

9 September 2022

Carissa Bryan  
[REDACTED]

Tēnā koe Carissa

**Request for Information – Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (LGOIMA) 1987**

We refer to your official information request dated 12 August 2022 for information about a monitoring fence being situated along the alleyway which goes from [REDACTED] through to [REDACTED]. Your points are addressed below.

1. *What criteria is utilised to determine when a monitoring fence is required, as it seems inconsistent with other new developments in Wainuiomata? In particular, I have uploaded evidence of completed new developments and developments underway, where monitoring fences have not been required. Why not in these locations, and why in the alleyway bordering my new home?*

The resource consent for [REDACTED] includes a condition requiring a fence of 1.7m in height, with a 30cm slat fence installed on top with 50% permeability, giving a combined fence of 2.0m height. This fence will ensure there is passive surveillance across the adjoining walkway, for safety reasons.

Such considerations are standard practice in accordance with the National Guidelines for Crime Prevention through Environmental Design. These guidelines outline how urban planning, design and place management strategies can reduce the likelihood of crime and deliver numerous social and economic benefits in the long-term. This is available here: [www.justice.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Publications/cpted-part-1.pdf](http://www.justice.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Publications/cpted-part-1.pdf).

Assessment against the Council's *Medium Density Design Guide* was triggered by a few non-compliances with General Residential Development Standards. Where design guide assessments are triggered, these are undertaken on a case by case basis with regard to the specific proposal and the characteristics of the site, so such outcomes differ for different proposals and different sites.

2. *What consideration was there given for the homeowners' privacy, given the internal and external main living area privacy will be impacted by this fence?*

The *Medium Density Design Guide* encourages low or visually-open fences for passive surveillance, particularly along boundaries of public spaces and accessways. The design guide also encourages suitable provision for privacy in private outdoor areas. Boundary treatments, particularly along public boundaries, aim to achieve a balance of both.

Again, this is a qualitative assessment, so it is not prescribed what this should look but it will vary for each assessment. However a 1.7m high solid fence with a 30cm open slat trellis on top would be considered to provide a high degree of privacy when assessed with regards to the design guide.

3. *What avenues are there for the impacted homeowners to apply for a modification to the compliance criteria for this consent?*

The condition requiring this 2.0m fence was proffered by the applicant's planner.

The initial recommendation by the Council's processing planner was that the fence be lowered to 1.5m in height, with the 30cm trellis above (i.e. a total height of 1.8m). After the resource consent was issued, the landscape plan was revised to show the existing solid fence being lowered to 1.7m in height, with an additional 30cm slat fence to be installed on top with 50% permeability, raising the combined height of the fence to 2.0m. This was then submitted to and approved by the Council, and so forms part of a legally-binding resource consent for the property.

Should you want to apply for a further alteration to the fencing compliance criteria under this resource consent, you would need to make an application to Hutt City Council to change the conditions of the resource consent, in accordance with s127 of the Resource Management Act. The process for this is described in the Council's website, see [www.huttcity.govt.nz/property-and-building/resource-consents](http://www.huttcity.govt.nz/property-and-building/resource-consents). Please note that we can give you no indication as to the outcome of this process.

4. *What evidence is there to support there is "anti-social behaviour" occurring in this alleyway to warrant this fence?*
5. *Is there any data that can be provided to the residents where a monitoring fence has succeeded elsewhere in reducing the statistics of anti-social behaviour?*
6. *What evidence is there to support a monitoring fence will have an impact on behaviour along this alleyway, if any evidence exists (particularly because the monitoring fence is on one side and only halfway)?*
7. *What evidence is there to support anti-social behaviour will stop rather than the participants just moving along the alleyway where they cannot be seen?*

You may be able to obtain responses to Questions 4-7 from Ministry of Justice or the Police. These are not matters able to be responded to by Hutt City Council.

You have the right to seek an investigation and review by the Ombudsman of this response. Information about how to make a complaint is available at [www.ombudsman.parliament.nz](http://www.ombudsman.parliament.nz) or freephone 0800 802 602.

Please note that this letter may be published on the Council's website.

Nāku noa, nā



Susan Sales

**Senior Advisor, Official Information and Privacy**