

# **Proposed District Plan Change 56**

**Enabling Intensification in Residential and  
Commercial Areas**

**Summary of Decisions Requested  
(Volume 1 of 3 – Submissions 1 to 100)**

**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](mailto: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](mailto: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

DPC56/001	Brett Parker .....	9
DPC56/002	Stephen Wright .....	9
DPC56/003	Graeme Sullivan.....	10
DPC56/004	Tracy Warbrick .....	10
DPC56/005	Melissa Yssel .....	11
DPC56/006	Gert Hartzenberg .....	11
DPC56/007	Stephen Owens.....	11
DPC56/008	Arthur Jacobson .....	12
DPC56/009	Helen Maddox .....	12
DPC56/010	Olivia George .....	13
DPC56/011	John Sheehan .....	13
DPC56/012	Henry Carthew .....	14
DPC56/013	Karen Jones .....	15
DPC56/014	Philip O'Brien and Glenys Barton .....	16
DPC56/015	Lorna Harvey.....	16
DPC56/016	Fiona Beals .....	17
DPC56/017	Daniel Harborne .....	18
DPC56/018	Peter and Judith Feakin .....	18
DPC56/019	Diane Knowles .....	19
DPC56/020	Bin Wang.....	20
DPC56/021	Kyn Drake .....	21
DPC56/022	Jing Chen .....	21
DPC56/023	Stephanie Maria Kusel.....	22
DPC56/024	Pauline Marshall.....	22
DPC56/025	Joanne Gallen and Kevin Doyle.....	23
DPC56/026	Grant Bristow .....	24
DPC56/027	Jane Bura.....	25
DPC56/028	Karen Ferguson .....	26
DPC56/029	Kelvin Maxwell .....	26
DPC56/030	Brendon Davies.....	27
DPC56/031	Richard Parry .....	27
DPC56/032	Reon McLaren.....	28
DPC56/033	Michael Taylor.....	29
DPC56/034	Darren Sears.....	30
DPC56/035	Angela Taylor .....	30
DPC56/036	Peter Kirker .....	31
DPC56/037	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga .....	31
DPC56/038	Rosemary Waters .....	35

DPC56/039	Martyn and Stephanie Robey .....	36
DPC56/040	Steve Winyard.....	37
DPC56/041	Clive and Shelley Eastwood .....	38
DPC56/042	Jennifer Miller.....	38
DPC56/043	Mike Byrne .....	39
DPC56/044	Laura Skilton .....	40
DPC56/045	John Wysocki.....	40
DPC56/046	Anna Wysocki .....	41
DPC56/047	Sandy Griffith .....	41
DPC56/048	Russell Walker .....	42
DPC56/049	Christine Hepburn .....	43
DPC56/050	Sandra Walker .....	43
DPC56/051	Margaret Short .....	44
DPC56/052	Amos Mann .....	45
DPC56/054	Henry Zwart.....	46
DPC56/053	Jo Wilkshire.....	48
DPC56/054	Henry Zwart.....	49
DPC56/055	Peggy Maurirere.....	50
DPC56/056	Balvant Magan .....	51
DPC56/057	Bruce Spedding.....	52
DPC56/058	Bernard Gresham.....	54
DPC56/059	Brian Herron.....	54
DPC56/060	Carolyn Anne Hamer .....	55
DPC56/061	Byron Cummins.....	55
DPC56/062	Olive Tupuivao .....	57
DPC56/063	Shayne Hodge .....	57
DPC56/064	Bruce Patchett.....	58
DPC56/065	Deborah Molloy .....	59
DPC56/066	John Christopher Sellars.....	60
DPC56/067	Brenda Irene Ralton .....	60
DPC56/068	Spencer Logan.....	60
DPC56/069	Dianne Ingham.....	62
DPC56/070	Anastay Papadopoulos .....	63
DPC56/071	Ernst and Gwendoline Haley .....	63
DPC56/072	Edwin Lancashire.....	64
DPC56/073	Richard Steel.....	64
DPC56/074	Brendan Murphy.....	65
DPC56/075	Kerry Gray.....	66
DPC56/076	Monica Murphy.....	67
DPC56/077	Ana Coculescu .....	68
DPC56/078	Lorraine Kaluza .....	69

DPC56/079	Katy and Wayne Donnelly.....	70
DPC56/080	James Scott .....	71
DPC56/081	David Smith.....	72
DPC56/082	Steve Shaw .....	73
DPC56/083	Peter and Katherine Kokich .....	74
DPC56/084	Edgar Andrew .....	75
DPC56/085	Andy Bogacki .....	76
DPC56/086	Ian McLauchlan.....	77
DPC56/087	Eve Bao.....	78
DPC56/088	Christina Meyer .....	78
DPC56/089	Steve Leitch .....	79
DPC56/090	Peter Healy .....	80
DPC56/091	Persephone Meads .....	80
DPC56/092	Andrew Newman.....	81
DPC56/093	John Hosegood .....	82
DPC56/094	Juan Qu.....	82
DPC56/095	Janet Pike .....	84
DPC56/096	Kate Harray .....	84
DPC56/097	Malcolm Lewis.....	85
DPC56/098	Johnston Dinsmore .....	86
DPC56/099	Caroline Patterson .....	86
DPC56/100	Frank Vickers .....	87





## 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.

DPC56/001 <b>Brett Parker</b>				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
1.1	Building height	Oppose	Retract the proposal to enable buildings of up to six storeys.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts of design of apartments.</li> <li>• Impacts of building materials for apartment blocks on the climate.</li> <li>• Predicted population growth and lack of demand.</li> </ul>
1.2	Building height	Oppose	Maintain the existing density form of up to three storeys only.	

DPC56/002 <b>Stephen Wright</b>				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
2.1	Notification	Oppose	Require adjacent property owners and other affected parties to be notified of any proposed changes to the height of existing dwellings in the proposed MDRAA and HDRAA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rights of affected parties to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Know that some property development next to them is planned and the shape/size of the proposed development, and</li> <li>○ Submit any concerns and seek mediation or compensation accordingly.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Impacts on views from taller buildings.</li> <li>• Impacts on privacy from taller buildings.</li> <li>• Impacts on property values.</li> </ul>
2.2	Notification	Oppose	Allow owners of potentially impacted properties to have the right to have their arguments heard and considered by an independent mediator, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the mediator is randomly selected from a panel of previously approved mediators.</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the developer covers the costs associated with the mediation.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

<b>DPC56/003 Graeme Sullivan</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
3.1	Building height	Oppose	Limit building heights to three-storeys.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts on the environment.</li> <li>Impacts on people's wellbeing.</li> <li>Impacts on infrastructure, including stormwater and wastewater infrastructure.</li> <li>Impacts on privacy.</li> <li>Impacts on access to sunlight for neighbours.</li> <li>People living near public transport will not use public transport.</li> <li>Impacts of no car parking requirements.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/004 Tracy Warbrick</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
4.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Special character homes and history of Petone.</li> <li>Impacts of Bob Scott Village on carparking and traffic</li> <li>Level of rates.</li> <li>Flood risk.</li> <li>Impacts of Pohutukawa trees on stormwater infrastructure.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/005 Melissa Yssel</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
5.1	Density	Oppose	No further medium density, or any other density, residential development in the Grounsell Crescent / Hill Road area and area next to Hutt River.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on traffic at Grounsell Crescent / Hill Road.</li> <li>• Impacts on the natural environment.</li> <li>• Flood risk.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/006 Gert Hartzenberg</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
6.1	Density	Oppose	No further medium density, or any other density, residential development in the Grounsell Crescent / Hill Road area and area next to Hutt River.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on traffic at Grounsell Crescent / Hill Road.</li> <li>• Impacts on the natural environment.</li> <li>• Flood risk.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/007 Stephen Owens</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
7.1	Building height and density	Oppose	No specific decision requested, but opposes the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on views.</li> <li>• Impacts on privacy.</li> <li>• Impacts on carparking.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on infrastructure.</li> <li>• Profiteering by developers.</li> <li>• Council rates.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

<b>DPC56/008 Arthur Jacobson</b>				
----------------------------------	--	--	--	--

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
8.1	Hill Residential Activity Area	Support	No amendment/expansion of PC56 to include any change to the current rules applying to the Hill Residential Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts of development on slope stability, including from earthworks.</li> <li>• Impacts of development on flooding, including from earthworks.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/009 Helen Maddox</b>				
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
9.1	Plan change as a whole	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts of overcrowding, including neighbourhood friction and lack of personal greenspace.</li> <li>• Impacts on road form lack of carparking, including impacts on safety.</li> <li>• Impacts on privacy.</li> <li>• Impacts on access to sunlight.</li> <li>• Impacts on views.</li> </ul>
9.2	-	Amend	Consider light filled properties and smaller or tiny homes concepts.	
9.3	-	Amend	Consider living green roofs, community gardens and a high minimum percentage green space per population percentage.	

9.4	-	Amend	Consider the impacts on people and the environment rather than focus on profit as has been the case in the past.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequacy of infrastructure.</li> <li>• Flood risk.</li> <li>• Preservation / increase of open green spaces and parks for public use.</li> <li>• The council needs to focus on a model to promote healthy living and a desirable place to live.</li> <li>• Impacts on health and wellbeing.</li> <li>• Impacts on the ecological environment.</li> </ul>
-----	---	-------	--	--

DPC56/010 Olivia George				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
10.1	Building height	Oppose	Keep the building restrictions at three stories in the Eastbourne Village area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on access to sunlight and warmth for smaller, more affordable homes.</li> <li>• Access to Eastbourne.</li> <li>• Impacts on the look and feel of Eastbourne and everyday experience of living in the suburb.</li> </ul>

DPC56/011 John Sheehan				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
11.1	Special Residential Activity Area	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change with regard to the character of Woburn and Boulcott.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on character of special residential areas.</li> <li>• Impacts on desirability of Hutt City.</li> <li>• Impacts of overcrowding.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on potential residents looking for a high-end residence.</li> <li>• Other areas where intensification can occur without destroying their character.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

<b>DPC56/012 Henry Carthew</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
12.1	Natural hazards	Amend	Review the intensification locations and qualifying matters in relation to natural hazards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter opposes some of the locations that have been identified as they will likely require significant investment in mitigation activities in the future to prevent climate change related issues.</li> <li>• The submitter makes the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Significant portions of high-density housing are being proposed in Medium and High Coastal Hazard Areas.</li> <li>○ There should not be any further intensification in high hazard risk areas, particularly in Petone, Alicetown and Moera, without an accompanying action plan for mitigating these risks over the next 30 years.</li> <li>○ The hazards in these areas should be classed as qualifying matters and their hazard ranking given a greater priority.</li> <li>○ Over the next 30 years climate related hazards are going to have an increasingly large impact on people's lives.</li> <li>○ The Council should be looking to minimise further population growth in these areas to reduce the number of potential households impacted.</li> <li>○ Alternatively, if an action plan is developed to identify climate related mitigation measures across the city and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
12.2	Natural hazards	Amend	Produce a plan (including funding allocations/estimates and priority) for mitigation measures to protect the proposed rezoned areas from these hazards over the next 30 years.	

				<p>investment is allocated for these then intensification can be encouraged in appropriate locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Other than identified above, the submitter supports the remainder of the plan change.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/013 Karen Jones				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
13.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan not well thought out for future issues.</li> <li>• Hutt City Council records are not accurate and up to date.</li> <li>• Lack of appeals to the Environment Court.</li> <li>• Housing demand has slowed.</li> <li>• Impacts on infrastructure capacity.</li> <li>• Impacts on removal of greenspaces on stormwater management.</li> <li>• Impacts on quiet urban areas.</li> <li>• Impacts on cultural wellbeing and safety, including crime rates.</li> <li>• Offset of development and provision of public spaces will not suit the greater majority of New Zealander's lifestyle.</li> <li>• Increased noise pollution.</li> <li>• Impacts on historic streets.</li> <li>• Impacts on amenity values.</li> <li>• Passive surveillance should only be in the Central Business District and shopping areas and only monitored by secure police personnel.</li> <li>• Value of outlook spaces.</li> </ul>

DPC56/014 Philip O'Brien and Glenys Barton				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
14.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in road traffic.</li> <li>• Increase in noise due to greater traffic and increased population.</li> <li>• Impacts on access to sunlight.</li> <li>• Impacts on privacy.</li> </ul>

DPC56/015 Lorna Harvey				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
15.1	HDRAA in Harbour View	Not stated	No specific decision requested, but opposes the proposed plan change with regard to Harbour View (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The landscape of the lower part of Harbour View makes the proposed change in zone far from suitable.</li> <li>• Concerns of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Steep slopes;</li> <li>○ Ageing and fragile retaining walls;</li> <li>○ Slope stability;</li> <li>○ Impacts of weather events, including impacts of climate change; and</li> <li>○ Natural hazard risk, including risk to health and safety of the community and risk to property and infrastructure.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



DPC56/016 Fiona Beals				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
16.1	Building height and density	Support in part	Include restrictions, where possible, to ensure that any development considers social impact, urban and social planning, and infrastructure needs (including public transport accessibility).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Careful amendments should be made with greater engineering / social development assessments released to the public before full support is given to the proposal.</li> <li>• This submission is in full support of increasing housing density (including multi-storey). The submitter understands the implications of not doing this in a region where population is growing.</li> <li>• This submission does not support a developer lead approach. This type of approach is profit before social benefit. Would like to see information about how such structures can be built on hills (which erode in the rain) and swamps (Wainuiomata). The LIM report for this submitter's property in Wainuiomata states that any height above one storey will need an engineering assessment.</li> <li>• In Northern Wainuiomata, there is concern that basic infrastructure such as emergency exits (from Wise and Wellington Road, which are dead end roads beyond Norfolk St) are not considered in developer lead planning. Sewage, stormwater etc. (ratepayers need more information on this, not a generic report for the Wellington region) needs to be addressed (in swamps, sewage systems can cause real issues). Also concerns regarding public transport links.</li> <li>• If development was Hutt City Council lead, then we would be seeing the plan put in place from the 1990's which had Wise St and Wellington Road joining, schools, shop redevelopment at Norfolk. This should all be considered. This submission is in full support of intensification through a social planning approach – not the current approach (which hasn't resulted in four storeys high).</li> <li>• This submission recommends buildings of no more than two storeys and that developers must include a provision for off-</li> </ul>

				<p>road parking – given public transport is terrible in Wainuiomata.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This submitter notes that if the population increases the way these plans suggest, a second access into Wainuiomata will be essential.</li> <li>• Provide the public with actual risk assessments for their zones. It is unfair to make an uninformed decision.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

<b>DPC56/017 Daniel Harborne</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
17.1	HDRAA	Support	No specific decisions requested.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts of sprawl on infrastructure and rates.</li> <li>• Utilise existing built infrastructure.</li> </ul>
17.2	Transport	Not Stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reallocate the transport corridors to prioritise the movement of people and freight.</li> <li>• On-street carparking from major routes, such as Ludlam Cres/Woburn Road, Knights Road, Victoria/Cuba Street should be removed in favour of bus-lanes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher density development will result in more people to transport, so the movement of these people and freight needs to be prioritised.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/018 Peter and Judith Feakin</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
18.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	No specific decision requested, but opposes the proposed plan change (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on infrastructure in Waterloo, including transport infrastructure.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts of shading.</li> <li>• Visual impacts of six-storey buildings next to single-storey buildings.</li> <li>• Impacts from aquifer penetration.</li> <li>• Natural hazard risk, including slope stability.</li> <li>• More suitable for development closer to existing commercial buildings and railway stations or in the Central Business District.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/019 Diane Knowles				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
19.1	Heritage	Oppose	<p>Amend the plan change to include the following statement:</p> <p><a href="#">That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Voluntary protection of heritage buildings.</li> <li>• Economic impacts on property owners.</li> <li>• Heritage values of identified houses, including building in heritage precincts.</li> <li>• Impacts on quality of heritage buildings.</li> <li>• Impacts on character of areas in the Special Residential Activity Area.</li> <li>• Some areas would benefit from investment, including Taitā and Naenae.</li> <li>• Engagement with owners of potential heritage properties.</li> </ul>
19.2	Heritage	-	Encourage homeowners to list their properties on the heritage register by creating a suite of benefits for heritage property owners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefits of incentives for owners of heritage properties.</li> <li>• Adequacy of existing benefits.</li> </ul>

DPC56/020 Bin Wang				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
20.1	MDRAA	Oppose	Include 2/275 Maungaraki Rd, Maungaraki in the MDRAA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2/275 Maungaraki Road, Maungaraki is appropriate for the MDRAA because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A large portion of the property is flat and can be developed easily,</li> <li>○ The property is close to public transport and the Petone and Hutt City commercial centres,</li> <li>○ The property is walking distance to local shops,</li> <li>○ The property is not directly attached to the reserve, and</li> <li>○ The Maungaraki community has been growing fast and more houses are needed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

DPC56/021 Kyn Drake				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
21.1	Building height	Amend	No specific decision requested, but seeks an increase in building size and density, and states that there should be more of the High Density Residential Activity Area, especially in places like Wainuiomata which have expanded so much.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increase in size of buildings is not enough.</li> <li>• Restrictions will hold Hutt City Council in a stall pattern because the population will continue to grow, and by continuing to build 'small', we are forced to go wide which puts massive pressure on infrastructure and increases costs to rate payers.</li> <li>• The area is losing too much green space. Hutt City Council should lobby central government to make it easier for residents to build higher.</li> <li>• Create a city with identity rather than one that looks like the rest in NZ. Based off the maps, there should be more of the "High Density Residential", especially in places like Wainuiomata which have expanded so much.</li> <li>• More of the population should be concentrated around shops, restaurants, and other businesses to support the local economy.</li> <li>• Hopefully high-density areas will encourage improved public transport.</li> </ul>

DPC56/022 Jing Chen				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
22.1	Heritage	Oppose	Include the following policy in the proposed plan change:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private residential properties in heritage areas should not be listed in the District Plan without the owner's consent.</li> <li>• Cost implications of heritage listing, including impacts on insurance costs and property values.</li> </ul>

			<a href="#">That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of heritage values of some houses in heritage areas.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/023 Stephanie Maria Kusel				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
23.1	Building height	Support in part	Extend the boundary [for the HDRAA], but keep it close to the station, and in the vicinity of the Waterloo Station, to the western side of Waiwhetū Rd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter understands that it is necessary to increase the availability of housing, and that it needs to be close to transport.</li> <li>However, the proposed boundary extending to include Rossiter Avenue and all the properties on the eastern side of Waiwhetū Road is a mistake. Would like to see the boundary kept to the railway line side of Waiwhetū Rd.</li> <li>Impacts on carparking, particularly at school pick up time and peak traffic.</li> <li>Difficulties on crossing Waiwhetū Road.</li> <li>Impacts of increasing the number of pedestrians.</li> </ul>

DPC56/024 Pauline Marshall				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
24.1	Natural hazards	Oppose	Greater emphasis on Eastbourne and the Eastern Bays as an area at risk from natural hazards like flooding, tsunami, and coastal hazards (including climate change and sea level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural hazard risk, including flood, tsunami, coastal hazard and Wellington Fault risks,</li> <li>Risks associated with the Wellington fault,</li> <li>Particular risks for Eastbourne and the Eastern Bays,</li> </ul>

			rise) and therefore unsuitable for further development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts of climate change and sea level rise,</li> <li>• Impacts of increased housing density on hazard risk, including impacts on the natural environment and costs to Council and ratepayers.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	---

<b>DPC56/025 Joanne Gallen and Kevin Doyle</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
25.1	HDRAA	Oppose	Reduce the size of the HDRAA to areas within 500m of the edge of the Central Business District and railway stations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues around public transport and walking given wet/windy weather for much of the year.</li> <li>• The distance of 1200m from the Central Business District and 800m from commercial centres and train stations is too broad an area, for two reasons. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Firstly, the shape of the valley and rail lines means that this metric would see almost the whole valley floor redesignated as high density residential. This affects Lower Hutt in a disproportionate way compared to other cities, and would see the majority of the city allowing six-storey buildings.</li> <li>○ Secondly, the distances are too large.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Natural hazard risk (particularly hazards associated with flooding, liquefaction, and earthquakes).</li> <li>• Infrastructure capacity.</li> <li>• Although Lower Hutt is a city in its own right, being a satellite city of Wellington, many people still regard the lifestyle as suburban living. This provides benefits of space in the property, rather than living in built-up central city areas.</li> <li>• The broad swathe of the city that is being redesignated as high-density residential could see the majority of the valley floor covered with six-storey buildings. PC43 showed a high</li> </ul>

				<p>level of concern from the community regarding intensification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A property on a back section in Taitā is bounded by nine other properties. It is conceivable that this single storey dwelling could be surrounded by nine six-storey buildings.</li> <li>• While it is expected that the council might act to protect certain heritage areas, we can see that the rest of the city will be allowed multi-storeyed buildings.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/026 Grant Bristow				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
26.1	Density	Oppose	Slow the current speed at which this city wide destruction is being carried out, and implement better controls over where large developments may be erected. This would include proper consultation with communities affected by developments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given the scale of changes proposed to the city, the submitter would like to see PC56 have more exposure.</li> <li>• Hutt City Council is working under central government, which plans for more densely populated, condensed cities. This may work for some citizens, but for others it will be detrimental in terms of physical health, mental health and wellbeing, as well as an inability to live a desired lifestyle in the current area of their choice. Large 6 storey developments will leave little room for parking or sufficient green space.</li> <li>• New builds across the city are being erected, many with very little space, outdoor areas, garaging or even parking for vehicles. Many are in areas already packed with residential housing, schools, and on street parking. There does not</li> </ul>
26.2	Density	Oppose	Higher density areas should be contained to main arterial routes and close to the Central Business District in the short term until such time this may be allowed to spread further.	
26.3	Density	Oppose	High density areas should be only within or adjoining the Central Business District zone. Encourage more apartments within the Central Business District zone.	



26.4	Density	Oppose	Medium density areas should only be along arterial routes or adjoining railway lines or within 100m of those areas.	<p>appear to have been any thought regarding increased congestion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These issues will multiply should this be allowed to continue unabated.</li> </ul>
26.5	Density	Oppose	Current residential areas may be subdivided as present, but with proper considerations being given in regard to heritage and character areas.	
26.6	Density	Oppose	New build subdivisions such as Parkway, could be considered a medium density straight away as there would be no impact on any current neighbour character.	

DPC56/027 Jane Bura				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
27.1	Heritage	Oppose	<p>Include the following policy in the proposed plan change:</p> <p><a href="#">That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private residential properties in heritage areas should not be listed in the District Plan without the owner's consent.</li> <li>• Restrictions on what a homeowner can do with a property in a heritage area</li> <li>• Cost implications of heritage listing, including impacts on insurance costs, property values and costs of repairs (including Council consent fees).</li> <li>• Variation in quality and type of houses in proposed heritage areas and lack of heritage values of some houses in proposed heritage areas.</li> <li>• Suitability of some identified areas for intensification.</li> </ul>

DPC56/028 Karen Ferguson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
28.1	Building height	Oppose	A decrease in the height of new buildings to two stories within Petone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on privacy,</li> <li>• Impacts on access to sunlight,</li> <li>• Impacts on access to gardens,</li> <li>• Impacts on overall health,</li> <li>• Impacts on parking,</li> <li>• Impacts on property values,</li> <li>• Impact on character on Petone,</li> <li>• Impact on crime, and</li> <li>• Impacts on green spaces, specifically Sladden Park, the golf course, Petone Rec and Hikoikoi Reserve.</li> </ul> <p>Also notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The historic significance of Petone,</li> <li>• Ongoing issues with their neighbours,</li> <li>• The need for housing,</li> <li>• Opportunity for developers to make significant money while individual existing property owners are left to suffer the consequences.</li> </ul>
28.2	Building height	Oppose	Greater consideration to the impact on individuals living in current dwellings, particularly in relation to privacy, access to sunlight and gardens.	
28.3	Carparking	Oppose	Include parking requirements in any plans.	

DPC56/029 Kelvin Maxwell				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
29.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on access to sunlight,</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on property values,</li> <li>• Impacts on natural state of the existing environment,</li> <li>• Impacts on infrastructure, including parking, public transport, drainage, sewerage and schools.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

<b>DPC56/030      Brendon Davies</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
30.1	Heritage	Support	Continue with the heritage classification of the area identified as HA-03 Hutt Road Railway Heritage Area.	Supports the HA-03 Residential Heritage Precinct (Hutt Road Railway Heritage Area) to retain and respect historic value.

<b>DPC56/031      Richard Parry</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
31.1	General	Not stated	A resubmission to residents with a plain English version of the works that are clear for laypeople.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter recommends a plain English, scenario-based interpretation of PC56 for residents so they can give fully informed consent. The density of the documentation is a barrier to many people having their fair say. Inclusion of scenarios such as, "A typical 800m<sup>2</sup> section with a four-story building would have XYZ noise impact on surrounding neighbours and create potential 123 impacts to parking," would provide a no-nonsense way of understanding what it means.</li> <li>• Will developers carry the burden of limiting impact on local environments. Issues surrounding increased water supply,</li> </ul>
31.2	Financial	Not stated	Provisions for developers to carry cost burdens associated with infrastructure and upgrades, and / or the Council to demonstrate this is well-served by projected tax take from new residents.	
31.3	Carparking	Oppose	Provisions for developers to reduce impact on existing residents through off street parking in new developments.	

31.4	Green space	Oppose	Provisions for existing green area density / volume to be preserved.	<p>routing of traffic, sewage / waste management and landfill. There is some increased Council revenue through rates (taxation) but it's not clear as to whether this projected future income would offset the cost of core upgrades. This should be made clear, so residents are aware of whether they'd be asked to cater for future cost by way of rates hikes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More densely packed areas of the Hutt do not have the same bird life and there is significant potential environmental impact of any proposed changes to the neighbourhood's outlook. These impacts make areas less "liveable" and are detrimental to people who've decided to reside there. This also extends to street parking, of which supply will be impacted by increased demand.</li> </ul>
------	-------------	--------	--	---

DPC56/032 Reon McLaren				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
32.1	Density	Oppose	A decrease in the height of new buildings to 2 stories within Petone area due to historical significance to this region.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose the height levels of new builds and amend to a maximum 2 levels. After 22 years in a property with established fruit trees and vegetable gardens, the submitter will lose privacy, sun for the garden, and overall health will decline.</li> <li>• Parking in this area is already an issue and previous calls have been made to Hutt City Council to remove cars from blocking driveway access.</li> <li>• Risk that properties in Petone will be devalued, and an impact on the wider character and village feel that the area is known for. Additional concerns regarding higher rate of theft and disruption with an increased population.</li> <li>• The submitter understands the need for additional housing, but does not want this to happen at the detriment of existing</li> </ul>
32.2	Density	Oppose	Provide greater consideration to existing landowners (privacy, sunlight, and backyards).	
32.3	Carparking	Oppose	Include provisions to increase the number of carparks.	

				property owners. Does not want intensification to impact on the green spaces.
--	--	--	--	---

<b>DPC56/033 Michael Taylor</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
33.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Abandon the proposed plan change and reinstate the previous residential activity areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability of the existing approach of the District Plan on intensification.</li> <li>• Heritage status should be available to property owners at their discretion.</li> <li>• Lack of consideration for existing character of residential suburbs, including section sizes, dwelling sizes and vegetation.</li> <li>• Special value and significance of Woburn and Boulcott.</li> <li>• Impacts of development on vegetation, including habitats of native birds.</li> </ul>
33.2	Vegetation	-	Include extensive preservation of trees, shrubs and green space in the District Plan.	
33.3	Vegetation	-	<p>In any redevelopment of any property where existing dwellings are removed/demolished, or new dwellings are being added to an existing site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All trees and shrubs over 2m high within 2m of the boundary to be preserved, and</li> <li>• All trees and shrubs 3m high within the property to be preserved.</li> </ul>	
33.4	Location of intensification areas	-	In consultation with residents, explore further suitable intensification areas, either by creation or expansion of existing zoning, including both the high and medium density areas.	
33.5	Heritage	-	<p>For historic heritage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proceed in consultation with residents,</li> <li>• Have well defined and published specifications about what can and cannot be considered "heritage", and</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Be realistic about what can and cannot be done to modernise/alter/improve heritage properties.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

**DPC56/034**      **Darren Sears**

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
34.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts on access to sunlight.</li> <li>Impacts on privacy.</li> <li>Aesthetic appearance.</li> <li>Loss of heritage.</li> <li>Impact on community feel.</li> <li>Volume of cars and residents.</li> <li>Ability of builders to build buildings of three storeys or more, impacts on current resources, added complexity for engineering and impacts on build times and costs.</li> <li>Ground stability on the valley floor.</li> <li>The size and location of residential zones medium and high density areas.</li> </ul>

**DPC56/035**      **Angela Taylor**

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
35.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts on infrastructure.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on car parking.</li> <li>• Possibility of a medium density area as opposed to high density.</li> <li>• Impacts on access to sunlight.</li> <li>• Impacts on privacy.</li> <li>• Impacts on outlook.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

<b>DPC56/036 Peter Kirker</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
36.1	High Density Residential Zoning	Oppose	Amend the proposed plan change to rezone St Columbans Grove to Medium Density Residential Activity Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts of residential development on transport infrastructure, including congestion, road noise and road safety.</li> <li>• Impacts of residential development on carparking.</li> <li>• Impacts on property values for existing homeowners.</li> <li>• Impacts on privacy.</li> <li>• Increase in noise from congested living conditions.</li> <li>• Impacts on character of the street.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/037 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
37.1	Amendment 5	Support	Retain as notified	Inclusion of historic heritage as a qualifying matter.

	Chapter 1 Urban Environment - Policy 2			
37.2	Amendment 15 Reference to Historic Residential Activity Area	Support	Retain as notified	Supports deletion of references to the Historic Residential Activity Area as the same areas will be covered by provisions relating to heritage precincts.
37.3	Amendment 46 Reference to Historic Residential Activity Area	Support	Retain as notified	Supports deletion of references to the Historic Residential Activity Area as the same areas will be covered by provisions relating to heritage precincts.
37.4	Amendment 52 Reference to Historic Residential Activity Area	Support	Retain as notified	Supports deletion of references to the Historic Residential Activity Area as the same areas will be covered by provisions relating to heritage precincts.
37.5	Amendment 27 Chapter 1 Heritage Proposed Policy (c)	Support	Retain as notified	Supports limiting building heights and densities within areas of significant heritage value.
37.6	Amendment 92 Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area: Residential Heritage Precinct	Support in part	Delete reference in Chapter 4F to the following precincts, which are located in the High Density Residential Activity Area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hardham Crescent</li> <li>• Petone State Flats</li> <li>• Hutt Road Railway</li> <li>• Petone Foreshore</li> </ul>	The submitter supports the proposed Residential Heritage Precinct. However, some areas in the precinct are located in the High Density Residential Activity Area and do not need to be repeated in this section.
37.7	Amendment 98 Chapter 4F: Building height and	Support	Retain as notified	Proposed Rule 4F 5.1.3.1 is supported.



	density in the Residential Heritage Precinct			
37.8	Amendment 98 Chapter 4F: Building height and density in the Residential Heritage Precinct	Support	Prioritise a plan change to include additional provisions for the protection of the heritage values of the identified Residential Heritage Precinct, or incorporate them into the upcoming District Plan review.	Demolition or inappropriate additions have the potential to undermine the collective integrity of historic areas.
37.9	Amendment 171 Chapter 4G 5.2 High Density Residential Activity Area Residential heritage precinct	Support in part	Delete reference in Chapter 4G to the following precincts, which are located in the Medium Density Residential Activity Area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moera Railway</li> <li>• Wainuiomata Terracrete Houses</li> </ul>	Supports the proposed Residential Heritage Precinct. However, some areas in the precinct are located in the Medium Density Activity Area and do not need to be repeated in this section.
37.10	Amendment 177 Chapter 4G 5.2.3 rules for building height and density	Support	Retain as notified.	Proposed Rule 4G 5.2.3.1 is supported.
37.11	Amendments 178 to 192 (inclusive) Heretaunga Settlement and Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precincts	Support	Retain as notified.	Comments on the heritage significance of the Heretaunga Settlement and Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precincts, including listing of the Heretaunga Settlement Worker's Dwellings in the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero.
37.12	Amendments 258 to 260 (inclusive) Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the recognition of the significant heritage values of the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.

37.13	Amendments 343 and 344 Chapter 11 Subdivision – special areas	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the proposed objectives and policies relating to identified heritage precincts.
37.14	Amendment 347 Chapter 11 Subdivision Rules	Support in part	Amend Rule 11.2.2.1 as follows: ... <a href="#">Historic Residential Heritage Precinct</a> ...	The proposed change to 'Historic Residential Precinct', which is elsewhere referred to as 'Residential Heritage Precinct'. This needs to be amended for consistency.
37.15	Amendments 375 to 378 Chapter 13 Network Utilities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the special consideration given to network utilities in the Heretaunga Settlement and Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precincts.
37.16	Amendment 391 Chapter 14F Heritage Buildings and Structures	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the amendment.
37.17	Amendment 392 Chapter 14F Explanation and reasons	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the amendment.
37.18	Amendment 395 Chapter 14F Rules	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the amendment.
37.19	Amendment 396 Chapter 14F Appendices	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the amendment as the heritage areas would be included in a different section of the appendix.
37.20	Amendment 397	Support in part	Add the following to Appendix Heritage 3: <a href="#">Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precinct, Petone Riddlers Crescent is characterised by many</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HNZPT supports the inclusion of Appendix Heritage 3 – Heritage Areas, and specifically the three heritage areas included in the appendix – Heretaunga Settlement, Jackson</li> </ul>

	Chapter 14F Appendices		<a href="#">examples of Victorian villas and cottages, erected at the turn of the century by early settlers to Petone. The boundaries are shown on the district plan maps as the Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precinct, HA-06.</a>	<p>Street, and Lower Hutt Civic Centre. These three are all listed by HNZPT as Heritage Areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It may be beneficial for plan users to know that these three areas have been recognised in the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangī Kōrero. The Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precinct is included in the Plan Change, with the same set of policies and rules as the Heretaunga Settlement Precinct.</li> <li>Riddlers Crescent should also be included in Appendix 3 as a Heritage Area.</li> </ul>
37.21	Amendment 397 Chapter 14F Appendices	Support in part	Consider whether the section of Jackson Street between Tory Street and Cuba Street meets the criteria for being included in the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding Jackson Street Heritage Precinct, the description states that the area is located 'between the intersection with Victoria Street in the west and Tory Street in the east'.</li> <li>Both the operative District Plan Historic Area and the Heritage New Zealand Heritage Area (List number 7369) extend as far as Cuba Street in the east. While this block between Tory and Cuba Streets has seen substantial modification in recent years, there are still two buildings which are recognised as 'contributing buildings' (358-360 Jackson Street and 362-364 Jackson Street).</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/038 Rosemary Waters</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
38.1	Entire plan change	Support	Approve the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing shortage for Lower Hutt.</li> <li>Housing affordability in New Zealand.</li> <li>Council's statutory obligations.</li> <li>Protection of the environment in the Hill Residential Activity Area through resource consent requirements for earthworks.</li> </ul>
38.2	Other zones	Requests amendment	Consider adding future amendments to allow intensification on other similarly zoned land, such as Hill Residential.	

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefits of creating sections that are well protected from sea level rise and flooding.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/039 Martyn and Stephanie Robey				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
39.1	Natural hazards	Amend	All areas contained in the identified tsunami and liquefaction risk zones to be excluded in those areas marked for high density housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter recognises that the rules relating to high density housing have been mandated by the government in its National Policy Statement on Urban Development.</li> <li>• Hutt City Council does, however, have discretion about where to apply these new rules within Hutt City. We note the Hutt City Council states it can place limits on certain areas such as those with natural hazards. It is these areas of natural hazards we wish to address in this submission.</li> <li>• The Hutt valley floor is already the most densely populated flood plain in New Zealand. The Hutt City Council has undertaken major work to minimise flood risk within its boundaries. Maps produced in 2012 show the risk of liquefaction to be high in the southern area of Hutt City. The Hutt City Council has now established blue demarcation lines, indicating the areas at risk of tsunamis within its boundaries.</li> <li>• The proposal to allow six-storey buildings within 800 metres from all train stations would include Petone, Ava, and Woburn stations, all of which fall within the liquefaction and tsunami zones. Such buildings would be subject to planning permission but in our view these areas should be excluded completely from the areas zoned for high density development. Given that the information regarding risks following an earthquake or a tsunami has been publicly available since 2012, we believe it would be irresponsible for Hutt City Council to allow such developments in these areas. Doing so would expose Hutt City Council and its ratepayers to future legal action following either a tsunami or severe</li> </ul>

				earthquake which resulted in damage to such buildings and their residents.
39.2	Recession planes	Amend	Revert to the previous recession plane rules for new three and six storey developments.	<p>In relation to the impacts of six and three storey dwellings would have on existing buildings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most serious impact would be the loss of sunlight, as a result of the proposed change to the rules regarding the recession plane. Under previous regulations, buildings could not be erected that broke a recession plane of 45 degrees at a height of 2.4 metres at the boundary. The new rules allow a recession plane of 60 degrees at a height of 4 metres at the boundary. For most existing properties in the Hutt area this would mean a complete loss of sunlight. Lack of sunlight has a negative effect on mental health and well-being.</li> <li>• This submitter recognises the need for new housing but it seems innately unfair that new housing could be built which would have such negative effects on the people living in the predominantly single-storey homes around it.</li> <li>• The visual impact of high buildings, 'pepper-potted' in streets of single-storey dwellings would be ugly, particularly given the Hutt City Council's proposed minimum landscaping and outlook rules for such high buildings. These rules do not provide enough green space or room for trees to absorb carbon and rainfall, or to offset some of the effect of increased heat build-up from solid structures and concrete paving. The lack of off-street parking presents other problems.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/040 Steve Winyard</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
40.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	Opposes six-storey houses because of:

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on views, and</li> <li>• Lack of back and front sections.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

<b>DPC56/041 Clive and Shelley Eastwood</b>				
---	--	--	--	--

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
41.1	Heritage	Oppose	<p>Include the following policy in the proposed plan change:</p> <p><a href="#">That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private residential properties in heritage areas should not be listed in the District Plan without the owner's consent.</li> <li>• Consultation has been inadequate.</li> <li>• 27 and 29 Buick Street are not heritage properties.</li> <li>• Opposes restrictions on what the submitter can do with their assets.</li> <li>• Cost implications of heritage listing, including impacts on insurance costs and property values.</li> <li>• Additional restrictions are highly likely to prevent the submitter from making improvements to their properties.</li> <li>• Impacts on Hutt City Council from increased management, loss of citizen goodwill and litigation from property owners.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/042 Jennifer Miller</b>				
----------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
42.1	Intensification in the Western Hills	Oppose	Removal of the Western Hills from the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Susceptibility of Western Hills to slips.</li> <li>• Impacts of removing vegetation with roofing iron and concrete on runoff, particularly given climate change.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on ecology.</li> <li>• Climate change should be the top priority.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

<b>DPC56/043 Mike Byrne</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
43.1	Special Residential Activity Area	Oppose	Keep Woburn, Lowry Bay, and Boulcott as Special Residential Activity Areas where intensification is not permitted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For decades successive councils have protected the special character of Woburn, Lowry Bay, and Boulcott through the provision of Special Residential Activity Areas in the District Plan. It is incredulous that this council could propose to remove Special Residential Areas from the District Plan and put in place a regime that may well decimate the character and value of these special suburbs of the Hutt.</li> <li>• Hutt City Council has proposed Heritage precincts which they have put little effort into analysing as they contain many houses which appear to have no heritage value at all.</li> <li>• Hutt City Council has a list of single properties that are outside the proposed heritage precincts. Council says they will deal with this next year. This will significantly disadvantage those property owners as by then the intensification rules will be in place. All heritage properties need to be included as part of this current change.</li> <li>• Heritage status is currently seen in a negative light. Hutt City Council have received considerable feedback about the need for initiatives that make owning a heritage property something of prestige. The current heritage fund Hutt City Council have established is completely inadequate.</li> <li>• This submitter feels that Hutt City Council communication has been terrible. They have reached out to the mayor on several occasions and have had no response.</li> </ul>
43.2	Heritage	Amend	Engage with individual property owners about their properties being heritage.	
43.3	Heritage	-	Develop a portfolio of benefits to incentivise heritage property owners. This could include - discounted rates, no cost resource consents and building consents, financial support for essential maintenance, rates caps for high value properties.	

<b>DPC56/044      Laura Skilton</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
44.1	Heritage	Requests amendment	Extend the Petone Foreshore Heritage Precinct to include Bay Street and Beach Street as a minimum, and consider the area covered in Figure 2.1.5 of the Petone 2040 Spatial Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports high intensity housing if it is undertaken well as it reduces reliance on cars and can assist in public transport usage.</li> <li>• Council has established six new residential heritage precincts which includes a small area of Petone, but does not include other areas that have similar housing. It also includes Coastal hazard areas.</li> <li>• Council should enlarge the new heritage precinct in Petone to preserve and protect a unique area that is already being destroyed due to poor planning regulations.</li> </ul>
44.2	Natural hazards	Requests amendment	Adjust the Coastal Hazard Areas to be better in line with the policies. Recommend adjusting these rules to allow a maximum of two stories in these areas.	

<b>DPC56/045      John Wysocki</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
45.1	Engagement	-	Consider feedback from ratepayers of existing established housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on carparking.</li> <li>• Impacts on stormwater and sewage infrastructure.</li> <li>• Impacts on traffic management.</li> <li>• Quality of footpaths.</li> <li>• Impacts on power supply.</li> </ul>
45.2	Building height	Oppose	Exclude six-storey and four-storey housing from the proposed plan change.	



DPC56/046 Anna Wysocki				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
46.1	Engagement	Oppose	Consider all feedback received.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on carparking.</li> <li>• Impacts on wastewater and other services.</li> <li>• Risk of some areas becoming ghetto-like.</li> <li>• Lack of green spaces, such as parks for families.</li> <li>• Existing infrastructure should be fixed first, such as streetlights, potholes in roads and broken footpaths.</li> <li>• Impacts on health systems.</li> </ul>
46.2	Infrastructure	Oppose	Ensure core facilities and infrastructure is functioning perfectly before deciding to go ahead with the proposed plan change.	

DPC56/047 Sandy Griffith				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
41.1	Heritage	Oppose	<p>Include the following policy in the proposed plan change:</p> <p><a href="#">That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private residential properties in heritage areas should not be listed in the District Plan without the owner's consent.</li> <li>• Intergenerational consequences of listing properties in heritage areas, including preventing families from helping children and parents through adding additional floor area to a current dwelling or adding an additional dwelling to a section.</li> <li>• Neighbouring streets could have properties built up to three to six storeys high, with heritage areas being restricted.</li> <li>• Impacts on layout and aesthetic of Lower Hutt.</li> <li>• Rules are too vague and leave a lot of discretion to the Council.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost implications of heritage listing, including impacts on insurance costs, property values and cost of repairs (including consenting fees).</li> <li>• Additional restrictions are highly likely to prevent the submitter from making improvements to their properties.</li> <li>• Impacts on Hutt City Council from increased management, loss of citizen goodwill and litigation from property owners.</li> <li>• Concern on the way the heritage areas have been chosen as the houses vary drastically in quality and type, and most do not look like heritage.</li> <li>• Issues on meeting healthy homes standards.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/048 Russell Walker				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
48.1	Heritage	Oppose	<p>Include the following policy in the proposed plan change:</p> <p><a href="#">That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private residential properties in heritage areas should not be listed in the District Plan without the owner's consent.</li> <li>• Heritage housing will stagnate.</li> <li>• Impacts on ability to makes changes to homes.</li> <li>• Cost implications, including reduction in property values.</li> <li>• Impacts on Hutt City Council from increased management, loss of citizen goodwill and litigation from property owners.</li> </ul>

**DPC56/049**      **Christine Hepburn**

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
49.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	No specific decision requested, but opposes the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reserve is a super outlook.</li> <li>• Lots of people walk and take their dogs. A play area for children.</li> <li>• Friends of Waiwhetū Stream have put a lot of effort into bringing back birds.</li> <li>• First-hand knowledge of how Lower Hutt reserves will be in the future.</li> </ul>

**DPC56/050**      **Sandra Walker**

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
50.1	Heritage	Oppose	<p>Amend the plan change to include the following statement:</p> <p><a href="#"><u>That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</u></a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private residential properties in heritage areas should not be listed in the District Plan without the owner's consent.</li> <li>• Impacts on Hutt City Council from increased management, loss of citizen goodwill and litigation from property owners.</li> </ul>

DPC56/051		Margaret Short		
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
51.1	Density	Oppose	Reconsider the intensification provisions (as required by the government) by means of four-storey buildings in the coastal areas of Lower Hutt and around the village area (Rimu Street) of Eastbourne.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intensification of residential housing in Lower Hutt coastal areas, such as Petone and Eastbourne, does not seem advisable with the forecasts of sea level rising, due to climate change and the possible flooding of housing in those areas.</li> <li>• Eastbourne only has one road out. In an emergency, such as an earthquake or storm which damages or blocks the road, it will be difficult to get the present population to safety. The increased population due to intensification will only compound the problem. In the past there have been hillside fires as well.</li> <li>• With the possibility of flooding in this area, it raises questions regarding home insurance. Buyers of the proposed intensification developments should be made aware of this.</li> <li>• With regard to areas of intensification, Rimu Street and a small part of Ouroua Street in Eastbourne can hardly be described as a "Commercial Centre". It has no bank, no supermarket, no big chain store, no clothes shops, no stationers, no book shop. It has a few essential food shops and a few other amenities providing for a community a 20 minute car / bus ride away from a real commercial centre.</li> <li>• Rona House (built 1965) is the one tower block in Eastbourne. At first the idea of tower blocks was welcomed until the disadvantages of high-rise buildings became 'glaringly apparent, not only denying sun, view and privacy to surrounding properties'. The Borough Council at the time, decided that no more tower blocks would be built in Eastbourne. On a windy day, it can be very difficult to walk around the area because of the northerly wind. Surrounding the village with tower blocks, shading it from the sun and possibly creating draughty wind flows does seem to be destructive.</li> </ul>

DPC56/052		Amos Mann		
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
52.1		Amend	No specific decision requested, but the submitter wants the District Plan to empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential zones, including Papakāinga and Co-housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current housing approaches aren't working for 90% of our community members throughout the majority of their lives</li> <li>• At this time, our community members have a wide and expanding range of needs across their life-stories: from childhood, to teenage-hood, to student-hood, to adulthood, and into old age and retirement, we each have a tremendous range of different community needs, environment needs, transportation needs, wellbeing needs, and wealth creation needs.</li> <li>• Housing solutions that are flexible enough to meet these needs look nothing like those from over the past 50 years.</li> <li>• We need the District Plan to support the change that is happening now, to be flexible and open enough to promote the change that we are faced with - it's no longer a choice whether our housing will change, it must change and it will change.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
52.2		Amend	The submitter requests accessibility and universal design requirements in the design guides and in incentives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
52.3		Amend	The submitter requests that incentives are provided for lifts in multi-storey developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
52.4		Amend	The submitter supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

52.5		Amend	The submitter requests building height limits, recession planes and setbacks to be consistent with those in the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS, and their recommendations for outdoor living space and green space are added.	•
52.6		Amend	The submitter requests that a permeability standard is added, such as a minimum of 30-40% of sites should be permeable.	•
<b>DPC56/054 Henry Zwart</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
52.1	Walkable catchments	Support	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and transit hubs.	<p>The submitter broadly supports and requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility and Universal Design requirements in the Design Guides and in incentives.</li> <li>• Easier consenting and incentives for accessible and eco-friendly developments.</li> <li>• Providing incentives for lifts in multi-storey developments.</li> <li>• Working with central government to improve accessibility and building performance requirements in the Building Code.</li> <li>• Prioritising emissions reduction, better quality of life, and community cohesion and resilience.</li> <li>• Work closely with Waka Kotahi to make a more liveability-focused and climate-focused road and street network, especially where intensification is happening.</li> </ul>
52.2	MDRAA - Development Standards	Amend	Building height limits, recession planes and setbacks that are consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS.	
52.3	MDRAA - Development Standards	Amend	Add a permeability standard, such as that minimum 30-40% should be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	
52.4	MDRAA - Development Standards	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	
52.5	MDRAA - Commercial activities	Amend	Small-scale commercial activity should be controlled or permitted or restricted discretionary, rather than the proposed discretionary.	

52.6	MDRAA - Commercial activities	Amend	Increase the scale of permitted commercial activities in these zones where the activities involve people spending time together, such as day-cares.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multifunctional community spaces within centres as Climate Action Hubs to support the circular economy, provide space for innovation, education and behaviour change and create a tangible vision of a low carbon future.</li> <li>• Circular economy principles being integrated into the district plan so that waste is minimised and designed out of construction projects, and that resource recovery infrastructure is put in place to manage any remaining waste.</li> <li>• Green spaces that are recreational, food producing, and support biodiversity. Community gardens and green stormwater infrastructure should maximise their value across all these outcomes and the District Plan should support the creation of a sustainable and resilient local food and biodiversity network system.</li> <li>• The new bicycle and micro-mobility device parking requirements for commercial and community facilities in the Centres and Mixed Use zones.</li> <li>• Centring Tangata Whenua and placing Te Tiriti at the core of planning.</li> </ul>
52.7	MDRAA - Building height	Amend	Height limits increased in the 15-minute walking catchments of rail stations.	
52.8	HDRAA - Access	Amend	Add a standard requiring developments to adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first best choice for access, with universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	
52.9	HDRAA - Commercial activities	Amend	Make the HDRAA more enabling of small-scale public facing commercial activities.	
52.10	General	-	Proper resourcing of Council teams [inferred to mean Council teams performing RMA functions] with more rates being used to resource these teams.	
52.11	General	-	Combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions, that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high calibre people and economies of scale.	
52.13	General	-	Prioritise universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel, for access to public transport.	
52.14	Co-housing, Tiny housing and Papakāinga	-	That the District Plan supports a diverse range of housing alternatives more fully with specific planning that incentivises and attracts co-housing, tiny-housing and Papakāinga projects.	<p>The submission addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The effects of the District Plan on housing affordability and housing/transport economics, and</li> <li>• Benefits of housing alternatives, including co-housing, tiny-housing, long-term flatting and group-purchasing, and Papakāinga.</li> </ul>

DPC56/053		Jo Wilkshire		
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
53.1	Special Residential Activity Area	Oppose	No specific decision requested, but opposes the removal of Chapter 4B: Special Residential Activity Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The objectives, policies and density standards of Chapter 4B do not contravene the medium and high density housing objectives.</li> <li>• The legislation has effectively given developers access to the whole valley floor, subject to a few heritage areas, with no regard for previous special character areas.</li> <li>• High density belongs in the inner city, not in the suburbs.</li> <li>• Submitter raises concerns on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Impacts on special character areas,</li> <li>○ Impacts on access to sunlight,</li> <li>○ Impacts on privacy,</li> <li>○ Party involvement in local body politics.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Submitter questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How many houses/dwellings are required,</li> <li>○ Why key information is being withheld,</li> <li>○ Where is the infrastructure plan to support proposed intensification.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suggests that intensification development should start in the city centre, and progressively move into the suburbs, replacing the older housing stock.</li> <li>• Concern regarding the lack of provisions for off-street parking.</li> </ul>
53.2	Heritage	Oppose	No specific decision requested, but opposes the listing of private residential properties as heritage under the proposed heritage areas without homeowner consent.	



DPC56/054 Henry Zwart				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
54.1	Walkable catchments	Support	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and transit hubs.	-
54.2	MDRAA - Development Standards	Amend	Building height limits, recession planes and setbacks that are consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS.	
54.3	MDRAA - Development Standards	Amend	Add a permeability standard, such as that minimum 30-40% should be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	
54.4	MDRAA - Development Standards	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	
54.5	MDRAA - Commercial activities	Amend	Small-scale commercial activity should be controlled or permitted or restricted discretionary, rather than the proposed discretionary.	
54.6	MDRAA - Commercial activities	Amend	Increase the scale of permitted commercial activities in these zones where the activities involve people spending time together, such as day-cares.	
54.7	MDRAA - Building height	Amend	Height limits increased in the 15-minute walking catchments of rail stations.	
54.8	HDRAA - Access	Amend	Add a standard requiring developments to adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first best choice for access, with universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	

54.9	HDRAA - Commercial activities	Amend	Make the HDRAA more enabling of small-scale public facing commercial activities.	
54.10	General	-	More rates being used for resourcing these teams [inferred to mean Council teams performing RMA functions] vs for maintaining large sections of road seal to a high standard for driving and parking private vehicles.	
54.11	General	-	Combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions, that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high calibre people and economies of scale.	
54.12	General	-	Change Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems and so forth that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	
54.13	General	-	Prioritise universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel, for access to public transport.	

<b>DPC56/055 Peggy Maurirere</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
55.1	Heritage	Oppose	Remove 5A Hector Street from the list of heritage properties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose their home being listed as a heritage property.</li> <li>• 3-4 storey buildings would be able to be built around them.</li> <li>• Impacts on Insurance payments.</li> <li>• No one should be able to tell them what they can or can't do to their own home.</li> </ul>

DPC56/056		Balvant Magan		
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
56.1	Heritage	Oppose	<p>Amend the plan change to include the following statement:</p> <p><a href="#">That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private residential properties in heritage areas should not be listed in the District Plan without the owner's consent.</li> <li>• Heritage areas impose significant restrictions on what a homeowner can do with their property.</li> <li>• The rules for heritage areas are vague and leave a lot of discretion to the Council.</li> <li>• Cost implications, including impacts on property values, insurance, and costs for repairs (including council consent fees).</li> <li>• Impacts on Hutt City Council from increased management, loss of citizen goodwill and litigation from property owners.</li> <li>• Concern on the way the heritage areas have been chosen as the houses vary drastically in quality and type, and most do not look like heritage.</li> <li>• These heritage areas will not only have disastrous consequences for the families affected, but will drastically impact the layout and aesthetic of the Hutt. While neighbouring streets build up to three or six stories high, these heritage areas will be forced into stagnation.</li> <li>• Furthermore, the houses in the proposed areas vary drastically in their quality and type. Many don't look like heritage at all. Others are unlikely to meet healthy homes standards. Yet they will all be included in the same umbrella of rules, forced into stasis while the rest of the Hutt modernises. To me, that is not fair.</li> <li>• Some of the areas, such as Hard ham Crescent or the Petone State Flats, are of the type and location perfectly fitting what I imagine the Government had in mind for</li> </ul>

				<p>intensification. To me and many others living in the area, these places do not hold any sentimental or heritage value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I want to have the choice as to whether my property is included in the Plan Change as now being in a heritage area. The Council must not be able to include the homes of local families as heritage without the agreement of the owner.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

<b>DPC56/057 Bruce Spedding</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
57.1	Wind	Amend	That limits are set for wind loadings and amplification around high rise developments, and that modelling is required prior to approval of any development, not only on that development but in the context of other buildings (existing, proposed or predicted).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should not allow development of new structures and increase density in areas which are at risk from inundation, damage from earthquakes, or extreme weather events (rainfall).</li> <li>There should be a focus on developing land on the fringe of urban areas with no agricultural value, to avoid the need for managed retreat in the future.</li> <li>In those areas at risk of inundation, allow transportable buildings on the condition they can be relocated as and when the need arises.</li> <li>This would create more opportunities for affordable housing while avoiding the future cost of compensation and relocation.</li> <li>Areas like Eastbourne and the Eastern Bays are valuable for their natural assets including the sea-side village context. This has commercial benefit locally and city-wide, as a recreational destination which will be amplified by the completion of the Great Harbour Way, continued development of the cross-harbour ferry service, and connection to the Remutuka Rail Trail. Unfettered</li> </ul>
57.2	Infrastructure	Amend	Any new development pays not only for the immediate additional infrastructure required but also for a proportion of future infrastructure needs including water, waste, transport and community facilities.	
57.3	Carparking	Amend	Developments that do not include parking should also pay a proportion for the probable increase in demand for parking they will place on the community.	
57.4	Density	Amend	That population density limits are set for areas where services and access are restricted by geography.	

57.5	Access to sunlight	Amend	That existing properties must retain a proven minimum level of access to natural sunlight all year round.	<p>development will damage this aspect of the area, changing the character and appeal of the suburb significantly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is unfair that the community should have to pay for infrastructure costs as a result of developments. New developments should pay the cost of any local infrastructure that may be needed and a proportion of the estimated repair costs that are envisaged to get the current infrastructure to an appropriate and sustainable standard. This includes the various water services and projected needs for developing water supplies, waste management and recycling, and transport infrastructure.</li> <li>In the Wellington region wind is a significant factor. In Eastbourne there is one anomalous 8 storey building at the foot of Rimu Street (village) - Rona House. There is significant turbulence around this building that is especially notable if on foot or cycling. This effect will be significant around any additional multi-storey buildings, so it would be essential to model and measure this for any building over 3 stories. The proposed unlimited heights in Petone and Hutt Central Business District could result in significant issues if this is not done.</li> <li>The Eastern Bays are already vulnerable from sea-level and extreme climate events. Population density will place additional pressure on a vulnerable access route, and increase the population at risk in the event of an emergency. It will make the community more vulnerable if the population increases significantly through development. As someone who has significant involvement in community resilience, the submitter is concerned that the area is already unprepared for emergency situations without amplification being added.</li> </ul>
57.6	Natural Hazards	Amend	That land designated as 'at risk' (from inundation, sea-level rise, or tsunami) be zoned for relocatable housing (possibly "tiny homes") to mitigate future impacts of having to retreat from these areas (and making more affordable housing possible at the same time).	
57.7	Density	Amend	Recognise the recreational (and hence commercial) value of areas and preserve the features that make it so, including lower density housing.	
57.8	General	Amend	Recognise that access to active recreation and active modes of transport such as cycling and walking must be included as a priority in any development, that new commercial buildings have facilities such as bike secure storage and showers etc, to support this.	
57.9	General	Amend	Require new developments to meet minimum standards of efficiency and sustainability, and include carbon offsets in the cost of construction.	
57.10	General	Amend	Any new buildings are keeping with the character of the location and existing buildings (where these are considered significant).	

<b>DPC56/058 Bernard Gresham</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
58.1	Density	Amend	More residential development, while preserving the integrity, character, and amenity of the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The negative impact on the integrity, character, and amenity of this city.</li> <li>• Lower Hutt was a garden city and has developed in accordance with sound town planning principles.</li> <li>• The area has a history of initiatives implemented by central and local government, which have resulted in varying levels of success.</li> <li>• Important to learn from the lessons of the past.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/059 Brian Herron</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
59.1	Heritage	Amend	Amend the provisions for heritage areas, to only include properties that have the written approval of the homeowner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed heritage areas included in the plan change have been done without homeowner consent.</li> <li>• The houses in the proposed heritage areas vary considerably, and many do not have heritage value.</li> <li>• Some of the houses will not meet the healthy homes standard.</li> <li>• Homeowners should be given the choice whether their property is included in the heritage schedule. Currently inflicting extra rules and costs to the homeowner without their input.</li> <li>• A number of the houses on the proposed schedule do not appear to meet the definition of a heritage building.</li> </ul>
59.2	Heritage	Amend	Revise the selection method for heritage houses.	

<b>DPC56/060 Carolyn Anne Hamer</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
60.1	Density	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on property values and investments.</li> <li>• Factors contributing to quality of life and wellbeing (outside areas, privacy, sunshine) will be impacted by 3 to 6 storey developments.</li> <li>• Control has been removed from individual property owners and given to developers. Many homeowners in this area purchased a lifestyle, not just a house.</li> <li>• Submitter raises concerns regarding the geographical extent of the proposed plan change.</li> <li>• PC56 will have impacts on carparking.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/061 Byron Cummins</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
61.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	<p>A full review by Hutt City Council of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, to be submitted with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The appropriate peer reviewed information of how the proposed changes will affect the existing infrastructure and its relationship to the specific parts of the RMA, and</li> <li>• The appropriate peer reviewed research and data congruent to the RMA that proves any intended changes are valid.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of public consultation for the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and amendments to the RMA,</li> <li>• Lack of peer reviewed detail and data on the impacts of the changes, including impacts on surrounding areas and resources, flora and fauna, civil and civic infrastructure,</li> <li>• The RMA has already been altered, but allows review and rejection by all local body councils and calls for the above planning and information to have been done before the implementation of any national policy statement,</li> <li>• Impacts on infrastructure, including sewage and stormwater infrastructure,</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts of reducing green spaces on stormwater management,</li> <li>• Lack of ability to appeal decisions to the Environment Court,</li> <li>• Accuracy of Council records,</li> <li>• Impacts on cultural wellbeing and safety, including impacts of higher density on crime rates,</li> <li>• Noise pollution,</li> <li>• Impacts on amenity values,</li> <li>• Passive surveillance,</li> <li>• Value of outlook space clauses,</li> <li>• Impacts on historic streets and buildings,</li> <li>• The offset of development and provision of “public spaces” will not suit the greater majority of New Zealanders lifestyle,</li> <li>• The national intensification plans the proposed plan change is based on has not been planned or thought out for future risk,</li> <li>• Housing demand has slowed and will continue to do so,</li> <li>• The current plan is based on use of three waters development without further public consultation,</li> <li>• Many provisions have been made for the control of development via the term “qualifying”, however this does not restrict, nor does it ensure those “qualifying” consultations are not removed by significant “contributions”.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--



DPC56/062 Olive Tupuivao				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
62.1	Heritage	Oppose	Amend the provisions for heritage areas, to only include properties that have the written approval of the homeowner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Homeowner consent should be given before the inclusion of a property on the heritage schedule (voluntary heritage policy).</li> <li>• Raises concerns on the potential impacts on property values.</li> <li>• Raises concerns on the potential impacts of renovating a property.</li> </ul>

DPC56/063 Shayne Hodge				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
63.1	Heritage	Amend	<p>Amend the plan change to include the following statement:</p> <p><a href="#">That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Homeowner consent should be given before the inclusion of a property on the heritage schedule.</li> <li>• The submitter owns a home which has been included in the heritage schedule, which will add significant time and cost implications to the renovations they are going to undertake.</li> <li>• Concerned that their renovations will not be able to go ahead as a heritage building.</li> <li>• Lack of consultation with homeowners throughout the process and not enough opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed changes.</li> <li>• The time period for submissions (1 month) makes it difficult for most residents to engage with the process and understand the implications it will have for their property.</li> <li>• Hutt City Council has failed to take into account the mandatory considerations of section 82(4)(a) and (b).</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volume 2 of the Plan Change Document makes several references to “heritage values” and the retention of heritage being of value to the community. However, it does not define what these “heritage values” are, who values this heritage, and to what extent.</li> <li>• The proposed heritage area will result in a significant contrast between these properties and the 3 or 6 storey development permitted on surrounding streets.</li> <li>• Significant constraints are being placed on homeowners, who will have to go to Hutt City Council for consent before altering their house. Hutt City Council retains a lot of discretion in this process and cannot guarantee a consent will be granted.</li> <li>• Risk of insurers increasing premiums on heritage houses, in addition to the increased Hutt City Council consent fees.</li> <li>• The value of the property could decrease by 10-30% with a heritage status and less interest in the property by potential buyers.</li> <li>• Many of the houses in the heritage area do not look like they have heritage values. Some are unlikely to meet healthy homes standards.</li> <li>• The proposed heritage areas of Hardham Crescent and Petone State Flats are good locations for intensification. To members of the community, they do not hold heritage value.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/064 Bruce Patchett				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
64.1	HDRAA	Amend	Rezone Columbans Grove to Medium Density Residential Activity Area	-

DPC56/065		Deborah Molloy		
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
65.1	Density	Oppose	Retain the resource consent process for building developed as part of intensification, and ensure neighbouring homeowners are consulted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 storey buildings in residential Petone should require resource consent.</li> <li>• Support more housing, but this should not be at the expense of good town planning and informed community collaboration and consent.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the existing infrastructure and whether this can support the proposed intensification.</li> <li>• Concerned that neighbouring properties will not be able to submit on proposed developments, especially regarding sunlight.</li> <li>• Risk that surrounding properties will be devalued.</li> <li>• Natural hazard risk with 6 storey developments on fault lines.</li> </ul>
65.2	Parking	Amend	Amend the provisions in PC56 to ensure car parking is considered in the planning process of new buildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People living in high density areas will still have cars. This needs to be planned for.</li> <li>• Off road carparking should be a requirement of all new buildings.</li> <li>• Petone streets are already busy, especially along the Old Hutt Road. Can the existing infrastructure support an increase in the number of cars.</li> </ul>

DPC56/066 John Christopher Sellars				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
66.1	Heritage	Amend	Amend the plan change to include the following statement:  <a href="#">That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Against the listing of private residential properties as heritage without homeowner consent.</li> <li>• Concerned on impacts on insurance costs.</li> <li>• Concerned on impacts on house sales.</li> <li>• Voluntary heritage policy is very much in the best interests and for the benefit of Hutt City and its citizens.</li> </ul>

DPC56/067 Brenda Irene Ralton				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
67.1	Heritage	Amend	Amend the plan change to include the following statement:  <a href="#">That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Against the listing of private residential properties as heritage without homeowner consent.</li> <li>• Concerned on impacts on insurance costs,</li> <li>• Concerned on impacts on house sales,</li> <li>• Voluntary heritage policy is very much in the best interests and for the benefit of Hutt City and its citizens.</li> </ul>

DPC56/068 Spencer Logan				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
68.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	No specific decision requested, but submitter opposes the plan change (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central and local government do not seem to be interested in retaining the character or aesthetics of a street,</li> </ul>

				<p>neighbourhood, or suburb. For example, Petone has many character single-storey bungalows and villas, which could potentially be surrounded by 3 or 6 storey townhouses/apartment blocks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of the plan change is to create 'affordable' housing, however the prices of general costs, labour, and materials have increased. Builders, developers, or construction companies are unable to sell at lower prices.</li> <li>• In a townhouse development in Taitā, only one of 184 units has an off-street carpark. This will leave everyone else to park on the street, congesting these suburbs.</li> <li>• Public transport in Lower Hutt is still a 'work in progress'. If people should be relying on public transport as their main mode of transport, this should be reliable and affordable.</li> <li>• In the past, Hutt City Council has enforced privacy between dwellings, which would be retracted completely with PC56. Privacy of existing homeowners will be diminished with new developments.</li> <li>• Houses need to matt the 'healthy homes' status, but this cannot be achieved without adequate sunlight and ventilation.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding sun, light, views, noise and whether people are prepared to live in this kind of density.</li> <li>• New housing in specific areas or 'highlighted' zones could be created that have little impact on neighbours.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
69.1	Density	Not stated	No specific decision requested by the submitter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding the wellbeing of the current residents of Lower Hutt. People have chosen to live in this area for the relaxed suburban lifestyle, not high density living.</li> <li>• Hutt City Council's response to the central government directive should be made public, so it is clear that local social and environmental impacts have been considered and this isn't rampant and unstructured development.</li> <li>• Developments should have requirements for landscaping, permeability, trees, rainwater tanks, minimum lot sizes, and financial contributions from developers.</li> <li>• Ensure quality design so Lower Hutt doesn't end up being a city of towering apartment blocks with loads of grey. Engage with a planning commissioner to ensure this doesn't happen.</li> <li>• Hutt City Council should ensure the housing market does not get flooded with vacant units. Higher density developments need to be quality housing, which is affordable now and delivers a legacy of housing options for future generations.</li> <li>• Increased density will put additional pressure on infrastructure. Sewage overflows, polluted beaches, traffic congestion, accidents, lack of parking, flooding, pressure on schools, medical and community facilities, could all be outcomes without adequate planning. Infrastructure needs to be in place before development starts.</li> <li>• Off street parking needs to be included in developments, to ensure that streets are kept safe and pedestrian friendly.</li> <li>• Impact on neighbours' sunlight, privacy, and peace need to be taken into account.</li> <li>• Uncertainty as to whether the people these developments are intended to serve will be able to afford them.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/070 Anastay Papadopoulos</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
70.1	Natural Hazards	Amend	Change the proposed Medium Coastal Hazard Area to a Low Coastal Hazard Area, based on SSP 8.5 and a projected 1.5m sea-level rise by 2130.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mapping Coastal Hazards based off SSP8.5 is illogical, as this degree of warming is seen as unlikely to happen by climate scientists. It assumes a substantial shift towards fossil fuels.</li> <li>• Other flood hazard maps in PC56 use the more realistic 1m sea level rise projection for 2130, rather than the 1.5m that SSP8.5 entails.</li> <li>• Inundation has been projected at 1m sea level rise, and rated as Low Risk by Hutt City Council. Confusion regarding how a level of sea rise that is more likely to happen (1m by 2130) is rated as a lower risk than a level of sea rise which is less likely to happen (1.5m by 2130).</li> </ul>
70.2	Natural Hazards	Amend	Set a new Medium Coastal Hazard Area, based on a projected 1m sea level rise by 2130.	

<b>DPC56/071 Ernst and Gwendoline Haley</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
71.1	Heritage	Oppose	No specific decision requested.	This submission opposes the proposed heritage provisions in PC56. Private residential properties should not be listed as heritage without the written consent of the homeowner.

<b>DPC56/072 Edwin Lancashire</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
72.1	Density	Oppose	Remove the provisions in PC56 allowing developments over 3 storeys high.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many people live in this area for the lifestyle, and increasing building height would significantly impact this. This development would be detrimental to all ratepaying residents.</li> <li>• Hutt City Council should be advocating on behalf of the residents, not the developers.</li> <li>• High density should not be developed next to existing single storey residential areas.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/073 Richard Steel</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
73.1	Density	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule 1, Part 6 of the RMA has not gone through appropriate parliamentary scrutiny.</li> <li>• Intensification is required in all cities, but needs to be coordinated with infrastructure (services, transport, road, car parking/charging).</li> <li>• Adequate planning to ensure retention of light and outdoor amenity.</li> <li>• Unrestrained 'right to build' is not the solution. Ignoring recession planes on a 300m<sup>2</sup> section and allowing developers to construct a 3 or 6 storey apartment block within 1m of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Risk that lack of sunlight, privacy, parking, and noise control will reduce the asset value of surrounding houses and force them to sell.</li> </ul>



				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This type of development will lead to poor living conditions.</li> <li>• Proposed provisions will affect most ratepayers.</li> <li>• The future of Hutt City Council housing policies should be made via referendum or other means.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

<b>DPC56/074      Brendan Murphy</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
74.1	HDRAA	Amend	Limit the HDRAA to be no more than 400 metres from a main train station hub and 800 metres from the Central Business District. Or follow the Christchurch City Council rejection of generic government mandated changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An 800m range is too wide an area to allow high density housing,</li> <li>• An 800m radius from a train station is quite a large area and the train stations are in some cases not that far apart. Therefore, the proposed 800m zone emanating from each station would overlap.</li> <li>• Concerned high density housing will encourage developments in reasonably nice medium-density zoned neighbourhoods into intrusive high-rise housing that contribute little to community life.</li> <li>• Submitter raises concerns on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Impact on privacy,</li> <li>○ Lack of personal space,</li> <li>○ Impacts on on-street parking,</li> <li>○ Impacts on footpaths,</li> <li>○ Poor berm maintenance,</li> <li>○ Visual deterioration,</li> <li>○ Traffic safety, and</li> <li>○ The atmosphere of a nice place to live, work and play.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High-rise apartments should be left to the Central Business District and maybe at transport hubs, but not every train station.</li> <li>• People and families do not thrive in overcrowded environments.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/075 Kerry Gray				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
75.1	Density	Oppose	Restrict intensification in residential areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By allowing intensification, Hutt City Council will not be following their intention in Policy 3 "Encourage development to achieve attractive and safe streets and public open spaces".</li> <li>• Traffic congestion and flow is already an issue in the Hutt Valley. The current access in and out of the city is inadequate for the existing development. Additional traffic will result in more carbon emissions and environmental damage.</li> <li>• Developments under construction will cause major safety issues for children getting to and from school. If active transport is not an option, parents will have to use private transportation, increasing traffic issues in the area.</li> <li>• 1.10.2 Amenity Values – Objective 1 The area has an ageing population which should be cared for in single storey dwellings. This will not be achieved with this objective.</li> <li>• Increased density developments will impact the sunlight received by neighbouring properties, and their ability to enjoy outdoor space, grow food, and plant trees to help combat the effects of global warming.</li> <li>• Hutt City Council should aim to create an environment where people can walk or cycle without fear.</li> </ul>
75.2	Density	Oppose	Ensure development does not impact on access to sunlight.	
75.3	Density	Oppose	Ensure higher density development is not undertaken where known traffic issues already exist.	
75.4	Density	Oppose	Amend car parking provisions to ensure all developments have off-street parking for each unit.	

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hutt City Council should allow for wellbeing which is achieved by access to outdoor spaces for recreation and relaxation.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/076 Monica Murphy				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
76.1	Density	Amend	Ensure all new residences have one car park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Walkable distance from train stations should be 400 metres.</li> <li>Six storeys in an average suburb street is too high and will affect neighbours' privacy.</li> <li>2 storey housing parallel to the street is totally unacceptable.</li> <li>Off street parking, garaging, and EV charging is necessary. Porutu Street has 27 new townhouses without off street parking; however, the street is only 500m long.</li> <li>Intensification will result in increased tensions between neighbours, increased traffic and hazards, and car break ins.</li> <li>Property values will drop as the area becomes less desirable to live in.</li> <li>Infrastructure and ageing water pipes will not be able to provide for increased density.</li> <li>Developers should not be allowed to make a quick large profit.</li> </ul>
76.2	Density	-	Convert grass berms into car parking bays with EV charging stations.	
76.3	Density	Amend	Ensure high density housing stays within 400m of train stations.	
76.4	Density	-	When providing housing, assess the complete social well-being effect on current and new residents, to keep Lower Hutt a happy, thriving, desirable place to live, work, and play.	

DPC56/077 Ana Coculescu				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
77.1	Density	Support	Support larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs, so long as they are not in areas prone to natural hazards (sea level rise, tsunami etc.).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see traffic congestion and parking effects viewed as an interim contributor to traffic calming and safer streets, and used tactically, not just as a negative effect.</li> <li>• This is really important to help shift our habits in the interim, as the community shifts to properly configured streets that support our neighbourhoods - i.e., as Hutt City Council retrofit streets with proper traffic-calming and placemaking elements that achieve this effect permanently.</li> <li>• Would like to see changes to HCC's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, and street maintenance systems that actively support, and don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.</li> <li>• Universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel, must be prioritised for access to public transport so that people don't need to drive to stations, or traverse inhospitable park and rides once they get there.</li> <li>• HCC's planning teams and consent enforcement teams are already vastly under resourced. These need proper resourcing otherwise all this good change won't be worth the paper it's written on. This submission supports more rates being used for resourcing these teams rather than for maintaining large sections of road seal to a high standard for driving and parking private vehicles.</li> <li>• Support combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions, that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high calibre people and economies of scale.</li> </ul>
77.2	Density	Amend	Where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned, would like to see these made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS.	
77.3	Density	Amend	Add a permeability standard, such as that minimum 30-40% of site should be permeable (incl. permeable pavers / gravel etc).	
77.4	Density	Amend	Support the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space and suggest these are added.	
77.5	Density	Amend	Small-scale commercial activity should be controlled or permitted or restricted discretionary, rather than the proposed discretionary.	
77.6	Density	Amend	The scale of commercial activities that are permitted in these zones should be increased where it is activities that involve people spending time together, such as day-cares.	
77.7	Density	Amend	Enable larger, more comprehensive developments in our centres, so increase height	

			limits in the 15-minute walking catchments to rail stations.	
77.8	Density	Amend	Shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed, with a policy for providing popup nearby public realm for development-shaded homes.	
77.9	Density	Amend	Add standard requiring that developments adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it, with universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	
77.10	Density	Amend	Zones should be more enabling of small-scale public facing commercial activities.	
77.11	Density	Amend	Support larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs, such as rail stations.	

<b>DPC56/078 Lorraine Kaluza</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
78.1	Density	Oppose	Require resource consent for all 3 storey developments, to ensure minimal impact on neighbouring properties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consents process ensures that 3 storey dwellings do not block out sunlight from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Leaving properties in the shade negates the provisions of healthy homes legislation, where dwellings must be mould and damp free.</li> <li>• Dwellings in the shade will prevent occupiers from growing fruit and vegetables. Impacts on physical and mental health.</li> <li>• Without adequate property planning, the key aspects of a pleasant family suburb will be removed.</li> </ul>
78.2	Density	Oppose	Neighbours of a proposed 3 storey development should be consulted prior to the granting of a resource consent.	

DPC56/079 Katy and Wayne Donnelly				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
79.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Push back on the 'one solution fits all' approach, and develop a plan which specifically meets the estimated housing requirements for Lower Hutt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hutt City Council should revisit the decision to incorporate MDRS provisions and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD as required by government. Should take a similar stance to Christchurch City Council.</li> <li>Proposed land use changes will result in unnecessary urban outcomes for the community. The housing analysis provided with PC56 does not identify a forecasted number of dwellings. However, the scale of the MDRS and High Density Housing Areas will be a complete overshoot of the estimated dwelling shortfall (7,926), because of the numerous town centres and rapid transit stations within Lower Hutt.</li> <li>Public notification for resource consent applications is an important check and provides balance in the administration of the District Plan. Under the proposed provisions, all the standards can be infringed at the discretion of Hutt City Council, without the knowledge of or feedback from neighbouring homeowners.</li> <li>The threat of notification helps to keep developers from infringing the standards in the District Plan, which is the expectation of the community.</li> <li>Height in relation to boundary and site coverage have the most impact on surrounding urban amenity. These standards should be adhered to, as it would encourage site amalgamation allowing spaced out 7 storey developments instead of jammed 4 storey developments. The former is a better urban outcome.</li> <li>It would be reasonable for PC56 to include a provision whereby if more than one of the standards in 4.2 is not met,</li> </ul>
79.2	Development Standards	Amend	Amend PC56 to include notification of an application if it breaches more than one performance standard.	
79.3	Development Standards	Amend	Amend PC56 so the height in relation to boundary standard applies at the property boundary (instead of transferred to the farthest boundary of a right of way).	

				<p>the preclusion of notification does not apply to that application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.2.4 is a blanket rule which could create poor outcomes for neighbouring properties. Rights of way should be considered on a case by case basis, rather than as a blanket right.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/080 James Scott				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
80.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central government does not have the mandate to impose changes to the District Plan.</li> <li>• Not enough time was provided for residents to submit on the proposed changes, and no right of appeal on the changes made.</li> <li>• The proposed changes will alter the character of the city.</li> <li>• A detailed assessment of how the proposed changes will alter ratepayers' fees has not been provided with PC56.</li> <li>• Lack of assessment of alternative options.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding sunlight, solar energy production, views, noise, privacy, vehicle parking, wind tunnels.</li> <li>• Infrastructure will require upgrades to meet the needs of increased population (roading, water, electricity), which has not been accounted for in PC56.</li> <li>• Recreational areas will become crowded, reducing quality of life.</li> <li>• Demolition of existing buildings will create waste, which has not been accounted for in PC56.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intensification will present more of a risk during natural hazard events (earthquakes), increasing costs to homeowners through insurance premiums and rates.</li> <li>• Developers will be in control of the way the city develops under PC56.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

<b>DPC56/081 David Smith</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
81.1	Density	-	Consider the role of developers under PC56, and the standards they need to meet.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the proposed provisions in PC56, but suggests amendments and raises some concerns.</li> <li>• Concerns that developers are being given permission to subdivide without considering the impact on neighbours and the environment. This extends to impacts during the construction phase of the development, whereby neighbours can experience disturbance.</li> <li>• Kitset houses being built in the district have resulted in polystyrene being blown into neighbouring properties, the day care centre, and in the sea. Hutt City Council should have considered this impact before consenting to a kitset house which is transported in polystyrene. This issue is amplified by living in a windy region.</li> <li>• Hutt City Council is obligated to enforce H&amp;S standards, requiring barriers around construction sites. Several examples around Hutt City where machinery and general rubbish have not had appropriate barriers. Public footpaths have also been blocked by gravel, without barriers, and no alternative route for pedestrians.</li> <li>• Landowners commissioning the work of developers are also having issues with their attitude towards the neighbourhood.</li> </ul>
81.2	Density	-	Consider denying approval for some kit set houses, especially in areas where high wind will cause issues during assembly.	
81.3	Density	Amend	Apply Amendment 338 (regarding allotment standards) and 339 (regarding natural hazards) to any subdivision approval.	
81.4	Density	Amend	Off street parking provisions should be included, especially in areas where there is limited off street parking available.	
81.5	Density	Amend	Limit subdivisions where extensive removal of trees will be required, to reduce impact on the environment.	
81.7	Density	Amend	Challenge housing intensification where there is conflict between the proposed housing and the surrounding environment.	



81.8	Density	-	Provide engineering reports on intensive housing for areas where water runoff could cause issues.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding the existing infrastructure and whether it is suitable for the number of subdivisions being approved by Hutt City Council currently.</li> <li>While intensification is necessary, Hutt City Council is obliged to ensure that housing is fit for purpose and of a high standard of construction.</li> <li>Intensification could result in an increasing ground water table, and pooling of water on neighbouring properties.</li> </ul>
------	---------	---	---	---

DPC56/082 Steve Shaw				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
82.1	Carparking	Amend	Require off-street parking.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter generally supports the plan change, but is concerned about some issues.</li> <li>New buildings not providing off street parking and there potentially being more vehicles parked on the road.</li> <li>The effect of less off-street parking on public car parks, particularly during sport events.</li> </ul>
82.2	Intensification	Amend	Review and limit intensification around public areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Areas close to public parks should have a reduced number of buildings to allow people to access them without having parking issues.</li> </ul>
82.3	Infrastructure	Amend	Review the adequacy of the current infrastructure, emergency services and medical facilities due to the proposed population increase.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter does not believe the city has suitable wastewater and sewage systems to accommodate the proposed increase in housing. They would like this addressed before any building commences.</li> </ul>

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
83.1	Density	Oppose	Exclude the Eastbourne area from housing intensification of up to 3 homes and up to 3 stories (the submitter would support 2 houses up to 2 stories high).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Eastern Bays land is subject to hazards including sinking and sea level rise.</li> <li>• The area is facing threats to its coastal infrastructure and properties. Storm surges will add to the threats and have been occurring more frequently.</li> <li>• Continuing to intensify in areas where these threats are known, seems counter to the common sense and will put more people and properties at risk and will expose Council to more costs at a later date.</li> <li>• Eastbourne infrastructure is unlikely to cope with intensification, especially water infrastructure which is already under pressure and at least one new leak is appearing every week.</li> <li>• Eastbourne is a small coastal settlement that has one way in and one way out. During summer the roads are already suffering from congestion and increasing delays throughout the Days Bay area. Intensification will add to this congestion.</li> <li>• The character of the area is such that intensification is out of character for the area.</li> <li>• The submitter proposes a maximum of 2 houses and no more than 2 stories per section if intensification proceeds.</li> </ul>

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
84.1	Natural hazards	Amend	Revise permitted development within the coastal hazard zone, with no intensification permitted in any of the coastal hazard zones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern with tsunami risk in Lowry Bay and Petone.</li> <li>• Considers removing minimum lot sizes and permitting 2-3 dwellings up to three stories per property to be unsafe for residents and financially disastrous for the Lower Hutt community in the event of a tsunami.</li> <li>• Climate change and the need for coastal retreat, not coastal intensification.</li> <li>• The three coastal zones in the proposed plan change which have been identified by GNS modelling for tsunami coastal hazard mitigation are based on an annual level of perceived risk of 1 in 100, 1 in 500, and 1 in 1000 year hazard repetition rates.</li> <li>• The three coastal zones in the plan change are well within the extensive yellow map evacuation zones (as marked on roads), which are based on a 1 in 2500 year repeat rate by Wellington Region Emergency Management Office (WREMO).</li> <li>• High possibility of inundation in the next 100 years.</li> <li>• Ability for residents to evacuate quickly in the event of tsunami (density will result in congestion).</li> <li>• Uncertainties in modelling/predictions for tsunamis underpinning zones.</li> <li>• Would like risks to citizens in the event of a tsunami mitigated in the District Plan</li> <li>• The submitter suggests intensification could be permitted in the zones between the boundaries of the yellow zone in the 1 in 2500 year WREMO evacuation zone and the 1 in 1000 year proposed plan change zone, subject to building</li> </ul>

				consent and based on an assessment of the hazard mitigation proposals by the developer.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/085      Andy Bogacki				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
85.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural hazard risk, including risk from earthquake faults, ground shaking, liquefaction, land instability, flooding and tsunami.</li> <li>• Impacts of the Hutt Valley Aquifer on foundations, and impacts of development on the Aquifer, including intrusions and contamination.</li> <li>• Impacts on the natural environment, including native birds and flora.</li> <li>• Impacts on quality of life for residents, including loss of sunlight and air, loss of views, increased wind speeds, traffic, on-street carparking and rubbish in the Hutt River and Wellington Harbour.</li> <li>• Impacts on infrastructure, including impacts on three waters infrastructure, impacts of sea level rise and sinking geology on infrastructure, and costs of new infrastructure.</li> </ul>

DPC56/086 Ian McLauchlan				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
86.1	Amenity values	Amend	Provide better protection of some of the existing amenity values in areas proposed for medium and high-density development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the plan change leaves the city exposed to poor developments.</li> <li>Acknowledges intensification is necessary if it is done in a manner that compliments the existing Cityscape and preserves some of the City's amenity values.</li> <li>The definition of amenity values is so fluid it is meaningless and does nothing to protect the amenity values of the existing built environment.</li> <li>Concern around uncertainty of the proposed plan and the potential for intense development to be 'random'.</li> <li>The application of zones has been poorly thought out – i.e., some areas too steep to sustain development.</li> <li>Infrastructure is both vulnerable to natural hazards and unable to cope with intensification – and will only worsen with further intensification.</li> <li>Impacts of climate change and natural hazards haven't been seriously considered.</li> <li>Shading compounded by intensification.</li> <li>Heat island effects and lack of trees for cooling.</li> <li>Parking, transport and congestion concerns.</li> <li>Doesn't enable affordable housing.</li> </ul>
86.2	Special Residential Activity Area	Amend	Exclude the three Special Residential Activity Areas from the plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These areas have contributed significantly to the diversity in our city and have been assessed as having special amenity values that are being ditched for no good reason.</li> </ul>
86.3	Special Residential Activity Area	-	Consult more with the ratepayers in Special Residential Activity Areas with a view to changing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The areas have contributed significantly to the history of our city and attract new residents who are looking for the</li> </ul>

			some of the rules. In particular, the one dwelling per 700sqm and 30% site coverage rules.	<p>amenity values that currently exist and are reinforced by the rules in the current District Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New rules erode that protection of diversity - they set arbitrary targets that every ruthless developer will aim to.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

<b>DPC56/087 Eve Bao</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
87.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Stop enabling intensification in residential and commercial areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no quick fix for housing crises.</li> <li>• The proposed plan change is a wrong vision of fixing the housing crisis.</li> <li>• It needs a 100-year plan so people don't need to live in tiny houses with no room to enjoy their life.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/088 Christina Meyer</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
88.1	Building height	Amend	Only allow single-storey dwellings for intensification.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wainuiomata is built on swamp land and may be subject to liquefaction risk.</li> <li>• Concerns three to four storey buildings will block sun/reduce light from single storey homes and worsen existing cold, damp and mouldy conditions.</li> <li>• Against the Labour goal and policy of healthy homes.</li> <li>• Effects on existing character of Wainuiomata.</li> <li>• Fire risk.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction of trees and impact on environment.</li> <li>• Infrastructure issues</li> <li>• Increased traffic and congestion.</li> <li>• Increased danger for cyclists.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

<b>DPC56/089 Steve Leitch</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
89.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule 1, Part 6 of the RMA has not gone through appropriate parliamentary scrutiny.</li> <li>• Intensification is required in all cities, but needs to be coordinated with infrastructure (services, transport, road, car parking/charging).</li> <li>• Adequate planning to ensure retention of light and outdoor amenity.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Risk that lack of sunlight, privacy, parking, and noise control will reduce the asset value of surrounding houses and force them to sell.</li> <li>• This type of development will lead to poor living conditions.</li> <li>• Proposed provisions will affect most ratepayers.</li> </ul>
89.2	Density	Oppose	The future of Hutt City Council housing policies should be made via referendum or other means.	

<b>DPC56/090 Peter Healy</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
90.1	Density	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing district plan allows both intensification and protects the sun, views, privacy, and the general high-quality environment of Hutt City.</li> <li>• Coastal inundation and impact of rising sea levels and sinking ground levels.</li> <li>• Poor condition of the road and no plans to protect it.</li> </ul>
90.2	Hill Residential Activity Area	Support	No specific decision requested, but supports the decision to not apply the plan change to the Hill Residential Activity Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the decision to not apply the plan change to the Hill Residential Activity Area, which controls development in the hill areas of the Eastern Bays. The existing roading servicing the zone are nothing more than single lane goat tracks and could not support the additional traffic likely to be generated by Plan Change 56.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC56/091 Persephone Meads</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
91.1	HDRAA	Amend	Limit houses in the High Density Activity Area to two storeys.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of sunlight and privacy.</li> <li>• Noise impacts.</li> <li>• Impact on carparking and traffic.</li> </ul>



DPC56/092 Andrew Newman				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
92.1	HDRAA	Amend	Adjust the High Density Residential Activity Area to the minimum allowed under the definitions as outlined - namely 1,200m from the Central Business District and 800m from railway stations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan fails to take into account the provision of infrastructure required to support the level of development that may result.</li> <li>• There is no additional provision or allocation of space for school, hospital, recreational, water processing or extraction or any other infrastructure.</li> <li>• It appears that a number of areas have been included in the High Density Residential Activity Area which do not need to be based on the distances outlined.</li> <li>• Given the difficulty of planning for the scale of intensification which will be enabled by this plan change, it would be sensible to take the minimum statutory requirement approach to this district plan.</li> </ul>
92.2	Heritage	Amend	Expand the heritage areas of the plan to include other areas of housing representative of the key periods of the expansion of the city to enable a broader swathe of the City's architectural history to be preserved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed plan change does not protect a broad array of the City's heritage</li> <li>• Some periods of City expansion have been entirely missed from the heritage zoning. In particular, collections of great examples of the expansion of the city in the late 1920s and early 1930s exist around Ava station/North Petone/Alicetown and in the formerly 'Special Residential' zoned areas of the Woburn area. Furthermore, similar representative collections of housing from later expansions can be found in other suburbs and without expansion of heritage zoned areas, the city will lose a great deal of its architectural history.</li> <li>• The obvious examples fall within areas previously determined to be 'special residential', but other areas exist and the Council should undertake a thorough review of the city to identify in situ clusters of original housing for heritage protection.</li> </ul>

DPC56/093 John Hosegood				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
93.1	General	Oppose	Hutt City Council should not support central government and instead follow a similar path to Christchurch City Council.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hutt City Council should present PC56 in a more digestible manner. The submitter does not see this approach of consultation as fit for purpose.</li> <li>Intensification of the built environment is desirable. However, the proposed means of achieving this is wrong. The district needs planning reviews of all proposed developments, rather than relaxed rules which allow development without a professionals input.</li> <li>Residents would like to see the objection Hutt City Council submitted to central government on the proposed intensification legislation. Hutt City Council should follow the lead set by Christchurch City Council.</li> <li>Changing planning rules so major changes can be made to areas people like and buy in, without proper assessment or consultation, should have been rules out in the first phase.</li> <li>New Zealand has a small population, so there is plenty of land for development if it is required. Tools such as the Public Works Act can help to acquire it.</li> </ul>
93.2	Density	Oppose	Define and implement a better approach to intensification.	

DPC56/094 Juan Qu				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
94.1	Heritage	Amend	Remove the proposed six residential heritage precinct areas, and identify houses with	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Against the creation of 6 new Residential Heritage Precincts.</li> </ul>

			significant historical values individually to protect them properly.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Against removing the 3 existing special residential activity areas.</li> <li>• Concern regarding abandoning a well-established special activity area to establish new areas, where the houses would vary drastically in their quality and type.</li> <li>• Many of the houses included in the new heritage precinct do not appear to have heritage qualities. Others are unlikely to be meeting the healthy homes standards. Yet all of these houses will be included under the same umbrella of rules, unable to modernise with the rest of the district.</li> <li>• Distinctive characteristics and special amenity values have been protected throughout the district, and the submitter would not like to see these get lost while houses in the proposed residential heritage precinct are restrained from further development.</li> <li>• Submitter would like to challenge the decision by the mayor and councillors to approve the recommended heritage precinct areas.</li> <li>• Confusion regarding the proposed rules for the heritage precinct area. It appears as if houses can still be demolished and rebuilt.</li> <li>• Confusion regarding why some houses are excluded from the heritage precinct area.</li> <li>• The current special activity area is maintained well and is worth keeping. The restrictions Hutt City Council put on homeowners in previous years will mean nothing if it is removed.</li> <li>• Refer to the original submission for attachments.</li> <li>• Explanation required as to why 69 Hutt Road has been excluded from historical precinct.</li> </ul>
94.2	Heritage	-	Present the evidence that demonstrates why the 6 areas with significant historical value have been identified.	
94.3	Heritage	Amend	If excluding individual houses from heritage areas is allowed, request that 73 Hutt Road is excluded.	
94.4	Special Residential Activity Area	Amend	Keep the three current Special Residential Activity Areas.	

DPC56/095 Janet Pike				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
95.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	No specific decision requested, but opposes the proposed plan change (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on privacy,</li> <li>• Impacts on access to sunlight, and</li> <li>• Impacts of property values.</li> </ul>

DPC56/096 Kate Harray				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
96.1	Ecology	-	Give more thought to our ecological corridors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern regarding 6 storey developments and the impacts this will have on shading across the community. Mental health implications and effects on the number and volume of wildlife. Spending time in nature improves mental and physical health and reduces stress and anxiety.</li> <li>• Concern that high density development will result in the reduction of trees, which attract native wildlife. There will be fewer places for residents to be surrounded by nature. The submitter does not like seeing blocks of houses surrounded by concrete with a tiny patch of grass and no trees.</li> <li>• High density development will place pressure on the ecological corridor which is crucial for the health of birds. Develop a plan for increasing green spaces for everyone to enjoy.</li> <li>• Recognises the need for more housing, but this should not come at the expense of nature.</li> </ul>
96.2	Trees	Amend	Increase the number of protected trees in the city.	
96.3	Parks and reserves	-	Guarantee that the existing parks and gardens will remain in the ownership of Hutt City Council.	

DPC56/097		Malcolm Lewis		
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
97.1	HDRAA	Amend	Reduce the high density areas (6 stories) from an 800m walking distance to a 400m walking distance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hutt City Council is able to moderate the extent of intensification based on walking distances, heritage, and natural disasters.</li> <li>Hutt City Council made a submission on the legislation opposing the national housing intensification bill. Christchurch City Council has gone one further and have voted against implementing the Governments Policy.</li> <li>If Hutt City Council was against the bill, then they have the opportunity to make the changes less intense. However, PC56 allows 6 storey developments to be built randomly between single storey houses.</li> <li>Hutt City Council has the ability to reduce the impact of intensification under the new legislation, and undertake changes in line with PC43 to allow controlled development.</li> <li>The submitter would like Hutt City Council to follow Christchurch City Council and vote against the whole PC56, but realises this is not likely to happen. In lieu of that, they would like Hutt City Council to use the methods within the legislation to better follow PC43.</li> <li>Hutt City Council have used 800m as a walking distance. In reality, people drive this distance. This will undermine the district's own Carbon Reduction Plan.</li> <li>By allowing intensification in high risk areas, such as coastal areas and close to fault lines, Hutt City Council could see a larger loss of life in a natural hazard event.</li> <li>Lower Hutt has special character areas that are not fully recognised. By allowing the random destruction of houses to allow for intensification, part of this district's history will be lost.</li> </ul>
97.2	Natural hazards	Amend	Amend the rules to not allow any intensification in Coastal Hazard Areas.	
97.3	Natural hazards	Amend	Amend the rules to not allow any intensification within 1km of a fault line.	
97.4	Heritage	Amend	Amend the rules to extend the existing heritage precincts.	

<b>DPC56/098 Johnston Dinsmore</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
98.1	Heritage	Amend	Exclude Queen Street, Buick Street and Bolton Street from the Heritage Precinct Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the past decades, the owners of the remaining 46 original houses on Queen Street have been preserving the historical qualities of their homes and the look of the street.</li> <li>• No reason to include Queen Street in the Heritage Precinct Area, as protection is already being done by the residents.</li> <li>• Buick Street should not be included in the proposed heritage area.</li> <li>• Even though some of the houses on Queen Street are original from the 1900's, the entire street should not be included in the heritage area as this will impose constraints on houses which do not have heritage qualities to protect.</li> <li>• Additional costs are associated with a house located in the heritage precinct area – insurance, repairs, etc. House is also more likely to sell below value.</li> <li>• Many people living in this area cannot afford the extra costs, as the price of living has already increased significantly putting many households in a tough position.</li> </ul>
98.2	Heritage	Amend	Consider Heritage Precinct rules for King Street and Beach Street, and Bay Street and Richmond Street up to Nelson Street.	
98.3	Density	Amend	In Petone, restrict building height to one level and one unit per site for any new development, including extensions to existing properties at one level.	

<b>DPC56/099 Caroline Patterson</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment / Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Decision requested by submitter</b>	<b>Submitter's reasons for decision requested</b>
99.1	Medium density housing in Wainuiomata	Amend	The submitter requests that they are invited to meetings that are held around intensification and	Regarding 112 Upper Fitzherbert Road:

			ultimately that the property at 112 Upper Fitzherbert Road is rezoned to residential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter does not oppose the proposed medium density intensification of the area as they recognise the need for more housing in Lower Hutt.</li> <li>• However, development on sites adjoining 112 Upper Fitzherbert Road would impact the property, which is rural (with horses, sheep and chickens which do not mix with a higher volume of dogs, noise fireworks etc).</li> <li>• The submitter proposes that their property at 112 Upper Fitzherbert Road is rezoned to residential so that the property is available for development for future housing.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	--

DPC56/100 Frank Vickers				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
100.1	Density	Oppose	Do not allow three units per site and three-storey development in residential areas without requiring resource consent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This blanket rule is far too blunt an instrument, and the unforeseen consequences have not been sufficiently evaluated.</li> </ul>

## Addresses for Service – Proposed District Plan Change 56

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



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

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	<a href="mailto:gmos@yahoo.com">gmos@yahoo.com</a>
DPC56/053	Jo Wilkshire	<a href="mailto:wilkshires@xtra.co.nz">wilkshires@xtra.co.nz</a>
DPC56/054	Henry Zwart	<a href="mailto:henrybzwart@gmail.com">henrybzwart@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/055	Peggy Maurirere	<a href="mailto:pegmaca@xtra.co.nz">pegmaca@xtra.co.nz</a>
DPC56/056	Bill Magan	<a href="mailto:bmagan17@gmail.com">bmagan17@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/057	Bruce Spedding	<a href="mailto:winzurf@gmail.com">winzurf@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/058	Bernard Gresham	<a href="mailto:gresham@xtra.co.nz">gresham@xtra.co.nz</a>
DPC56/059	Brian Herron	<a href="mailto:brianherron100@yahoo.co.nz">brianherron100@yahoo.co.nz</a>
DPC56/060	Carolyn Hamer	<a href="mailto:carolynahamer@gmail.com">carolynahamer@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/061	Byron Cummins	<a href="mailto:byron@howardmaterialhandling.co.nz">byron@howardmaterialhandling.co.nz</a>
DPC56/062	Olive Tupuivao	<a href="mailto:oliviaturpuivao@gmail.com">oliviaturpuivao@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/063	Shayne Hodge	<a href="mailto:shayne@thehodgegroup.co.nz">shayne@thehodgegroup.co.nz</a>
DPC56/064	Bruce Patchett	<a href="mailto:brucegwen@xtra.co.nz">brucegwen@xtra.co.nz</a>
DPC56/065	Debbie Molloy	<a href="mailto:dbb.molloy@gmail.com">dbb.molloy@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/066	John Sellars	<a href="mailto:johnsellars@xtra.co.nz">johnsellars@xtra.co.nz</a>
DPC56/067	Brenda Ralton	<a href="mailto:brendaralton@icloud.com">brendaralton@icloud.com</a>
DPC56/068	Spencer Logan Valuations Ltd	<a href="mailto:admin@spencerlogan.co.nz">admin@spencerlogan.co.nz</a>
DPC56/069	Dianne Ingham	<a href="mailto:di@3days.co.nz">di@3days.co.nz</a>
DPC56/070	Anastay Papadopoulos	<a href="mailto:tas.papadopoulos@gmail.com">tas.papadopoulos@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/071	Ernest and Gwendoline Haley	<a href="mailto:e.haleymarks@xtra.co.nz">e.haleymarks@xtra.co.nz</a>
DPC56/072	Edwin Lancashire	<a href="mailto:piano.tuner@xtra.co.nz">piano.tuner@xtra.co.nz</a>
DPC56/073	Richard Steel	<a href="mailto:Rjsteel72@gmail.com">Rjsteel72@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/074	Brendan Murphy	<a href="mailto:murphyfm@xtra.co.nz">murphyfm@xtra.co.nz</a>
DPC56/075	Kerry Gray	<a href="mailto:usgrays@outlook.com">usgrays@outlook.com</a>

DPC56/076	Monica Murphy	<a href="mailto:murphyfm@xtra.co.nz">murphyfm@xtra.co.nz</a>
DPC56/077	Ana Coculescu	<a href="mailto:a.coculescu@gmail.com">a.coculescu@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/078	Lorraine Kaluza	<a href="mailto:lkwgtn@gmail.com">lkwgtn@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/079	Katy and Wayne Donnelly	<a href="mailto:waynedonnelly@xtra.co.nz">waynedonnelly@xtra.co.nz</a>
DPC56/080	James Scott	<a href="mailto:mjcjscott@slingshot.co.nz">mjcjscott@slingshot.co.nz</a>
DPC56/081	David Smith	<a href="mailto:davidlfsmith54@gmail.com">davidlfsmith54@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/082	Steve Shaw	<a href="mailto:ackpotsteve57@gmail.com">ackpotsteve57@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/083	Peter and Katherine Kokich	<a href="mailto:kp.kokich@gmail.com">kp.kokich@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/084	Andrew Edgar	<a href="mailto:Andy.Edgar519@gmail.com">Andy.Edgar519@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/085	Andy Bogacki	<a href="mailto:andybogacki@bogacki.co.nz">andybogacki@bogacki.co.nz</a>
DPC56/086	Ian McLauchlan	<a href="mailto:ian.mclauchlan@gibbonsheat.com">ian.mclauchlan@gibbonsheat.com</a>
DPC56/087	Eve Bao	<a href="mailto:evebao@live.com">evebao@live.com</a>
DPC56/088	Christina Meyer	<a href="mailto:tinawyse1964@gmail.com">tinawyse1964@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/089	Steve Leitch	<a href="mailto:biggins@xtra.co.nz">biggins@xtra.co.nz</a>
DPC56/090	Peter Healy	<a href="mailto:peterhughhealy@gmail.com">peterhughhealy@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/091	Persephone Meads and Justin and Kate Meads	<a href="mailto:jkmeadsfamily@gmail.com">jkmeadsfamily@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/092	Andrew Newman	<a href="mailto:andy_mellon_uk@yahoo.com">andy_mellon_uk@yahoo.com</a>
DPC56/093	John Hosegood	<a href="mailto:hosegood@outlook.co.nz">hosegood@outlook.co.nz</a>
DPC56/094	Juan Qu	<a href="mailto:quju6463@yahoo.com">quju6463@yahoo.com</a>
DPC56/095	Janet Pike	<a href="mailto:Janet.Pike@cableprice.co.nz">Janet.Pike@cableprice.co.nz</a>
DPC56/096	Kate Harray	<a href="mailto:kate.harray@xtra.co.nz">kate.harray@xtra.co.nz</a>
DPC56/097	Malcolm Lewis	<a href="mailto:malcolmlewis978@gmail.com">malcolmlewis978@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/098	Johnston Dinsmore	<a href="mailto:edwardjohnsmore@gmail.com">edwardjohnsmore@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/099	Caroline Patterson	<a href="mailto:Caroline.patterson@effem.com">Caroline.patterson@effem.com</a>
DPC56/100	Frank Vickers	<a href="mailto:153.vickers@gmail.com">153.vickers@gmail.com</a>
DPC56/101	Colin and Margaret Clarke	<a href="mailto:candmclarke@xtra.co.nz">candmclarke@xtra.co.nz</a>

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

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

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

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

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



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

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