level rise	Amend	HCC should prevent further development in areas of Petone already identified as subject to sea level rise. Make sea level rise a qualifying matter in applying PC56.	
195.3	Natural Hazard – sea level rise	Amend	Include managed retreat as a qualifying matter in PC56.	
195.4	Natural Hazard – sea level rise	Amend	Develop a longer sighted plan, which links to metres of sea level rise rather than time. For example, plan for 5m sea level rise rather than 50 years.	
195.5	Natural Hazard – sea level rise	Amend	HCC must plan for sea level rise which is not linear and gradual, but may occur catastrophically in response to major events.	
195.6	Natural Hazard – sea level rise	n/a	HCC must ensure capital expenditure by both private and public funds occurs only in areas where housing and communities will be viable in the future.	Submitter lives in a sound house which was built approximately 100 years ago. HCC should revise the provisions to replace or renovate houses after 30 or 50 years, to prevent development of substandard quality.
195.7	Natural Hazard – sea level rise	Amend	Clearly state in the District Plan that all HCC infrastructure investment will occur in areas that will provide for future generations (as guided by a new metric informed by sea level rise and managed retreat).	HCC should not invest in infrastructure in areas identified as not providing long term viable living space (e.g. areas subject to sea level rise and managed retreat).

195.8	Natural Hazard – sea level rise	Amend	HCC should adopt the IPCC (International Panel on Climate Change) scenarios and projections for sea level rise to inform decision making. Use the National Adaption Plan August 2022 to guide risk assessment planning decision.	
195.9	Natural Hazard – sea level rise	n/a	HCC should ensure all councillors and staff understand and are conversant with the IPCC reports, scenarios, assumptions, and projections.	Education is vital to ensuring money is spent with a view to the future.
195.10	Natural Hazard – sea level rise	n/a	HCC should inform and involve communities with the science, HCC's response to the science, and government initiatives on sea level rise through local media and council releases.	
195.11	Natural Hazard – sea level rise	n/a	HCC should develop a strategy which ensure developers have long term financial liability for the housing they build.	Developers must be required to recognise their responsibility to contribute quality housing for future generations. At present, developers are allowed to develop in areas that are not likely to be viable in the future, displacing the liability of onus onto the community. HCC is ignoring its responsibility to warn potential buyers that these properties have no future resale or habitable value. Data from the IPCC has been presented consistently since 1988 on a five year cycle, and more recently the Ministry for the Environment has also presented data.
195.12	Density	Amend	Introduce a qualifying matter for the development of high and medium density housing to ensure a minimum land area is acquired for development in one parcel (e.g. one third of a hectare). This would allow the model of housing development to be changed.	A District Plan should involve more than a consideration of building regulations. It should seek to address positive conditions for creating great communities where all feel equally valued. It is time to change the model that allows ad hoc development by developers or individuals without a wider view/vision of how the community should unfold into the future. Models should allow for occupants involvement in housing creation.
195.13	Density	Amend	Introduce a further qualifying matter for the provision of community facilities within high and medium density developments. For example, green space, shared community facilities (laundry, outdoor drying on roof-tops, gardens,	

			hoops, hopscotch, outdoor tables, barbeques, shared common room, shared bike storage).	
195.14	Density	Amend	HCC should promote the involvement of current owners of high and medium density housing in future projects. HCC incentives should enable community input, as a starting point for occupier involvement.	
195.15	Density	n/a	HCC should engage with the community to show different models of housing development from around the world. This could help to inform future planning.	
195.16	General	Not stated	A response to my submission that reflects the urgency of sending correct signals to the public and developers while channelling resources to areas viable for future development.	

DPC56/196 Robert and Marie Whitney				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
196.1	Heritage	Oppose	Amend the plan change to include the following statement: "That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner."	This submission is opposed to the proposed heritage provisions in PC56, for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private residential properties should only be listed as heritage with the written consent of the homeowner. • Safety is a particular concern given developing awareness of fires, earthquakes, flooding, tsunami. • Homeowners should have been consulted about and involved in any decisions that affect the value of the property (price, safety, liveability, etc.).

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCC went against previous decisions while preparing PC56, and were not prepared to critically review reports written by consultants. Basing a Plan Change on a drive around the city results in incorrect information, which has previously been shown in public hearings (63 Laings Road). • Heritage areas will impact the layout and aesthetic of Hutt City. Neighbouring streets will be able to build to 3 and 6 storeys, while heritage areas will be limited to one storey. • Heritage status imposes significant restrictions on what a homeowner is able to do with their property. Homeowners will have to seek resource consent to make changes on the property, with vague rules which give a lot of discretion to HCC. • HCC have indicated they are not prepared to critically evaluate consultants reports, so homeowners should be involved in any decisions involving their property. • Heritage listings will impose significant ongoing costs to property owners. Insurers will charge increased premiums, there will be additional costs associated with repairing to the original standard, and further costs for HCC consent fees. • Heritage listings reduces the value of a property by 10-30% and potential buyers lose interest when informed of heritage status. The full extent of impact is unclear. • Houses in the proposed areas vary drastically in their quality and type. Many don't appear to have heritage values and others don't meet the Healthy Homes Standards. • Homeowners should have the choice whether their property is included or not. • HCC have much to lose through costs of increased management, loss of citizen goodwill and likely litigation for its removal by informed property owners.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/197 Theresa Cooper				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
197.1	Density	Oppose	Amend Onehuka Road, Tirohanga, to a Medium Density Residential Zone.	<p>This submission opposes the proposed provisions for Onehuka Road, Tirohanga, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Onehuka Road is a narrow street on a hill slope. It operates more as a one way street, with restricted access to residential dwellings, many of which have shared driveways. • The surrounding area is dominated by significant native planting which attracts native birds. • 6 storey residential development would impact sunlight, accessibility, and increase the risk of land slips. • Onehuka Street is located close to the Wellington Faultline.

DPC56/198 Les Jones				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
198.1	General	Oppose	Restrict PC56 to areas in the direct vicinity of a transport hub or the city centre.	<p>This submission opposes the proposed provisions in PC56, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The city is already too congested. • There are existing issues with parking, charging electric vehicles, roading network serving the population. • Social issues. • Infrastructure overload. • Road pavements are not adequate for the proposed increase in population.

DPC56/199 Justin Cargill				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
199.1	Density	Not stated	Resource consent criteria should be clearly and fully articulated from the outset, so developers know whether or not to approach HCC.	<p>This submission notes the need for intensification, but raises concerns with how PC56 will be implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the long-term implications or future risks have not been fully considered, and the submitters are worried that regulations will be thwarted. • The Hutt City infrastructure capacities (stormwater, drainage, and sewage systems) are already strained and unable to cope with current population densities and weather conditions. • Developers piggybacking on the deteriorating infrastructure system will cause more issues. There have been several previous reported instances of developers breaching HCC provisions. There will be more incentive to do this under PC56. • 'Wellbeing' is not achieved by cramming people into housing with little social areas. • Owner-occupier dwellings encourages an attachment and commitment to the local community. Intensification encourages investors to purchase high and medium density housing to rent to tenants. • PC56 does not ensure that future developments keep to the existing character of the area. • Quiet urban areas, such as <i>cul de sacs</i>, have the potential to become overdeveloped. • Short-sighted to not include off street parking provisions for new apartments and multi-storey buildings. Raises issues of inconvenience (parking at distance from dwelling), concerns
199.2	Density	Not stated	There is room for HCC discretion regarding consent approval and conditions, which should be exercised. HCC should not be exclusively acting for the best interest of developers.	
199.3	Density	Not stated	Resource consent should be granted following a full impact assessment, not on the basis of a formula.	
199.4	Density	Not stated	Implement checks and provisions to ensure rigorous adherence to regulations.	
199.5	Density	Not stated	Neighbouring property owners should be consulted regarding development, and objections taken seriously.	
199.6	Density	Not stated	Limit the number of higher density developments on any one street.	
199.7	Density	Not stated	Only permit three to six storey developments in the CBD.	
199.8	Density	Not stated	Residential housing outside of the CBD should be limited to two storey dwellings only, with provision for at least one off-street carpark.	

199.9	Density	Not stated	Parking buildings should be developed to ensure shoppers' parking spaces are not diminished.	for vehicular safety and rubbish pick up/street cleaning activities.
199.10	Density	Not stated	Minimum unit sizes should be specified, considering the psychology of personal space.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern regarding the use of wording such as 'effects' and 'impacts' and who measures these. • Distance from boundary regulations are not sufficient to prevent neighbouring developments blocking sunlight. Site assessment and resource consent should be necessary and granted on a site-by-site basis.
199.11	Density	Not stated	Opening up large areas of unoccupied land should be prioritised. Land should be released in stages, as infrastructure is improved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public spaces do not compensate for small backyards, which inhibit social activity and entertainment and markedly reduce play space. • Peripheral land should be utilised and intensification of existing areas minimised. Families/individuals who have moved into suburbs further from shopping centres can be expected to buy electric vehicles and hybrids. • Intensification results in the loss of green space, only leaving room for tiny garden plots and not medium to larger trees. • Materials from demolished homes should be re-purposed, reducing the strain on landfills. House demolition should be monitored.
199.12	Density	Not stated	As the housing market corrects, there should be a corresponding decline in granted consents.	A hesitancy before madly rushing into further destruction of the current urban character in favour of multi-unit developments characterised by the same basic design and materials.
199.13	Density	Not stated	Clearly define areas of 'spare capacity', independent of any potentially interested parties.	Concern regarding the use of the wording 'spare capacity' in Amendment 23. Concerned that areas will be defined as 'spare capacity' only once developers have shown interest. Unless 'spare capacity' is defined at the outset, the submitter suspects that some areas will be forced to fit the criteria to serve the interests of developers.

DPC56/200 Stephen Prebble				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
200.1	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>	<p>This submission is opposed to the proposed heritage provisions in PC56, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private residential properties should only be listed as heritage with the written consent of the homeowner. • Heritage status imposes significant restrictions on what a homeowner is able to do with their property. Homeowners will have to seek resource consent to make changes on the property, with vague rules which give a lot of discretion to HCC. • Heritage listings can impose significant ongoing costs. • Impact on property value.

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	jgallen.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	marijld@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	Elizabeth 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	transitiontownslowerhutt.nz@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