

**Hutt City Proposed District Plan**  
**Hearing Stream 3 – Residential Zones**  
**(Hearing Stream 3)**

**Hearing Summary Statement**

**Kate Pascall**

---

1. My name is Kate Pascall. I am a Principal Planner at Boffa Miskell Limited and I have been engaged by Hutt City Council as the reporting officer for the Residential Zones topic for the Proposed District Plan hearings. I was also the reporting officer for Hearing 1.
2. I am also joined today by several experts who have provided evidence either to support my recommendations:
  - 1.2.1 Ms Miriam Moore, Urban Design Expert, in relation to a number of urban design matters raised in submissions including those from Urban Edge Planning and Kāinga Ora
  - 1.2.2 Mr Luke Benner, Traffic Expert, in relation to the zoning of Park Road, Belmont
  - 1.2.3 Mr Matt Aitchison, Civil Engineer, in relation to the rezoning request at 320 Eastern Hutt Road.
3. By way of an overview, the Residential topic includes:
  - 1.3.1 Urban Development Strategic Direction Objectives UDSD-O3 to UDSD-O7
  - 1.3.2 Large Lot Residential Zone provisions
  - 1.3.3 Medium Density Residential Zone provisions

1.3.4 High Density Residential Zone provisions

1.3.5 Rezoning requests within these zones

4. This hearing does not address submissions on the Papakāinga rules and standards within the residential zone chapters, which will be covered in Hearing Stream 7 alongside the submissions on the Papakāinga district wide activity chapter.
5. The PDP has generally carried over the provisions of the Operative District Plan as it relates to the Medium and High Density Residential Zones. Those provisions were introduced to the ODP in 2023 through Plan Change 56, Enabling Intensification in Residential and Commercial Areas. Plan Change 56 was the Council's response to legislative requirements to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) into its District Plan.
6. The key difference between the ODP and the PDP in terms of the residential zones is the introduction of the Large Lot Residential Zone, which replaces the Hill Residential Activity Area and the Landscape Protection Activity Area of the ODP. Those areas of the ODP were outside the scope of Plan Change 56, as they were not considered to be a 'relevant residential zone' as defined under the RMA for the purposes of applying the MDRS. The zones align with the Large Lot Residential Zone of the National Planning Standards and through the plan review process the Council has largely applied this zoning to the existing Hill Residential and Landscape Protection areas. The zoning applies to areas where medium to high density development is generally inappropriate due to servicing constraints, access constraints and low levels of access to commercial and community services.

**My evidence**

7. As set out in my Section 42A report, amendments are sought by submitters in relation to the following key issues:
  - 1.7.1 Strategic Direction Objectives UDSD-O3 (Urban form) and UDSD-O5 (Development capacity)
  - 1.7.2 The objectives and policies of the Residential Zones, including requests for additional objectives and policies

- 1.7.3 Amendments to rules and standards – these amendments range from minor through to more substantive changes to matters such as thresholds for non-residential activities or activity status for breaches of residential standards
  - 1.7.4 Retirement villages and how these are assessed in terms of design relative to medium and high-density residential development, including the building standards that apply
  - 1.7.5 A large number of requests to rezone land including requests to rezone properties from large lot residential to medium density or from medium density to large lot residential
8. I have recommended a number of amendments to provisions and zoning as a result of submissions. These amendments do not change the fundamental policy direction of the Residential zones, but rather provide clarity, support the achievement of wider PDP objectives, and support efficient implementation of the PDP.
9. In my rebuttal evidence I have recommended additional amendments to provisions relating to waste management in multi-unit developments in response to evidence from Kaaren Rosser on behalf of Enviro NZ. These amendments provide more policy direction for new multi-unit development of 4 or more units to provide adequate waste storage and collection areas. This addresses a gap where the Council's Waste Bylaw only requires the provision of a waste management plan for multi-unit developments of 10 or more units.
10. I also responded to evidence provided on behalf of Silverstream Park Christian Centre, seeking the rezoning of the site at 320 Eastern Hutt Road. I am now recommending a split zoning for the site, of Medium Density Residential which applies to the existing Retreat buildings and activities, and Large Lot Residential for the currently undeveloped northern portion of the site. This is a change from my recommendation to retain the Large Lot Residential Zone for the entirety of the site. I have also recommended extending the Silverstream Retreat Precinct boundary as sought by the submitter.
11. Though not in response to further submitter evidence, I also advised through my rebuttal evidence of a change to a recommendation I made in my Section 42A report relating to relief sought by FENZ. In my section 42A report, I agreed with FENZ that emergency towers and communication poles up to 15m in height on the

same site as an emergency service facility should be exempt from the PD standards relating to height, height in relation to boundary and setbacks. I have reconsidered my position on this and consider such an exemption is only appropriate in relation to the height limits, recognising that these structures could have effects on amenity of adjoining residential sites. I also note that currently, emergency service facilities are zoned Mixed Use, rather than residential, so these exemptions would only apply should an emergency service facility be established on a residentially zoned site, which would require consent as a restricted discretionary activity.

**Correction to zoning request maps**

12. Since my rebuttal evidence was published, I became aware of an error in the rezoning request maps that were supplied with that evidence. The error relates to the rezoning request as it applies to properties on Park Road on page 114 of my rebuttal evidence, which is the subject of a number of submissions. The map does not show number 38 Park Road as being included within the area of the rezoning request, which is incorrect. I have provided an updated set of maps correcting this error.
  
13. I am happy to answer any questions the Hearing Panel may have in relation to my evidence. Ms Moore, Mr Benner and Mr Aitchison are also available to answer questions relating to their evidence.

**Kate Pascall**

22 June 2026