## **Proposed District Plan Change 80 Submission form**

Absolutely Positively **Wellington** City Council

Me Heke Ki Põneke



General Minor Amendments to District Plan Text and Maps VII
Form 5, Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991 EIVED

15 DEC 2015

100		THE OWNER OF THE OWNER, WHEN			
191	hm	CCIC	ME	can	ho
D 1111		P-7-118			

**Emailed to:** 

district.plan@wcc.govt.nz

Posted to:

District Plan Team Wellington City Council

PO Box 2199 Wellington 6011

Your name and contact details

Delivered to: Ground Floor Reception

Civic Square/101 Wakefield Street

Wellington

We need your submission by Monday 18 January 2016 at 5pm

Full name THE THORNDON SOCIETY INC
Full address POBOX 12389 THORNDON, WELLINGTON 6144
Address for service of person making submission BRETT MCKAY  380 TINAKORI ROAD THORNDON WELLINGTON 60!!
Phone 9770280 Fax
Email thorndonsociety Pgmail. com brest. mckay @ paradise. ne7. nz
Trade competition and adverse effects (colect appropriate)
Trade competition and adverse effects (select appropriate)
☐ I could / ☑ could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
☐ I am / ☑ am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:  (a) adversely effects the environment, and  (b) does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.
Delete entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
The specific provisions of proposed District Plan Change 80 that my submission relates are as follows (Please continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)
SEE ATTACHED
. 7

AREA POLICY 12.2.1.2 IN THE EXPLANATION TO RESIDENTIAL POLICY 4.2.7.3 BUT WITH AMENDMENTS
OR ADDITIONS.
SEE ATTACHED
We seek the following decision from the Council (Please give precise detail.)
SEE ATTACHED
Please indicate by ticking the relevant box whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission
☑ I wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submission.
☐ I do not wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submission.
Joint submissions
If others make a similar submission, please tick this box if you will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.
If you have used extra sheets for this submission, please attach them to this form and indicate this below
Yes, I have attached extra sheets.
Signature of submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter):
M/Clay Date 1/12/15

Personal information is used for the administration of the submission process and will be made public. All information collected

will be held by Wellington City Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

THORNDON SOCIETY COMMITTEE MEMBER.

(You should include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended. You should

THE THORNDON SOCIETY SUPPORTS THAT PART OF DPC 80
RELATING TO THE INCLUSION OF A REPERENCE TO CENTRAL

also state the reasons for your views. Please continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)

My submission is that

## **Proposed District Plan Change 80**

## **Submission from the Thorndon Society Inc**

Alterations to Volume 1 – Text

The Thorndon Society **supports** that part of Proposed District Plan 80 relating to the inclusion of a reference to Central Area Policy 12.2.1.2 in the explanation to Residential Policy 4.2.7.3.

However, we seek several amendments or additions, namely:

- 1. That the proposed additional wording in Policy 4.2.7.3 be included as a separate paragraph at the end of the policy.
- 2. That in Policy 4.2.7.3 under the heading "Full conversion of a residential building to a non-residential use" include a reference to the consideration of Policy 12.2.1.2 as follows or to the like effect:

In Inner Residential Areas adjacent to the Central Area, Policy 12.2.1.2 will also be taken into account.

- 3. That in Policy 4.2.7.3 under the heading "Matters to consider when assessing applications for non-residential activities, including work from home activities" include a reference to the consideration of Policy 12.2.1.2 as follows or to the like effect:
  - The application of Policy 12.2.1.2

## Reasons for our submission:

A reference to Policy 12.2.1.2 as a separate paragraph at the end of Policy 4.2.7.3 will highlight that this is a separate matter requiring specific attention.

At present the last paragraph deals solely with the protection of residential amenities whereas proposals under Policy 12.2.1.2 would take into account broader planning and environmental considerations relating both the Central Area and adjacent Inner Residential Areas.

A stand-alone statement will also provide greater surety that Policy 12.2.1.2 will not be overlooked when officers are considering applications.

The requests in (2) and (3) above for additional references are to reinforce the proposed introductory statement which will assist in ensuring that Policy 12.2.1.2 is not overlooked.

In a wider context the Thorndon Society supports the Council's proposal because we believe that previous oversights in respect of Policy 12.2.1.2 are symptomatic of the confusion and uncertainty that now applies in respect of the Council's policies relating to mixed use development in residential areas.

The laudable aim of promoting more mixed use development in general throughout the city has not been properly reconciled with the situation in the inner-city residential suburbs where there is

already a relatively high level of mixed use and ongoing pressure for central area uses to encroach into surrounding residential neighbourhoods.

The Council once had a firm and clear policy to protect inner-city suburbs from non-residential encroachments but this is no longer the case. The current policies and provisions now send mixed messages to residents and developers and are in need of review.

The 2014/15 application for the establishment of a three storied office and retail development on a residential site at 92 Tinakori Road, highlighted for the Thorndon Society the problems associated with administering the current District Plan provisions and the shortcomings have been identified.

While we believe that under the section 32 processes for DPC 80 it is incumbent on the Council to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the existing residential rules in respect of Policy 12.2.1.2, which might justify amending some of the rules in Chapter 5 of the Plan at this stage, we would not press this point. However, the Thorndon Society will continue to advocate for a wider review of the residential provisions to deal with the shortcomings and ambiguity in respect of mixed use development. For now we support the current plan change which will help to address one aspect of the issue.