

***Summary of Submissions***

***Proposed District  
Plan Change 45 -***

**Urban Development Area  
and Structure Plans**

# Proposed District Plan Change 45

## Urban Development Area and Structure Plans

### Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
1	Tony Watson	PO Box 390 Levin	No
<p>Submitter requests that the road linking Mark Avenue with Jamaica Drive be completed as soon as possible and no later than mid-2007.</p> <p>Decision Requested: No specific decision proposed on the plan change.</p>			
2	W Moore, PJ Willis, NE & BT Wood, and TB Ross-Wood	c/o Brian Warburton 20 Addington Road, RD1 Otaki 5581	No
<p>Submitter states that the section 32 analysis for the proposed plan change is inadequate; and further, "The Council is obligated to evaluate the appropriateness or otherwise of including some land and excluding other land from the area shown on Map 3."</p> <p>Decision Requested: That the land legally described as Pt Sec 9 Horokiwi Road District (CT WN 400/89) be included within the Urban Development Area, and as being suitable for rural/residential development.</p>			
3	Alexandra Page	279 Horokiwi Road Horokiwi	No
<p>Submitter opposes the construction of the 4-lane link proposed in the structure plan.</p> <p>Decision Requested: To be kept in touch regarding the issue of this road and any future developments regarding where it is to be built.</p>			
4	Pryor Timothy Rowland	73A Te Anau Road, Hataitai Wellington	No
<p>Submitter is opposed to the construction of any road that affects the Korokoro Valley namely the proposed 4-lane link road.</p> <p>Decision Requested: To remove the link road from the plan.</p>			
5	Peter John Graham	19 Beazley Avenue Paparangi Wellington 6037	No
<p>Submitter strongly supports the proposal – in particular that the Grenada North/Takapu Rd/Tawa interchange connection with Petone goes ahead as soon as possible.</p>			

<p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>Approve the change subject to comments above.</p>			
6	Craig & Kim McKendry	84 Cunliffe Street Churton Park Wellington 6037	No
<p>Submitter is concerned that there are no provisions in the structure plan pertaining to schooling infrastructure.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That schooling infrastructure be provided for in both the Lincolnshire Farm development as well as future such developments in the Wellington area, but particularly in the areas covered by the Northern Growth Management Plan.</p>			
7	Lynette & Craig Eustace	5 Van Der Velden Way Horokiwi Wellington	No
<p>Submitter sites the proposed 4-lane link road and the lack of an outer green belt buffer zone as potential concerns for Horokiwi residents.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Horokiwi's western boundary sections, which border on Lincolnshire Rd and the back blocks of Hillcroft, Van Der Velden Way and Horokiwi Rd be kept part of Horokiwi.</p>			
8	Wellington District Council NZ Automobile Association	c/- John Christianson 113 Pinehaven Road Pinehaven	Yes
<p>Submitter is concerned that although much attention has been given to the layout and design of the development itself, the information on traffic effects on adjacent existing roads, especially State Highway One is insufficient.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the plan change not proceed until the above-mentioned concerns on traffic effects are adequately addressed.</p>			
9	Transpower NZ Ltd	Attn: Yana Bosseva Burton Planning Consultants Ltd PO Box 33-817 Takapuna Auckland	Yes
<p>Submitter feels that the interface between the National grid and proposed development and subdivision should be properly managed to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the adverse effects of the National Grid; and</li> <li>• the adverse effects of others' activities on the National Grid,</li> </ul> <p>are avoided, remedied and mitigated.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>Submitter requests that steps be taken to further ensure the appropriate management of development near transmission lines by</p>			

<p>adding content to, or amending the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• new objective and associated policies in Section 27.2 to manage the interface between development and transmission corridors.;</li> <li>• Rule 28.3.2 (addition of a new (restricted) Discretionary Activity relating to separation distances between transmission lines and Development Area lots, structures, etc...);</li> <li>• a new issue into Section 2.8 of the structure plan to protect high voltage transmission line corridors;</li> <li>• a new key principle into Section 3.1 of the structure plan to protect public safety, amenities, and the National Grid;</li> <li>• amend LDP1 of Section 4.3 in the structure plan to preserve the integrity of the National Grid;</li> <li>• a new Section 6.2.9 under Section 6.2 of the structure plan to ensure safe separation distances of subdivisions from transmission lines;</li> <li>• amend all Structure Plan maps to show the National Grid;</li> <li>• amend Structure Plan Map 3 to show a limited development area corridor along the National Grid.</li> </ul>			
10	Pauatahanui Inlet Community Trust	<p>Convenor, Catchment Issues Group c/o George McMillan 17 Samwell Drive Whitby Porirua</p>	No
<p>Submitter emphasizes the importance of controlling runoff into the Porirua Stream &amp; Porirua Harbour – specifically encouraging monitoring during initial development and in years to follow.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>The Trust asks that Council retain Section 7 of the Structure Plan as currently written to ensure future runoff management in the area.</p>			
11	Graham D'Arcy-Smith	<p>381 Horokiwi Road Horokiwi Wellington</p>	No
<p>The submitter argues that the extent of the NGMF area, and its components, are not clearly delineated. There is nothing in the documents for proposed plan change 36, or on Map One in the NGMF document, to clearly define the areas of land to which the NGMF relates, and therefore nothing to define the area of land that is subject to that proposed plan change, or any subsequent plan changes and/or variations.</p> <p>It is also stated that the analysis in the Section 32 report is inadequate and that the area defined as Urban Development Area requires further justification in its selection.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the land legally described as Lot 3 DP 306892 &amp; Lot 3 DP89282 be included within the Urban Development Area, and as being suitable for rural/residential development.</p>			
12	Housing NZ Corporation	<p>c/o Tonkin &amp; Taylor Ltd Chris Hansen PO Box 2083 Wellington</p>	Yes
<p>HNZC generally supports the intentions of the proposed Plan Change as it provides for the comprehensive planning of new urban development. However, of particular concern is the blanket approach to all development requiring a Discretionary Restricted resource consent.</p> <p>Additionally, the submitter seeks to amend the plan change in a number of suggestions cited below:</p>			

Decision Requested:

- specify an appropriate timeframe for the rezoning of land within the urban development area to residential (outer);
- recognise that with an appropriate structure plan, urban development within the Urban Development Areas can occur as Permitted or Controlled Activity;
- retain policy 27.2.1.5 wording as currently written;
- retain policy 27.2.1.6 wording as currently written;
- retain policy 27.2.1.7 wording as currently written;
- retain policy 27.2.1.8 wording as currently written;
- retain policy 27.2.1.9 wording as currently written;
- provide additional rules for both Permitted Activities and Controlled Activities consistent with the Outer Residential Rules under rule 28.3.2;
- retain rule 28.3.2 wording as currently written, including non-notification statement and assessment criteria 28.3.2.14 for those proposals not consistent with Permitted Activity or Controlled Activity rules and / or the structure plan;
- provide additional rules for both Permitted Activities and Controlled Activities consistent with the Outer Residential Rules under rule 28.3.3;
- retain rule 28.3.3 wording as currently written, including non-notification statement for those proposals not consistent with Permitted Activity or Controlled Activity rules and / or structure plan;
- retain minimum density of 25 households per hectare of gross land area as written in rule 28.3.3;
- if council is intent on keeping all resource consent Discretionary Restricted Activities the following decision is sought:
  - (1) remove "alterations of, and additions to" from rule 28.3.3 and resultant requirement for a detailed development plan assessment; and,
  - (2) insert new Permitted Activity Rule for alterations and additions.
- provide additional rules for both Permitted Activities and Controlled Activities consistent with the structure Plan and / or Outer Residential Rules under rule 28.3.4;
- retain rule 28.3.4 wording as currently written, including non-notification statement for those proposals not consistent with Permitted Activity or Controlled Activity rules and / or the structure plan;
- provide additional rules for both Permitted Activities and Controlled Activities consistent with the Outer Residential Rules under rule 28.3.5;
- retain rule 28.3.5 wording as currently written, including non-notification statement for those proposals not consistent with Permitted Activity or Controlled Activity rules and / or the structure plan;
- retain no minimum lot size and number of houses per lot as written in rule 28.3.5;
- if Council is intent on keeping all resource consent Discretionary Restricted Activities the following decision is sought:
  - (1) remove "alterations of, and additions to" from rule 28.3.5 and resultant requirement for detailed development plan assessment;
  - (2) insert new Permitted Activity Rules for alterations and additions; and
- retain structure plan as currently written.

13	Land Transport New Zealand	Attn: Mark Yaxley PO Box 13 364 CHRISTCHURCH	Yes
----	----------------------------	--	-----

Submitter believes that the plan change requires amendment in order to achieve sustainable development and a sustainable land transport system.

Decision Requested:

- Submitter urges Council to apply the full recalculated developer contributions charge for all developments both within the Proposed Plan Change area and the wider Wellington City in order to maximise the funds available to offset the transport impacts of development;
- supports Urban Development Rule 28.3.2, but seeks to amend it through the addition of a requirement to assess transport effects in the area;
- wishes to amend proposed Development Rule 28.3.4.6 through the replacement of 'traffic' with 'transport';

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• requests that a full transport assessment analysis be undertaken including an assessment of the potential transport effects and mitigation measures with and without the proposed Grenada – Petone link; and</li> <li>• <u>decline</u> to approve Proposed Plan Change 45 until such time that a comprehensive transport effects assessment has been undertaken to evaluate the proposed Plan Change Structure Plan and the associated transport Rules to allow Land Transport New Zealand to assess the suitability of the Proposed Plan against the purpose and objectives of the Land Transport Management Act.</li> </ul>	
14	Tawa Community Board	Attn: Ngaire Best 4a Rewa Terrace Tawa	?
<p>The submitter supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the element of Plan Change 45 that confirms the road link between Jamaica Drive and Mark Avenue; and</li> <li>• the link road from Tawa to the Grenada Interchange and over toward the Hutt Valley, however this support is provisional upon greater understanding of the environmental and economic impact at the time of Resource Consent.</li> </ul> <p>Additionally the Board has concerns in relation to the capacity of the existing storm water system and the Porirua Stream, as it relates to existing and future development.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>No decision specified – however, submitter does site that future development should not affect the surrounding natural environment.</p>			
15	Transit New Zealand	Attn: Mike Weir PO Box 27 477 Wellington	Yes
<p>Submitter supports the development of the land in accordance with the vision, objectives, themes and values of the Northern Growth Management Framework. However, the exact details and timing of development require careful consideration in order for Transit to fulfil its statutory role with respect to the state highway system.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>Submitter requests the adoption of the proposed plan change provided that an amendment is made to the non-notification statement under rules 28.3.3 and 28.3.4 – this amendment calls for an exception to the rule when Transit NZ is the affected party in relation to the state highway system.</p>			
16	Woodridge Estate Ltd	c/o Truebridge Callender Beach Ltd Ian Prentice PO Box 13 142 Wellington 6032	Yes
<p>Submitter <u>supports</u> the principal of the proposed Urban Development Area and the Lincolnshire Farm Structure Plan but <u>opposes</u> some aspect of the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that Council should amend the plan change so that the proposed land uses under the LFSP are fully integrated into the existing District Plan zones ie: the residential area rules apply on residential zoned land etc;</li> <li>• that Rule 28.1.1.1 be deleted from the Plan Change;</li> <li>• that rule 28.3.1 read "Rural Activities and <u>Buildings</u>..."</li> <li>• that the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph under standards &amp; terms for rule 28.3.2 be amended to read:  <i>"For any subdivision incorporating new roads, all services must be reticulated underground."</i>  <i>"For any subdivision incorporating new roads, all new residential employment and commercial lots must be provided with a connection to a fibre optic cable."</i></li> <li>• that the following statements under stage RA9 be deleted:</li> </ul>			

- (1) "Development of the rural residential area with regard to the matters set out in 6.2".
- (2) "Any substantial earthworks required in order to extend Woodridge Drive through to the boundary with RA5 and RA6 with the legal road area vested in Council."

- that the following statement under stage RA10 be deleted:  
"Any substantial earthworks required in order to extend Woodridge Drive through to the boundary with RA5 and RA6 with the legal road area vested in Council."
- that RA11 require the construction and vesting of the Key Local road from RA10 to RA12;
- that Council provide for a cleanfill as noted on the TCB Plan provided;
- that the formation of the linkage to RA5 and RA6 and the construction of the Key Local road should be undertaken as part of the same stage, stage RA10;
- that the land uses proposed in the Structure Plan be amended in accordance with TCB Plan 04295-PG-01-A, which proposes:
  - (1) An additional link road to Hororkiwi Road.
  - (2) Provision of a Cleanfill on Woodridge Land.
  - (3) Extension of the Residential 1 Zone.

Decision Requested:

That PC45 is amended to accommodate the issues listed above.

17	Lincolnshire Farm Ltd	c/- Truebridge Callender Beach Ltd Attn: David Gibson PO Box 13 142 Wellington 6032	Yes
----	-----------------------	--	-----

Submitter supports the overall principle and intention of the proposed new urban development area zone as well as the use of structure plans to guide development within the new zone – however, they also site specific opinions on certain issues in the plan change:

- support the proposal to delete the last bullet point of policy 4.2.9.2 that relates to the creation of a link road from Mark Avenue to Jamaica Drive;
- support the proposal to delete the last bullet point of policy 14.2.9.3 that relates to the creation of a link road from Mark Avenue to Jamaica Drive;
- oppose the removal of Appendix 7 to Chapter 7;
- generally support the rezoning of land as shown in Map A. However, is opposed to the loss of the current zoning of:
  - (1) Suburban Centre zoned land between the motorway and the former northern landfill, and
  - (2) Outer Residential zoned land adjacent to the northern end of Mark Avenue.
- oppose the removal of the notation to Appendix 7 on Map 26;
- support the deletion of the notional road link on maps 26 and 27 of the District Plan as shown on Map C;
- that the permitted activity rule is extended to allow for residential activities and the construction of residential buildings within the residential 1 land use area;
- oppose policies 27.2.1.9 and 27.2.1.10;
- amend rule 28.1.1 and add new rules 28.1.2 and 28.1.3 to further clarify permitted activities rules;
- amend the wording in Controlled Activities Rules 28.2.1;
- amend or make additions to Rules 28.3.1 – 28.3.6;
- under Issues 2.8, 3.1 and 6.1 of the structure plan the reference to "No 'big box' retail" should be deleted;
- under Issues 6.2 of the Structure Plan the reference to "Non-retail" should be deleted;
- similarly, the second bullet point that discusses limits on retail activities over 500m<sup>2</sup> in the Employment Requirements EMR2 should be deleted;
- that the staging provisions set out in Appendix A are altered to allow greater flexibility;
- to amend the structure plan maps such that:
  - (1) the employment area, between motorway and former northern landfill is increased in size by extending the

- boundary to the motorway (i.e. the rural residential strip beside the motorway is removed) and by extending the boundary to the collector road (i.e. the rural residential area around the former landfill is removed);
- (2) the residential 1 land use area to the north east of intersection 1 is increased in size;
  - (3) the route of the key local road through the rural residential land use area toward the northern end of the zone is amended;
  - (4) a part of the reserve 1 area at the end of Hillcroft Road has been amended to rural residential;
  - (5) the boundary between the reserve 1 area and the residential 1 areas are refined to follow the topography for which residential subdivisions have been preliminarily designed;
  - (6) a further change requested is the route of the Avenue/Principal road immediately to the south of intersection 2. The route of the Avenue/Principal road should be moved to the west and replace the Collector road. This is because the route of the Avenue/Principal road as shown is too steep to physically construct such a road.

Decision Requested:

That proposed plan change 45 is approved with changes and amendments as suggested above or to address the issues raised in this submission.

18	Armstrong Jones Management Ltd	c/- Barker & Associates Ltd Attn: Matt Norwell PO Box 37806 Parnell Auckland	Yes
----	--------------------------------	--	-----

Submitter generally opposes the plan change in its current state, but would accept its approval given a few amendments are made.

Decision Requested:

To amend the plan change as follows:

- add a new objective (27.2.2) which reads as follows (or any similar wording that has the same effect):  
*"To ensure that activities establishing in the Urban Development Area do not compromise the function of existing centres through loss of viability as a consequence of the redistribution of retail activities."*
- add new objective 27.2.1.10A which reads as follows (or similar):  
*Ensure that activities avoid adverse consequential effects on the vitality and amenity of existing centres due to a redistribution of retail activities.*
- that rule 28.3.4 be amended by inserting the following provisions:  
*Retail floor space in employment areas:*  
*(i) The total area of indoor and outdoor space used for the display and retailing of goods manufactured or repaired on-site shall be a maximum of 250m<sup>2</sup> per site or 25% of the total gross floor area, whichever is lesser.*  
*(ii) The total area of indoor and outdoor space used for other retailing activities shall be a maximum of 100m<sup>2</sup> per site.*  
*Retail floor space in neighbourhood centres:*  
*(i) No individual Retail Activity shall exceed 500m<sup>2</sup>.*  
*(ii) For the purpose of this rule, Individual Retail Activity means any retail activity carried on under a distinct, single store brand or trading logo.*
- clarify that any activity failing to comply with the above suggested retail development standards is a non-complying activity.

19	Kiwi Income Property Trust	c/- Barker & Associates Ltd Attn: N J Roberts PO Box 37806 Parnell	Yes
----	----------------------------	---	-----



		Auckland	
<p>The submitter would not oppose Plan Change 45 provided it is refined in the manner set out below in order to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects that might be generated by the provisions as publicly notified. In the event that relief in general accordance with that specified below is not granted then the submitter would oppose the plan change.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the plan change as notified be withdrawn – if it is not, the submitter seeks the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>redraft objective 27.2.1 to clearly express the requirement to ensure that the future development does not compromise the function of existing centres in the region through loss of vitality, amenity or viability as a consequence of the redistribution of retail activities;</li> <li>augment the existing proposed policies to more clearly express the need to avoid the consequential loss of vitality and amenity from existing centres in the region due to a redistribution of retail activities facilities. This could be achieved by way of the insertion of a new policy along the following lines: <p>27.2.1.10A</p> <p><u>To avoid the consequential loss of vitality and amenity on existing centres in the region due to a redistribution of retail activities. Activities shall not result in significant adverse consequential effects on the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community served by that centre.</u></p> </li> <li>amend the proposed standards and terms as set out in rule 28.3.4 with wording to achieve the intent of the following: <p><i>Retail floor space in employment areas:</i></p> <p>(i) <i>The total of indoor and outdoor space used for the display and retailing of goods manufactured or repaired on-site shall be a maximum of 250m<sup>2</sup> per site or 25% of the total gross floor area, whichever is lesser.</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>The total area of indoor and outdoor space used for other retailing activities shall be a maximum of 100m<sup>2</sup> per site.</i></p> <p><i>In neighbourhood centres, no individual Retail Activity shall exceed 500m<sup>2</sup>. For the purpose of this rule Individual Retail Activity means any retail activity carried on under a distinct, single store brand or trading logo; and</i></p> </li> <li>clarify that any activity failing to comply with the above suggested retail development standards is non-complying.</li> </ul>			
20	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Attn: Ling Phang PO Box 11-646 Wellington	Yes
<p>Submitter feels the change is consistent with the Regional Land Transport Strategy in particular the provision for the potential link between SH1 and SH2. Additionally the Regional Council suggests three amendments to the plan change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the permitted activity rule 28.1.1 should read: all <u>existing</u> permitted activities in the Rural Area...;</li> <li>on page 27/5, amend the last paragraph as such: Northern Growth <del>Northern Growth</del> Management Framework...; and</li> <li>on page 28/7, amend first paragraph as such: Resource consent will be assessed in terms of section 104B (not 104D)...</li> </ul> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That proposed Plan Change 45 is approved subject to amendments suggested above.</p>			
21	Jennifer Gail Houlston	48 St Johns Terrace Tawa Wellington	No
<p>Submitter feels that there is a lack of provisions for educational facilities in the plan change.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That provision be made for schools and that land be set aside for educational purposes.</p>			