

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991
AND
IN THE MATTER of Submissions and Further Submissions
on the Proposed Hutt City District Plan

Minute 13

Proposed District Plan – Hearing Stream 3 – Further Information

17 August 2026

Introduction

1. The Hutt City Council (HCC) Proposed District Plan (PDP) Hearings for Hearing Stream 3 were held on 22, 23 and 25 June 2026. This Minute addresses two sets of matters arising from our deliberations on the evidence and materials provided to us at, and subsequent to, the hearing.

Council reply to evidence presented on behalf of Go Architecture by Paula Clarke

2. Firstly, the hearing on 23 June included the presentation of a statement of evidence by Ms Paula Clarke who runs Go Architecture, an architectural practice based in the Hutt Valley. Ms Clarke addressed the Panel with respect to her practice's submission. Go Architecture had originally submitted on a series of PDP standards, as to their reasonableness and workability.
3. The main focus of Ms Clarke's presentation at the hearing was on Standards MRZ-S10/HRZ-S10 to which, at that stage, the Council reporting officer (Ms Pascal) had not recommended any amendments. Ms Clarke was concerned that the standards, which would apply glazing controls on façades of residential units oriented to the street, were too broad, ill-defined and onerous, particularly where modest renovations to existing buildings were proposed. To remedy this, she proposed a limitation of the application of the rule only to new buildings, or new parts of buildings.
4. At the hearing we asked Ms Pascal to address these matters in her reply statement, and followed this request up in Minute 8 issued on 2 July 2026. Ms Pascall did so in her reply statement dated 17 July 2026, with reference to additional commentary from an urban design perspective from Ms Moore in her own reply statement, dated the same day.
5. Having considered Ms Clarke's and Ms Moore's evidence, Ms. Pascall agreed that it was unreasonable to apply this standard to the existing parts of the dwelling where glazing may already be non-compliant and concluded that it was reasonable to exclude existing residential units from the 20% glazing requirement and only apply the standard to additions/extensions that have a street-facing façade. She further indicated that the resulting amendments that she proposed with respect to Standards MRZ-S10/HRZ-S10 were

achievable in the context of the limitation imposed by the Medium Density Residential Standards as they were more (and not less) enabling.

6. We thank Ms Pascall for her considered reply. However, we note that Ms Clarke also raised a number of other points in relation to Standards MRZ-S10/HRZ-S10 and to other standards in the PDP that we would appreciate a specific response to from Council reporting officers as to whether they consider any additional amendments may be required (on the assumption that they agree further changes are warranted and there is scope in submissions to do so).
7. These matters are as follows:
 - a. Ms Clarke alludes to what she saw as a vagueness where the application of Standards MRZ-S10/HRZ-S10 to residential units ‘facing the street’ were concerned (paragraph 3.47 in her speaking notes). She gave the example of units located in hill suburbs and positioned well below street level, or in other areas on rear sites with no street frontage, suggesting that it would be inappropriate to apply the standards in such circumstances. In her reply statement, Ms Moore (urban design) considers that the standard is sufficiently clear and uses wording similar to that employed in other district plans. With respect, we are not convinced that it is clear on its face and we would encourage Ms Pascal and Ms Moore to consider whether further amendments are warranted to appropriate limit its scope and avoid its application to new dwellings in the scenarios Ms Clarke illustrates (e.g., along the lines of “... *facing the street, with a direct view of the street* ...”).
 - b. Ms Clarke also suggested a further amendment to Standard LLRZ-S1 to change the reference to ‘gross floor area’ to ‘internal floor area’ to align the National Environmental Standards for Detached Minor Residential Units (paragraphs 2.3 and 6.3 in her speaking notes). Does Ms Pascal agree that an amendment to Standard LLRZ-S1 is warranted and, if so, can she please confer with Mr Bellamy and Mr Horrell (the Council reporting officers for the Rural topic) as to whether any consequential amendments required to other PDP provisions (e.g. Rules GRUZ-R6, RLZ-R7)?

- c. Ms Clarke is concerned about the implications of the definition for *'building footprint'* and considers an exclusion for eaves of up to 600mm should be provided for (paragraphs 3.1 to 3.5 in her speaking notes). Does Ms Pascal agree that Ms Clarke has raised a valid issue and, if so, what amendments would she recommend?
- d. Ms Pascall recommended some amendments to Standard HRZ-S8 to address Ms Clarke's points. We would ask Ms Pascall to confer with Mr Davis (the Council reporting officer for the Business topic) as to whether consequential amendments to Standards MCZ-S9/NCZ-S9/LCZ-S9 are warranted, as Ms Clarke suggests (paragraph 7.1 in her speaking notes).

Map relating to recommended extension of Silverstream Retreat Precinct

- 8. Secondly, Ms Pascal recommended in her rebuttal evidence that the Silverstream Retreat Precinct be extended to align with the site boundary on the northern boundary of the site adjacent to Reynolds Bach Drive, in response to the submission, and evidence presented on behalf of the submission by the Silverstream Park Christian Centre.
- 9. We would ask Ms Pascall to provide a map clearly illustrating the extent of the extension she recommends (the map that the submitter provided in evidence and that she referred to was insufficiently clear, for our purposes).

Timing

- 10. It would be appreciated if Ms Pascall's right of reply on the matters covered in Minute 11 that we are anticipating receiving on Friday, 21 August 2026, could additionally address the above matters.

DJ McMahon

Independent Commissioner

Deputy Chair Hutt City Proposed District Plan Hearing Panel

17 August 2026