

Further Submission for the Proposed District Plan

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

Privacy Statement

Your further submission must include your name, and an address for service (preferably email, but you can use a postal address). All information you include in this further submission, including your name and address for service, will be provided to other submitters and published on Hutt City Council's website. Paper copies may also be made available. Hutt City Council is required to collect and publish this information to carry out its functions under the Resource Management Act 1991 and to enable others to take part in the district plan process. The Council, other submitters, and the Environment Court may need to contact you during this process.

If your further submission does not include your name and an address for service, it will be rejected.

While the Council will retain all information provided in your further submission in secure council systems, all contact details will be removed from any documents published on Council's website once the district plan process is complete. However, your name and the contents of your further submission will still appear in these documents.

You have the right to ask for a copy of any personal information we hold about you, and to ask for it to be corrected if you think it is wrong. If you'd like to ask for a copy of your information, or to have it corrected, please contact us at contact@huttcity.govt.nz, call 04-570-6666, or write to us at Private Bag 31912, Lower Hutt 5040.

To: Chief Executive, Hutt City Council

1. This is a further submission from:

Full Name	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; display: flex; justify-content: space-between; padding: 2px 5px;"> Last First </div>	
Company/Organisation	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>	
Contact if different	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>	
Address	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; display: flex; justify-content: space-between; padding: 2px 5px;"> Number Street </div>	
	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;"> Suburb </div>	
	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; display: flex; justify-content: space-between; padding: 2px 5px;"> City Postcode </div>	
Address for Service if different	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;"> Postal Address </div>	
Phone	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; display: flex; justify-content: space-between; padding: 2px 5px;"> Home Work </div>	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;"> Mobile </div>
Email	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>	

2. This is a **further submission** in support of or opposition to a submission on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan.

3. I consider that, under Clause 8 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act, I may make a further submission because:

I represent a relevant aspect of the public interest

Please give details:

I have an interest in the Proposed Plan Change that is greater than the interest of the general public

Please give details:

I represent Hutt City Council

4. I support or oppose the submission of:

Name and address of original submitter and submission number of original submission:

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

5. The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

6. The reasons for my support or opposition are:

Please give reasons:

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

7. I seek that the whole or part [*describe part*] of the submission be allowed or disallowed:

Please give precise details:

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

8. I **wish** **do not wish** to be heard in support of my submission

(Please tick one)

9. If others make a similar submission,

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

(Please tick one)

Signature of submitter

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

	<i>Date</i>
--	-------------

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

To: Hutt City Council (“Council”)
district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz

Date: 22 July 2025

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Submitter Name: Foodstuffs North Island Limited

Submitter No. 239

Address for Service: Barker & Associates Ltd
Attn Ashleigh Wharam / Matt Norwell
Level 2, 60 Cuba Street,
Te Aro, Wellington 6011

Email: AshleighW@barker.co.nz / MattN@barker.co.nz

IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLAUSE 8(1) OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE OF THE RMA

Foodstuffs North Island Limited have an interest in the proposed district plan greater than the interest that the general public has because the submitter currently operates five stores within the Hutt City district and the submitter’s long-term aspiration is for further expansion opportunities to serve growing communities.

ATTENDANCE AT COUNCIL HEARING

Foodstuffs North Island Limited wishes to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of our submission.

If others make a submission, Foodstuffs North Island Limited will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Person authorised to sign on behalf of Foodstuffs North Island Limited.



Matt Norwell

Director

Foodstuffs North Island (FSNI) Further Submission

Submitter		Their Submission				FSNI Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.1d	Definitions	Amend	Seeks that activities are organised using a nesting table. Would provide a logical method for organising different land use activities in a broader term	Seeks amendment to include nesting table for definitions.	Support	Supports FSNI submission (239.06) to create a nesting table within the definitions.	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.2b	TR-Transport	Amend	Considers the plan should include recognition of operational and functional needs recognises that restaurants should be supported for the positive contribution they make to the viability and function of centres.	Amend matters of discretion in rule as follows: "Matters of discretion are restricted to: ... <u>3. The operational and functional needs of the activity to exceed the high trip generation threshold.</u> 4. Effects on the capacity, safety, efficiency, and multi-modal function of the transport network. 45. Whether safe and effective access can be provided and maintained for emergency service vehicles to the site and within the transport network. 56. The design of transport facilities and their integration with the transport network. 67. Whether any improvements to the transport network are proposed or required as a <u>direct</u> result of the <u>proposed</u> activity, and a financial contribution has been made in accordance with the provisions of the Financial Contributions chapter. ..."	Support	Supports FSNI submission (239.07) to recognise the operational and function need of the HTGA in the matters of discretion.	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.6	EW-Earthworks	Amend	Considers the 500m ² limit does not reflect the generally larger scale of sites and required earthworks to enable commercial and industrial activities and	Amend clause (2) of the rule as follows: "2. The area of earthworks must not exceed 2500m² <u>500m²</u> per site in any 12-month period."	Support	Supports with FSNI submission 239.10	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.7	FC-Financial Contributions	Oppose	Considers chapter does not provide sufficient guidance as to how/when Financial Contributions would be required by Council. Has potential to disincentivise development. Is in direct conflict with s108(10)(b) of the RMA as the level of contribution is not clearly determined in the PDP.	Seeks that the FC chapter is reconsidered "to reduce discretion and provide clearer guidance for council and developers."	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.11	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.10a	CCZ-City Centre Zone CCZ-P3	Oppose in part	Policy seeks to protect adverse effects on amenity and vitality therefore if the car parking is not visible then this policy should not apply. Drive-through activities seek to provide on-site parking, this policy would deter development in commercial zones.	Amend policy as follows: "2. Potentially incompatible activities include: ... f. Carparking at ground level <u>visible at the street edge or public space</u> on sites subject to the Active Street Frontage Overlay; and ..."	Support in part	Aligns with FSNI submission 239.12 which If carparking not visible no effect on visual amenity, will deter development in zone for supermarkets that seek to provide onsite customer parking	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				FSNI Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.13a	CCZ-City Centre Zone CCZ-R18 (carparking activities)	Oppose in part	Rule as notified does not make it clear whether the reconfiguration of an existing carpark requires resource consent.	Amend rule as follows: "1. Activity status: Permitted Where: ... <u>d. The carparking is related to the reconfiguration of an existing carpark area; or</u> <u>e. The parking spaces are for accessible parking or electric vehicle charging."</u>	Support	239.27	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.14a	CCZ-City Centre Zone CCZ-S4 (Active frontages – Buildings and structures)	Oppose in part	The submission acknowledges intent of active street frontage controls; however they do not appropriately recognise existing development. Frontage controls are very onerous for existing buildings and would result in unreasonable resource consent requirements	Amend standard as follows: "On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay, or in the Riverbank Precinct and with a riverbank frontage: 1. <u>For any new building or redevelopment of the site, there must be a building or abutting group of buildings built to the front boundary, to the full width of the Active Street Frontage Overlay, and to any riverbank frontages, to a minimum height of 4m above:</u> ... 2. Alternatively, the <u>new</u> buildings or parts of buildings may be set back from the front boundary or riverbank frontage by up to 2m where: ... 4. The <u>Any new</u> buildings must not have a featureless façade on the front boundary of more than 3 <u>4</u> m in width at any part of the building between 0.5m and 2.5m in height above footpath level <u>and roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building on the front boundary must be at least 50% visually transparent.</u> ... 7. The <u>Any</u> new building must have the principal public entrance on: ... 9. Roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building on the front boundary must be at least 50% visually transparent."	Support	Supports FSNI Submission 239.17	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				FSNI Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.14b	CCZ-City Centre Zone CCZ-S5 (Active frontages – Required verandahs)	Oppose in part	The submission acknowledges intent of active street frontage controls; however they do not appropriately recognise existing development. Frontage controls are very onerous for existing buildings and would result in unreasonable resource consent requirements	Amend standard as follows: "1. Where any building is constructed, added to, or altered on a site with a frontage in the Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B, it must provide a verandah or canopy in legal road along the length of the Active Street Frontage Overlay that: ..."	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.18	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.16a	CCZ-City Centre Zone CCZ-S8 (Location and design of carparking)	Oppose in part	Does not recognise the specific operational and functional requirement of activities, such as restaurants in particular, which have loading requirements as part of their store formats that are usually located at the rear of buildings with the main entrance then located at the front of the building. This restricts the opportunity to provide parking at the rear of the building to comply with these standards while creating functional site layouts.	Amend standard as follows: "On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B: 1. Carparking must only be located: ... c. shielded from the Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B by a building, <u>or</u> d. <u>otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space.</u> 2. Carparking may not be served by a <u>new</u> vehicle crossing across an Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B. On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay C: 3. Carparking must only be located within or underneath a building, on top of a building at least 3 metres above ground level, beside a building accounting for no more than 50% of the width of the site, or behind a building, <u>or otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space.</u> ..."	Support	Aligns with FSNI submission 239.31	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.10b	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-P3 (Potentially incompatible activities)	- Oppose in part	Policy seeks to protect adverse effects on amenity and vitality therefore if the car parking is not visible then this policy should not apply. Drive-through activities seek to provide on-site parking, this policy would deter development in commercial zones.	Amend policy as follows: "2. Potentially incompatible activities include: ... f. Carparking at ground level <u>visible at the street edge or public space</u> on sites subject to the Active Street Frontage Overlay; and ..."	Support in part	Aligns with FSNI submission (239.13) to recognise that if the car parking is not visible then Policy MCZ-P3 should not apply.	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.13b	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone	- Oppose in part	Rule as notified does not make it clear whether the reconfiguration of an existing carpark requires resource consent.	Amend rule as follows: "1. Activity status: Permitted Where: ..."		Aligns with FSNI submission (239.28) that seeks to provide for reconfiguration of an existing carpark, accessible parking and	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				FSNI Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
		MCZ-R18 (Carparking activities)			d. <u>The carparking is related to the reconfiguration of an existing carpark area; or</u> e. <u>The parking spaces are for accessible parking or electric vehicle charging.</u>		electric vehicle charging spaces as permitted activities.	
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.15a	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S4 (Active frontages - Buildings and structures)	Oppose in part		Amend standard as follows: "On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay, <u>any new buildings shall provide the following:</u> ... 3. The buildings must not have a featureless façade on the front boundary of more than 3-4 m in width at any part of the building between 0.5m and 2.5m in height above footpath level <u>and roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building on the front boundary must be at least 50% visually transparent.</u> ... 6. The <u>Any new</u> building must have the principal public entrance on: ... 7. Roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building on the front boundary must be at least 50% visually transparent.	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.19	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.15c	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S5 (Active frontages - Required verandahs)	Oppose in part		Amend standard as follows: "Where any building is constructed, added to, or altered on a site with a frontage in the Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B, it must provide a verandah or canopy in legal road along the length of the Active Street Frontage Overlay that: ..."	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.20	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.16b	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S8 (Location and design of carparking)	Oppose in part	Does not recognise the specific operational and functional requirement of activities, such as restaurants in particular, which have loading requirements as part of their store formats that are usually located at the rear of buildings with the main entrance then located at the front of the building. This restricts the opportunity to provide parking at the rear of the building to comply with these standards while creating functional site layouts.	Amend standard as follows: "On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B: 1. Carparking must only be located: ... c. shielded from the Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B by a building, <u>or</u> d. <u>otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space.</u>	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.32	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				FSNI Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
					<p>2. Carparking may not be served by a <u>new</u> vehicle crossing across an Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B.</p> <p>On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay C:</p> <p>3. Carparking must only be located within or underneath a building, on top of a building at least 3 metres above ground level, beside a building accounting for no more than 50% of the width of the site, or behind a building, <u>or otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space.</u></p> <p>..."</p>			
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.13c	LCZ - Local Centre Zone LCZ-R13 (Carparking activities)	Oppose in part	Rule as notified does not make it clear whether the reconfiguration of an existing carpark requires resource consent. Refer to original submission for full reasons.	<p>Amend rule as follows:</p> <p>"1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>4. The carparking is related to the reconfiguration of an existing carpark area; or</u></p> <p><u>5. The parking spaces are for accessible parking or electric vehicle charging."</u></p>	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.29	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.15b	LCZ - Local Centre Zone LCZ-S4 (Active frontages – Buildings and structures)	Oppose in part		<p>Amend standard as follows:</p> <p>"On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay, <u>any new buildings shall provide the following:</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>3. The buildings must not have a featureless façade on the front boundary of more than 3-4 m in width at any part of the building between 0.5m and 2.5m in height above footpath level <u>and roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building on the front boundary must be at least 50% visually transparent.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>6. The <u>Any new</u> building must have the principal public entrance on:</p> <p>...</p> <p>7. Roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building on the front <u>boundary must be at least 50% visually transparent.</u></p>	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.21	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				FSNI Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.15d	LCZ - Local Centre Zone LCZ-S5 (Active frontages – Required verandahs)	Oppose in part		Amend standard as follows: "Where any building is constructed, added to, or altered on a site with a frontage in the Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B, it must provide a verandah or canopy in legal road along the length of the Active Street Frontage Overlay that: ..."	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.22	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.16c	LCZ - Local Centre Zone LCZ-S8 (Location and design of carparking)	Oppose in part	Does not recognise the specific operational and functional requirement of activities, such as restaurants in particular, which have loading requirements as part of their store formats that are usually located at the rear of buildings with the main entrance then located at the front of the building. This restricts the opportunity to provide parking at the rear of the building to comply with these standards while creating functional site layouts.	Amend standard as follows: "On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B: 1. Carparking must only be located: ... c. shielded from the Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B by a building, <u>or</u> d. <u>otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space.</u> 2. Carparking may not be served by <u>a new</u> vehicle crossing across an Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B. On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay C: 3. Carparking must only be located within or underneath a building, on top of a building at least 3 metres above ground level, beside a building accounting for no more than 50% of the width of the site, or behind a building, <u>or otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space.</u> ..."	Support	Supports FSNI submission (239.33) which considers that these rules do not recognise the specific operational and functional requirement of activities, such as supermarkets in particular, which have integral back-of-house and loading requirements as part of their store formats that are usually located at the rear of buildings with the main entrance then located at the front of the building.	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.13d	NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone NCZ-R13 (Carparking activities)	Oppose in part	Rule as notified does not make it clear whether the reconfiguration of an existing carpark requires resource consent. Refer to original submission for full reasons.	Amend rule as follows: "1. Activity status: Permitted Where: ... d. <u>The carparking is related to the reconfiguration of an existing carpark area; or</u> e. <u>The parking spaces are for accessible parking or electric vehicle charging.</u> "	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.30	Allow submission
Bunnings Ltd	173.2	TR – Transport TR-R3.2	Oppose in part	Does not oppose provision in its entirety, as it relates to the Metropolitan Centre Zone, but seeks to ensure that the matters of discretion are appropriate, include recognition of operational and functional needs thereby recognising that trade supply retail should be supported	Amend the matters of discretion under TR-R3.2 as follows: Matters of discretion are restricted to:	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.07	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				FSNI Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
				for the positive contribution they make to the viability and function of these centres. Opposes reference to a financial contribution within the matters of discretion for the reasons detailed in Part 2 below (refer to original submission for full reasons)	1. The extent that the development provides for active and public transport modes. 2. Positive effects on facilitating the uptake of active and public transport modes where in relation to any matter specified in TRP7: Positive effects. <u>3. The operational and functional needs of the activity to exceed the high trip generation threshold.</u> 4. Effects on the capacity, safety, efficiency, and multi-modal function of the transport network. 5. Whether safe and effective access can be provided and maintained for emergency service vehicles to the site and within the transport network. 6. The design of transport facilities and their integration with the transport network. 7. Whether any improvements to the transport network are proposed or required as a <u>direct</u> result of the <u>proposed</u> activity, and a financial contribution has been made in accordance with the provisions of the Financial Contributions chapter. 8. The transport needs of activities on the site. 9. Any cumulative adverse effects.			
Bunnings Ltd	173.4	EW – Earthworks EW-S1.2	Oppose in part	Limit does not reflect the generally larger scale of sites and required earthworks to enable commercial and industrial activities.	Amend EW-S1.2 as follows for Commercial and industrial Zones: 1. The area of earthworks must not exceed <u>3000m²</u> 500m² per site in any 12-month period.	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.10	Allow submission
Bunnings Ltd	173.5	FC - Financial Contributions	Oppose	Consider that the Financial Contributions chapter does not provide sufficient guidance as to how/when Financial Contributions would be required by Council. This leaves the discretion to Council and has the potential to disincentivise development.	Seeks reconsideration of Financial Contributions chapter to reduce discretion and provide clearer guidance for council and developers.	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.11	Allow submission
Bunnings Ltd	173.6	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-P3 (Potentially incompatible activities)	Oppose in part	Opposed to all ground level car parking (on sites subject to Active Street Frontage Overlay) being considered as a potentially incompatible activity in the Metropolitan Centre Zone. The policy seeks to protect adverse effects on amenity and vitality therefore if the car parking is not visible then this policy should not apply. Trade supply retail activities generally seek to provide on-site customer car parking. This policy will act as a deterrent to development in these commercial zones.	Amend MCZ-P3 is as follows: Carparking at ground level <u>visible at the street edge or public space</u> on sites subject to the Active Street Frontage Overlay;	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.13	Allow submission
Bunnings Ltd	173.7	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone	Oppose in part	Opposes the rules pertaining to carparking activities which does not make it clear whether the reconfiguration of an existing carpark requires resource consent.	Amend MCZ-R18 as follows:	Support	Support FSNI submission 239.28	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				FSNI Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
		MCZ-R18 (Carparking activities)		Reconfiguration of an existing carpark within the same area of the site, including where that reconfiguration results in a change to the type and/or number of parking or loading spaces provided should not need consent. Further, accessible parking should be provided for as a permitted activity	1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with: i. CCZ-S6: Active frontages – Existing vehicle crossings, ii. CCZ-S8: Location and design of carparking, b. The carparking is not accessed with a vehicle crossing over an Active Street Frontage Overlay B, and c. The carparking is not accessed with a vehicle crossing over an Active Street Frontage Overlay A; or <u>d. Reconfiguration of an existing carpark area; or</u> <u>e. The parking spaces are for accessible parking or electric vehicle charging.</u>			
Bunnings Ltd	173.8a	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S4 (Active frontages - Buildings and structures)	Oppose in part	Recognises the intent of the active street frontage controls but considers that they do not appropriately recognise existing development. It is considered that these controls should apply to new buildings and new development only and the requirements should be adjusted such that they do not apply in the case of small change/addition to a building/site but rather only in a substantial redevelopment of a site. In Bunnings experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity.	CZ-S4 as follows: On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay, <u>any new buildings shall provide the following:</u> ... 3. The buildings must not have a featureless façade on the front boundary of more than 3.4 m in width at any part of the building between 0.5m and 2.5m in height above footpath level <u>and roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building on the front boundary must be at least 50% visually transparent.</u> 6. The Any new building must have the principal public entrance on: a. An Active Street Frontage Overlay A frontage, if any, b. Otherwise, an Active Street Frontage Overlay B frontage, if any, c. Otherwise, an Active Street Frontage Overlay C frontage. 7. Roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building on the front boundary must be at least 50% visually transparent.	Support	Support FSNI submission 239.19	Allow submission
Bunnings Ltd	173.8b	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S5 (Active frontages - required verandahs)	Oppose in part	Recognises the intent of the active street frontage controls but considers that they do not appropriately recognise existing development. It is considered that these controls should apply to new buildings and new development only and the requirements should be adjusted such that they do not apply in the case of small change/addition to a building/site but rather only in a substantial redevelopment of a site. In Bunnings experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies.	Amend MCZ-S5 as follows: 1. Where any building is constructed, added to, or altered on a site with a frontage in the Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B, it must provide a verandah or canopy in legal road along the length of the Active Street Frontage Overlay that:	Support	Support FSNI submission 239.20	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				FSNI Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
				Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity.				
Bunnings Ltd	173.9	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S8 (Location and design of carparking)	Oppose in part	Opposes the standards pertaining to carparking activities and the location of parking which requires the provision of on-site car parking to be located within, underneath, on top of, or at the rear of the building which it serves. These rules do not recognise the specific operational and functional requirement of activities, such as trade supply retail, which have integral back-of-house and loading requirements as part of their store formats that are usually located at the rear of buildings with the main entrance then located at the front of the building. This restricts the opportunity to provide parking at the rear of the building to comply with these standards while creating functional site layouts. Bunnings considers that if the car parking is not visible then this should be a permitted activity.	Amend MCZ-S8 as follows: On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B: 1. Carparking must only be located: a. within or underneath a building, or b. on top of a building at least 3m above ground level, or c. shielded from the Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B by a building, or <u>d. otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space.</u> 2. Carparking may not be served by a <u>new</u> vehicle crossing across an Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B. On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay C: 3. Carparking must only be located within or underneath a building, on top of a building at least 3 metres above ground level, beside a building accounting for no more than 50% of the width of the site, or behind a building, <u>or otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space</u>	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.32	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.16	SIGN – Signs SIGN-S2 (Combined area of signs per site)	Oppose in part	Based on the area that is permitted per site, this combined total area is too low. Is likely to be exceeded by a single sign. Large format retail with multiple frontages often have signage on multiple facades. Modest additional signage is likely to require consent	Amend as follows: ".... (2). The maximum total area of signs per site (other than official signs, temporary signs and election signs) is 20 70m ²"	Support	FSNI agrees that the limit on signage is low and would likely require consent for any supermarket activity signage.	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.1b	CCZ - City Centre Zone	Oppose in part	Purpose of zone and activities provided for, conflicts with planned character and built form, listed incompatible activities and Standards Challenging to see how permitted activities such as supermarkets could feasibly develop or redevelop within parameters of Standards Objectives and policies do not recognise functional realities of some activities, thereby consent pathway will be challenging.	Seeks reconsideration of the CCZ framework to achieve greater alignment and support of permitted activities. (Refer to original submission).	Support	This submission point generally aligns with FSNI's submission.	Allow submission
Woolworths New	271.2	CCZ - City Centre Zone	Oppose in part	Policy identifies ground-level car parking as a potentially incompatible activity within the Active Street Frontage Overlay. Carparking is a standalone activity even when	Amend the policy direction to recognise the functional realities of activities that are best located in the City Centre Zone.	Support	Supports FSNI submission 239.12	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				FSNI Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
Zealand Limited		CCZ-P3 (Potentially incompatible activities)		ancillary to an otherwise permitted activity This suggests the zone is only supportive of part of a land use and not those components (carparking) which allow it function Heavy focus in policy on urban design outcomes For permitted land use activities which rely on car parking to function, difficult to achieve alignment.				
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.4	CCZ - City Centre Zone CCZ-R4 (Alterations and additions to existing buildings and structures)	Oppose in part	Potential for alterations to require consent, due to existing building design not complying with Active Frontage Controls, even if alteration not modifying external building form	Amend provision to create a separate permitted activity rule for 'alterations', or Amend provision so that 'alterations' are only required to achieve compliance with criteria CCZ-R4(b) and (c).	Support	This supports the points raised in FSNI submission regarding the application of Active Frontage controls to existing development.	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.8	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-P3 (Potentially incompatible activities)	Oppose in part	Policy identifies ground-level car parking as a potentially incompatible activity within the Active Street Frontage Overlay. Carparking is a standalone activity even when ancillary to an otherwise permitted activity This suggests the zone is only supportive of part of a land use and not those components (carparking) which allow it function Heavy focus in policy on urban design outcomes For permitted land use activities which rely on car parking to function, difficult to achieve alignment.	Amend the policy direction to recognise the functional realities of activities that are located in the Metropolitan Centre Zone and serve the community	Support	Aligns with FSNI submission 239.13	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.9	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-P4 (Likely incompatible activities)	Oppose in part	Where an existing vehicle crossing in the overlay, is the only crossing serving an activity, should be able to retained without being considered incompatible. Other objectives and policies are strong enough to achieve purpose without total removal of existing environment	Amend policy to exclude existing vehicle crossings on Active Street Frontage Overlay B, from being likely incompatible.	Support	This supports the points raised in FSNI submission regarding the application of Active Frontage controls to existing development.	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.10	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-R4 (Alterations and additions to existing buildings and structures)	Oppose in part	Potential for alterations to require consent, due to existing building design not complying with Active Frontage Controls, even if alteration not modifying external building form	Amend provision to create a separate permitted activity rule for 'alterations', or Amend provision so that 'alterations' are only required to achieve compliance with criteria MCZ-R4(b) and (c)	Support	This supports the points raised in FSNI submission regarding the application of Active Frontage controls to existing development.	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.15	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S6 (Active frontages)		As notified, the Standard does not provide for development in Active Frontage Overlay A or B, unless existing vehicle crossings are removed. Non-compliance likely even for modest development not related to vehicle access. Overly restrictive for established land uses	Amend standard to include an exception that this standard not apply to an existing access where it is the only public vehicle access to the site.	Support	This supports the points raised in FSNI submission regarding the application of Active Frontage controls to existing development.	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				FSNI Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
		Existing vehicle crossings)		Reference in discretion matter #5 about closing crossings has no supporting context in chapter overview, objectives or policies, unclear if means temporary or permanent closure. Closing public access to existing land uses	Amend matters of discretion as follows: "Matters of discretion if the standard is breached: ... 5. Effects on the current or potential future ability of the road to be closed to general motor vehicle traffic. ..."			