

Summary of submissions
Proposed District
Plan Change 67

Rezoning of 43 Spenmoor Street, Newlands

November 2008

Summary of Submissions

District Plan Change 67 – Rezoning of 43 Spenmoor Street, Newlands

- Submitters -

The list below contains the names and contact information for submitters on Plan Change 67.

Number	Name	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
1	Brendon Clegg	59 Satara Crescent	Khandallah	Wellington
2	Phillip Colett	32 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
3	Brae Watkins	75 Spencer Street	Crofton Downs	Wellington
4	Sharon Murray	31 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
5	Vanessa Hawkey	12 Liverpool Street	Miramar	Wellington
6	NZ Fire Service Commission	C/- Beca Carter Hollings & Ferner Ltd	PO Box 3942	Wellington
7	Paul Monahan	12 Liverpool Street	Miramar	Wellington
8	Angela Roche	21 Tanera Crescent	Brooklyn	Wellington
9	Hayim Machum	19 Waru Street	Khandallah	Wellington
10	Andrew Wilk & Davinder Johal	35 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
11	Cindy Collett	32 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
12	Vinay Kuma	24/8 Girton Terrace	Mt Cook	Wellington
13	Penny Parsons	37 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
14	Warwick & Rosemary Spencer	41 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
15	Amanda Harrison	23 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
16	Michael Barker	23 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
17	Regional Public Health	Private Bag 31907	Lower Hutt	Attn: Dr Stephen Palmer
18	Fletcher Tay	47A Lyndfield Lane	Newlands	Wellington
19	Newlands Scout Group	c/- Debbie Balloch	15 Brooker Grove	Newlands, Wellington
20	Miles & Suzanne Vintiner	14 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
21	Paul Murray	31 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
22	Jeremy & Veronica Simonsen	16 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
23	Silvia Mackie	27 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
24	Michael Mackie	27 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
25	Lesley & David Jacobson	38 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
26	S Dunston & H Gardiner	21 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
27	Jessica Tay	47A Lyndfield Lane	Newlands	Wellington
28	Mana Hogan	22 Selwyn Terrace	Thorndon	Wellington
29	Joseph Lupi	59B Mandalay Terrace	Khandallah	Wellington
30	Arjun Singh	6 / 193 The Terrace	Wellington	
31	Ruosi He	1 / 16 Farnham Street	Kingston	Wellington
32	Wayne Huygen	33 Lyndfield Lane	Newlands	Wellington
33	F Anderson & W Jansen	39 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
34	Ian Leary	24 Mark Avenue	Paparangi	Wellington

35	Frances Poff	32 Lyndfield Lane	Newlands	Wellington
36	Peter Rundlett	27 Woodland Road	Johnsonville	Wellington
37	Kevin Palmer	68C Kenya Street	Johnsonville	Wellington
38	Karyn Carter	44 Lyndfield Street	Newlands	Wellington
39	James Curry	44 Lyndfield Street	Newlands	Wellington
40*	Residents of Spenmoor Street	31 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
41	Susan Scott	12 Guadalupe Crescent	Grenada Village	Wellington
42	Alan Denne	36 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
43	R Manley	40 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
44	Brendan Garby	6 / 28 Majoribanks Street	Mt Victoria	Wellington
45	Jeremy Harrison	23 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
46	Megan Brown	23 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
47	Christoper Gollins	113A Motuhara Road	Karehana Bay	Porirua
48	Duncan Van Dorp	6 Hollies Crescent	Johnsonville	Wellington
49	Andrew Monahan	28 Rewa Road	Hataitai	Wellington
50	Jake Tipler	37 North Terrace	Kelburn	Wellington
51	Tim Baty	C/- PO Box 725	Wellington	
52	Judith Haggat-Baty	92 Cashmere Avenue	Khandallah	Wellington
53	Warrick McCluskey	3 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
54	Paul Lundberg	4 Spenmoor Street	Newlands	Wellington
55	Greater Wellington Regional Council	PO Box 11-646	Wellington	Attn: Ling Phang

* - note – while this is the address for service, the submission was signed by residents at the following Spenmoor Street residences:

2A, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15A, 15B, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25A, 25B, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 35A, 36, 37, 38, 39, & 40

CONTENTS

1.	GENERAL SUBMISSIONS	3
1.1.	General support for the plan change	3
1.2.	Other General Submissions.....	8
1.3.	Plan Change Appendix	12
2.	TRAFFIC	13
3.	STORMWATER, FLOODING & STABILITY.....	22
4.	LANDSCAPE	24

1. General Submissions

1.1. General support for the plan change

Submission 1

The submitter supports the plan change in its entirety and notes the following benefits:

- the proposal will provide more residential land close to the central city
- suitable to locate development close to amenities (CBD & Johnsonville)
- adds variety to the urban landscape
- alleviates difficulty in finding residential sections in central Wellington with a view

Decision Requested:

Approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 3

The submitter supports the plan change in its entirety. It is noted that the proposal is consistent with Council and Central Government policies on sustainable population growth management near existing centres, schools, public transport and infrastructure amenity. The submitter notes that the developer will have to apply for resource consent following approval of the plan change – and that the consent process will ensure any future development is of a reasonable standard.

Decision Requested:

Approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 5

The submitter supports the plan change in its entirety. The development is close to schools, buses, and shops. The submitter notes that the neighbourhood is also close to the CBD, allowing for short commute times for private vehicles. This, combined with the availability of public transport in the area, will reduce pollution and greenhouse emissions.

Decision Requested:

Approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 7

The submitter supports the plan change in its entirety. It is noted that the area contains ample existing infrastructure to accommodate increase in population. The proposal would also provide affordable housing close to the CBD.

Decision Requested:

Approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 8

The submitter supports the plan change and sites that it is a valuable resource in meeting increased future housing demand.

Decision Requested:

Approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 9

The submitter supports the plan change in its entirety. Council has already approved a 40 lot subdivision on the land, and existing infrastructure is ample to accommodate further intensification.

Further, the Rural zoning currently in place is inappropriate given that the land is adjacent to Residential and Suburban area, and is nearby to the central city. This proximity to the CBD is a beneficial to Wellington, with increased housing being proposed nearby.

The submitters states that a resource consent would be required for subdivision if the rezoning is approved – this would provide further certainty to the public/neighbours on the design and effects of further subdivision.

Decision Requested:

Approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 12

The submitter supports the entire plan change. Specifically, it is submitted that the proposal will allow for affordable housing to be available close to Wellington City. Further, existing infrastructure is capable of accommodating more development.

Decision Requested:

Approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 28

The submitter supports the proposal. It is submitted that the rezoning would allow for affordable housing close to the CBD. The submitter believes the Rural zoning is not the best use for the land as it does not support the future growth of Wellington.

Decision Requested:

That the Council approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 29

The submitter states that the Rural use is inappropriate due to the land's surroundings and close proximity to the city. It is further submitted that the existing infrastructure can cope with more intense development with no cost to ratepayers.

Decision Requested:

That the Council approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 30

The submitter believes that Newlands is the ideal area for residential intensification in Wellington. The close proximity to the CBD provides for sustainable living options.

Decision Requested:

That the Council approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 31

The submitter notes that the existing infrastructure can cope with further intensification. It is submitted that the Rural zoning of the land is not appropriate, and rather that the Residential use would provide an opportunity for affordable housing close to Wellington city.

Decision Requested:

That the Council approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 34

The submitter supports the rezoning. The site is not in Rural character, and Residential zoning would be a more sustainable use of land resources. Existing Residential rules can control any adverse traffic effects.

Decision Requested:

That the Council approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 36

The submitter does not support the provision to restrict the height of some portions of buildings on the land to 5m. It is submitted that the pine trees currently proposed to be protected on the land should be removed as they suppress the regeneration of native plants and are a danger and nuisance to local residences.

The submitter also sites the land is near to the Johnsonville Town Centre which has been earmarked for more intensive development. Not allowing a Residential use here would seem inconsistent with the Town Centre plan.

Decision Requested:

That the Council:

- remove the 5m height restriction from all parts of the site.
 - remove any covenant protection of pine trees and encourage their removal under any subsequent landscape plans.
 - approve the rezoning from rural to residential
-

Submission 37

The submitter supports the rezoning. It is surrounded by residential use and supported by existing infrastructure. The land's proximity to the CBD promotes urban containment.

Decision Requested:

That the Council approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 44

The submitter supports the rezoning and believes it will contribute to increasing housing affordability in Wellington.

Decision Requested:

That the Council approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 47

The submitter supports the rezoning, citing that the location is ideal for residential intensification. It is submitted that the City needs more residential sites close to the CBD. Further, the area has good connectivity which can be enhanced by possible walking and cycling tracks. The roading in the development is to a high standard can cope with more intensity.

Decision Requested:

That the Council approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 48

The submitter supports the rezoning stating that the land is on existing transport routes and close to existing schools and shopping facilities. The residential use in this area is more sustainable than one further from the CBD.

Decision Requested:

That the Council approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 49

The submitter supports the rezoning and cites the following benefits:

- it will free up more available land for affordable housing
- the area is close to existing utilities, schools, bus services, shops, etc, reducing infrastructure requirements
- increased residential use near the CBD enhances the city's vibrancy and reduces greenhouse gas emissions associated with commuting
- the residential use is more appropriate than rural as the land is too small to economically sustain rural purposes
- the most visual part of the site from Wellington City has been omitted from intensification to mitigate adverse visual effects, with the majority or needed earthworks already being undertaken
- the road constructed at the developer's expense could accommodate 500 additional homes
- more residential use will help cater to the expected population increase in Wellington
- the land has enjoyable views
- resource consent will still be required to further subdivide the land if rezoning is approved
- more people in the area will contribute to local business' success.

Decision Requested:

That the Council approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 50

The submitter supports the rezoning and believes it will contribute to increasing housing affordability in Wellington.

Decision Requested:

That the Council approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 51

The submitter supports the rezoning and believes it will contribute to increasing housing affordability in Wellington. The site also offers pleasant outlook and all day sun.

Decision Requested:

That the Council approve DPC67 as notified.

Submission 52

The submitter supports the rezoning and believes it will contribute to increasing housing affordability in Wellington, and reduce strain on existing transport systems.

Decision Requested:

That the Council approve DPC67 as notified.

1.2. Other General Submissions

Submission 2

The submitter notes that they purchased their property with the knowledge that a 40-lot rural residential subdivision was approved in the area and that this number was not excessive. If the plan change proposal is approved, it would allow for the quiet cul de sac to become a busy thoroughfare – and further that they would not have purchased their house had they known this was proposed in the area.

Decision Requested:

That the plan change be declined and that any future application to increase the residential capacity of the site be declined.

Submission 6

The submitter supports the plan change, and wants to promote home sprinkler installation in all new dwellings. As the proposed development is in a reticulated area with ample supply of water, installation of domestic sprinklers would reduce per capita water use and ensure the fastest and most effective protection against fires.

Decision Requested:

That the plan change be approved with the inclusion of a recommendation for new dwellings to be installed with domestic sprinklers (in accordance with Fire Systems for Houses NZS4517:2002).

Submission 10

The submitters note that they moved into their current property on Spenmoor Street with the knowledge that 40 houses were approved for the property at #43 – and that they would not have moved onto the street if they knew of the proposal to further intensify the site. They submit that the Council should protect the safety and lifestyles of ratepayers from encroachment of property developers.

Decision Requested:

That the rezoning not be approved and that any further application to increase the number of lots on the site be declined.

Submission 11

The submitters note that they moved into their current property on Spenmoor Street with the knowledge that 40 houses were approved for the property at #43 – and that they would not have moved onto the street if they knew of the proposal to further intensify the site. They submit that the Council should protect the safety and lifestyles of ratepayers from encroachment of property developers.

Decision Requested:

That the rezoning not be approved and that any further application to increase the number of lots on the site be declined. Should the plan change be supported, it should be subject to an amended plan incorporating a new road that enters/exists the site without use of Spenmoor Street.

Submission 14

The submitters indicate their dissatisfaction with the applicant's consultation and relationship management with local residents and note that several agreements between the parties have not been upheld by the applicant to date. Specifically, they submit that road calming measures, landscaping, reliable storm water drainage, safety fences, etc. have not been undertaken.

Decision Requested:

That the Council declines the application to change the zoning at 43 Spenmoor Street from Rural to Outer Residential.

Submission 15

The submitter bought her residence recently with the knowledge that 40 houses were approved on the site and would not have done were 114 lots approved there. It is submitted that an expansion of the subdivision would will destroy the character of the street and make it unsafe. The submitter stresses that amenity for existing residents on the street should be protected.

Decision Requested:

That the Council decline Private Plan Change application.

Submission 16

The submitter bought his residence recently with the knowledge that 40 houses were approved on the site and would not have done were 114 lots approved there. It is submitted that an expansion of the subdivision would will destroy the character of the street and make it unsafe. The submitter stresses that amenity for existing residents on the street should be protected.

Decision Requested:

That the Council decline Private Plan Change application.

Submission 17

The submitter believes that the proposal is inconsistent with WCC's Urban Development Strategy and Centres Policy – specifically it is contrary to the Council's desire to maintain a compact urban form.

It is submitted that the development represents a 'sprawling approach,' and that residential intensification within Newlands' existing neighbourhood network will better provide for growth in the area.

Decision Requested:

That Council retain the existing rural residential zoning and reject the proposed plan change.

Submission 18

The submitter notes that further development on the site will have high potential impact on the area, & create a large amount of unneeded housing and unwanted construction for the next 5-10 years.

Decision Requested:

That the Council decline Private Plan Change application.

Submission 20

The submitters believe that the Council has an ethical responsibility to existing residents as ratepayers to protect their existing lifestyle from encroachment by developers.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 21

The submitter believes that the Council has an ethical responsibility to existing residents as ratepayers to protect their existing lifestyle from encroachment by developers. It is submitted that the proposed development would destroy the street's character as a quiet cul-de-sac and make it a busy main road.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 22

The submitters state that increased traffic on the street will make it unsafe and ruin the existing character as a quiet cul-de-sac. The current character of the street has made it of high value and this will be compromised if the street links into nearly three times the existing houses.

It is also submitted that the proposal is at odds with the economic downturn, and that the existing 40 lot subdivision has had difficulty with sales – the need for more lots at this time is not needed.

Decision Requested:

The submitter seeks the following relief:

- that the application is declined;
 - if approved, that an alternative access to the subdivision be built and the current accessway be abandoned (to be completed before any construction begins);
 - that the land shown as 'area 200', 10.23ha on TSE plan 313-03-152B be covenanted or made as Council Reserve to prevent further development there;
 - if Council accepts a reserve contribution then those monies should be used for amenities or improvements in the local vicinity.
-

Submission 24

The submitter says that the street will take on an unattractive character if the application is approved and it is contrary to the character they sought when purchasing the house.

They further submit that the infrastructure on the property is questionable. There has been flooding of homes in the area due to poor stormwater management systems. It is submitted that new public space should be created to increase amenity for the community as part of the proposal – the Council has a responsibility to protect the quality of life for existing residents.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 25

The submitter is dissatisfied with the level of consultation undertaken with both the approved Resource Consent of the land and with the proposed rezoning. It is submitted that the developer previously made a number of verbal promises to reduce impacts on local residents that have not been honoured.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site. Further, that the Council protect the land from further development to retain the character and heritage of Wellington City.

Submission 26

The submitter believes that doubling the volume of housing in the neighbourhood would reduce amenity for residents unless upgrades to play areas, parks, and public spaces are undertaken.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 38

The submitter does not agree with statement 8.17 under the plan change report that Spenmoor Street could safely accommodate another 500 new homes. The submitter questions the benefits for pedestrians and cyclists highlighted in the report.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change and retain the status quo.

Submission 40

The submitter believes the proposal will provide for the destruction of community spirit and character, causing Spenmoor Street to change from quiet cul de sac to busy main road. The developer has provided only one option for access to the site, limiting options to consider. The Council has an obligation to protect its ratepayers' amenity.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

1.3. Plan Change Appendix

Submission 54

The submitter seeks amendment to the Plan Change Appendix.

Decision Requested:

That the Council amend the plan change appendix as follows (text to be added is underlined):

5.6.3 Additional standards and terms

Building platforms shall be shown for each lot in any subdivision application.

A building plan must be included with any subdivision application. The plan shall consider the following design guide principles.

- *House sites shall consider their relationship with those on adjoining lots and how they will integrate with the surrounding 'natural' landscape*
- *The siting of buildings minimises the visual impacts of any earthworks associated with access and building platforms.*
- *Maintenance of the openness and coherence of the ridgeline and hilltop. This is particularly relevant when subdividing the land into smaller allotments*

A landscape plan and written specifications must be included with any subdivision application. The landscape plan shall include:

- *Areas of existing trees to be retained;*
- *any established vegetation to be retained for visual separation and screening*
- *where appropriate, establish planting of indigenous plant species to enhance or restore indigenous biodiversity*
- *Location and extent of any fencing of covenanted bush; maintenance planting in the covenanted areas should consider indigenous plant species.*
- *Consideration of linkages of the covenanted areas with nearby reserve and open space areas including Tyers Road reserve, Homebush Park (Khandallah to the west)*
- *Street tree and associated public area landscape planning*
- *Identification for internal access ways, public furniture and areas, including any proposed foot paths, seats, etc*

The submitter also seeks the inclusion of new text to the Appendix as follows:

Successful development of this site will require a mixture of lot sizes and protection of regenerating native vegetation.

Restrictions by way of consent notice or covenant must be placed on the new allotments at the time of subdivision.

2. Traffic

Submission 2

The submitter states that Spenmoor Street lacks the capacity to safely cope with the volume of traffic that will result from the proposed plan change being approved. It is submitted that the street is already congested, and with vehicles parked on both sides of the road, its width is reduced to approximately 3.8metres. The submitter suggests that increased usage of the road brought on by the proposed plan change would exceed the capacity of the street and become dangerous. Further, the submitter notes that there would be an increased risk of collisions at the entrance to the proposed subdivision as it is located in the cul de sac where vehicles frequently turn around to exit the street.

Decision Requested:

That the plan change be declined and that any future application to increase the residential capacity of the site be declined.

Submission 4

The submitter opposes the plan change on the basis that the street lacks the capacity to accommodate additional vehicle traffic. The road is too narrow and essentially is reduced to one lane when cars are parked on both sides.

Decision Requested:

That the rezoning not be approved and/or that the subdivision be accessed by an alternate route than Spenmoor Street if more than 40 lots/houses are sold.

Submission 10

The submitters note that Spenmoor Street is narrow and winding, and lacks the capacity to safely cope with increased vehicle traffic resulting from further development on the site. They believe the already overcrowded street would become dangerous if the development is intensified further. It is submitted that further traffic would result in a greater number of collisions, increased noise pollution, and an increased risk to young children.

Decision Requested:

That the rezoning not be approved and that any further application to increase the number of lots on the site be declined.

Submission 11

The submitter states that Spenmoor Street is too narrow and congested to accommodate further development at #43. It is submitted that the carriageway is reduced to approximately 3.8m-width near the Scout Hall when cars are parked on both sides of the street. The submitter disputes the statement from the Plan Change Document suggesting that the subdivision could accommodate a further 500 homes – and believes that this comment does not take into account the road safety conditions in the area. The increased traffic would have further adverse effects at the Wakely Road intersection.

The submitter also notes the increased likelihood of collision if further development is approved. Residents currently use the cul-de-sac at the end of the street, of which access to #43 is gained. The meeting of the cul-de-sac and accessway to the site will increase the risk of vehicle collisions. In addition, there are no give way signs or traffic calming measures currently in place to mitigate such effects.

The submitter sites that some houses presently on the street rely on on-street car parks as they have no garages or driveways. The existing residents' use of this amenity should be preserved.

It is also noted that access for emergency vehicles is very difficult with high traffic and vehicle parking on both sides of the road. The single nature of the access route is also vulnerable to being isolated in the event of a natural disaster.

Other options should be explored for vehicle access to the site.

Decision Requested:

That the rezoning not be approved and that any further application to increase the number of lots on the site be declined. Should the plan change be supported, it should be subject to an amended plan incorporating a new road that enters/exists the site without use of Spenmoor Street.

Submission 13

The submitter notes the difficult and dangerous pedestrian environment at the intersection of Newlands Road and Wakely Road – specifically, there is no pedestrian crossing, and the right-angle bend in the road makes for limited visibility. Adding additional houses in Spenmoor Street will make this more dangerous.

It is also submitted that the high volume of on-street parking on both sides of Spenmoor Street often allows only one lane for traffic to flow. Adding more housing on the street will make the situation more chaotic and dangerous.

Decision Requested:

That the Council declines the application to change the zoning at 43 Spenmoor Street and that any future request to increase the number of lots on site be declined.

Submission 14

The submitters cite several reasons why they believe the application should be denied. With respect to traffic issues on the street, they cite that it contains dangerous corners, blind hillocks and driveways, poor visibility of entrances/exits, and an existing high traffic volume. They submit that a potential increase in residential development could endanger current residents and add unwanted noise, clutter and congestion.

The submitters also note that safety issues could arise in emergency situations given the narrow and crowded nature of the street. They believe that intensive development that gains access from a single narrow road is contrary to WCC policy as it promotes poor connectivity. Other accessways should be produced to reduce/eliminate such adverse impacts.

Decision Requested:

That the Council declines the application to change the zoning at 43 Spenmoor Street from Rural to Outer Residential.

Submission 15

The submitter states that Spenmoor Street is incapable of coping with increased traffic volumes, and struggles to meet current demand. It is submitted that the road is too narrow and congested, with the width often being effectively reduced to a 3.8m (or less) width. If the subdivision at number 43 increases in size, the traffic effects would become dangerous.

Further, the submitter disagrees with section 8.17 of the application that the street could accommodate 500 homes. Traffic problems will also be increased at the intersection of Newlands Road and Wakely Road with increased volumes coming from the site.

It is submitted that use of on-street parking for existing residents should be considered when assessing the application.

The submitter notes that the subdivision will be at risk to inadequate access for emergency vehicles. The single access to the site leaves the subdivision vulnerable to isolation in the event that the road is blocked by accident or damage from natural disasters.

Decision Requested:

That the Council declines the Proposed Plan Change and any future requests to increase the number of property lots on the site. If this relief is not granted, then the development should not occur until an amended plan is adopted that incorporates a new road that allows traffic to enter or leave the subdivision without having to use Spenmoor Street and without creating traffic hazard elsewhere in Newlands.

Submission 16

The submitter states that Spenmoor Street is incapable of coping with increased traffic volumes, and struggles to meet current demand. It is submitted that the road is too narrow and congested, with the width often being effectively reduced to a 3.8m (or less) width. If the subdivision at number 43 increases in size, the traffic effects would become dangerous.

Further, the submitter disagrees with section 8.17 of the application that the street could accommodate 500 homes. Traffic problems will also be increased at the intersection of Newlands Road and Wakely Road with increased volumes coming from the site.

It is submitted that use of on-street parking for existing residents should be considered when assessing the application.

The submitter notes that the subdivision will be at risk to inadequate access for emergency vehicles. The single access to the site leaves the subdivision vulnerable to isolation in the event that the road is blocked by accident or damage from natural disasters.

Decision Requested:

That the Council declines the Proposed Plan Change and any future requests to increase the number of property lots on the site. If this relief is not granted, then the development should not occur until an amended plan is adopted that incorporates a new road that allows traffic to enter or leave the subdivision without having to use Spenmoor Street and without creating traffic hazard elsewhere in Newlands.

Submission 18

The submitter suggests that increased traffic on the street would be dangerous to local residents.

Decision Requested:

That the Council decline Private Plan Change application.

Submission 19

The submitter notes that it is difficult to find a car park on the street under existing conditions and that this would be compounded by intensifying the subdivision. It is submitted that the increase in vehicle traffic would be dangerous to scouts coming and going from the Scout Hall.

Decision Requested:

That the Council decline Private Plan Change application and retain the status quo.

Submission 20

The submitter states that Spenmoor Street is a narrow, winding street that lacks the capacity to safely cope with traffic derived from the proposed expansion of the subdivision.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 21

The submitter states that Spenmoor Street lacks the capacity to cope with any increase in traffic flows. Where vehicles are parked on both sides of the street, the width is narrowed to 3.8m or less in instances. There is poor visibility at sharp turns, a number of children live on the street, and the scout hall's regular meetings also add to traffic problems on the street.

Increased traffic volumes would increase the risk of collisions, raise traffic noise, and reduce air quality according to the submitter. In addition, as a single-access route, the sub division would open Spenmoor Street to isolation in the event of natural disaster or major collision, and add a risk to accessibility for emergency vehicles.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 22

The submitters state that the street is narrow, with poor visibility in places and that increases in vehicle traffic due to the subdivision will lead to increases in accidents. The traffic report indicates the road can handle 500 more traffic movements, but this disregards the wishes of the existing residents to not exceed current traffic levels. The intersection at Wakely Road and Newlands Road is difficult and dangerous as is, and this would only be compounded by adding higher levels of traffic from the development. Traffic calming measures were supposed to be implemented as a result of the previous Resource Consent process which have not been done.

Decision Requested:

The submitter seeks the following relief:

- that the application is declined;
- if approved, that an alternative access to the subdivision be built and the current accessway be abandoned (to be completed before any construction begins);
- that the land shown as 'area 200', 10.23ha on TSE plan 313-03-152B be covenanted or made as Council Reserve to prevent further development there;
- if Council accepts a reserve contribution then those monies should be used for amenities or improvements in the local vicinity.

Submission 23

The submitter states that increased vehicle traffic will result in higher risks for traffic accidents and pedestrian safety. Car parking is already at a premium in the street and access for emergency vehicles is concern. Construction traffic also reduces amenity for neighbours as onstreet parking can be restricted and construction vehicles travelling at high speeds is dangerous.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 24

The submitter says that the street already has difficulty coping with present vehicle and construction traffic including damage to cars parked on the street and delays due to the narrow nature of the street. Visibility is often low and onstreet parking is already difficult to gain due to high volumes.

The submitter is also concerned that only one access is being provided for such a large subdivision – this could cause problems for emergency vehicles.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 25

The submitter states that the proposed development would have negative impacts on Spenmoor Street and other local roads. Spenmoor is a narrow street with existing traffic problems, including regular meetings at the local Scout hall compromising parking availability and the road width. The increase of a further 122 houses is impracticable when considering the traffic effects. Visibility is low in places, and the risk of collision will be increased with greater traffic volumes. Alternative access routes should be provided to mitigate these adverse effects for the existing neighbourhood.

The proposal would also increase pressure on local parks and onstreet parking.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site. Further, that the Council protect the land from further development to retain the character and heritage of Wellington City.

Submission 26

The submitter believes the proposal would lead to dangerous impacts on traffic safety in the neighbourhood. Visibility and the steep, narrow nature of the road make navigation difficult under existing circumstances, further exacerbated when the local Scout hall is in use. Further increases in traffic volumes will pose safety threats to children and pedestrians. Construction traffic in recent years has already lead to negative outcomes in the area – parked cars have been scratched and some owners have been asked to move their vehicles to allow transport vehicles to pass.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 27

The submitter is opposed to the proposal. It is submitted that the rezoning would allow for huge traffic impacts in the area. Traffic safety and onstreet parking will be compromised.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and retain the existing approved Resource Consent plans. Further, that the Council provide for carparks at the local Scout Hall with a footpath upgrade and possible speed bumps there to increase safety.

Submission 32

The submitter opposes the plan change as the area and road network can't cope with an increase in residential intensity. Additional vehicles would create safety issues for the entire area.

Decision Requested:

That the Council decline the zone change and maintain the status quo.

Submission 33

The submitter opposes the plan change as the area and road network can't cope with an increase in residential intensity and consequential vehicle traffic. The increase in traffic flow caused by the use of the local Scout Hall must also be taken into account to ascertain the extent of existing traffic problems.

Decision Requested:

That the Council decline the zone change; or

Should the Council approve the proposal that a condition be imposed to provide a separate access to the development other than Spenmoor Street.

Submission 35

The submitter believes that increasing residential intensity in the area will lead to more traffic congestion in the area. It is submitted that the road is already difficult to navigate and will become more dangerous with increased traffic flows. Pedestrian safety will be endangered as well.

Decision Requested:

That the proposal be declined

Submission 38

The submitter opposes the rezoning. It is submitted that the proposal would put a significant strain on the existing road network in the area, and there would be noticeable effects on safety and efficiency of road users.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change and retain the status quo.

Submission 39

The submitter does not agree that Spenmoor Street could cope with vehicle traffic brought about by the introduction of up to 500 new homes on the site. The submitter questions the research that has been undertaken to produce such figures.

Further, the submitter states that the hope of the applicant to gain more access to public transport is not guaranteed.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change and retain the status quo.

Submission 40

The submitter states that Spenmoor Street lacks the capacity to safely cope with the volume of traffic expected from the proposed subdivision expansion. The existing road is as narrow as 3.8m in places with cars parked on both sides and visibility is often low with blind corners and undulations.

Vehicle collision risk will increase, greater noise pollution from traffic will occur and safety hazards will result from further intensification of the site.

The single access is a significant risk for the access for emergency vehicles, and the street risks isolation if blocked by accident or natural disaster.

The submitter notes that many existing houses have no off-street carparking and require that resource on Spenmoor Street. Users of the local Scout Hall also need place to park.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 41

The submitter believes the proposal would lead to dangerous impacts on traffic safety in the neighbourhood. Construction traffic in recent years has already lead to negative outcomes in the area – parked cars have been scratched and some owners have been asked to move their vehicles to allow transport vehicles to pass.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 42

The submitter believes the proposal would lead to dangerous impacts on traffic safety in the neighbourhood. Construction traffic in recent years has already lead to negative outcomes in the area – parked cars have been scratched and some owners have been asked to move their vehicles to allow transport vehicles to pass.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 43

The submitter believes the proposal would lead to dangerous impacts on traffic safety in the neighbourhood. Construction traffic in recent years has already lead to negative outcomes in the area – parked cars have been scratched and some owners have been asked to move their vehicles to allow transport vehicles to pass.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 45

The submitter opposes the plan change. It is submitted that Spenmoor Street could not cope with additional vehicle traffic and is 'bad enough' at present. With limited off-street carparking, many residents park on the street, reducing it to one lane effectively at times – the submitter states that the potential increase in vehicles arising from the proposal would not be sustainable via one lane. The increased traffic would increase risk to local children and pets as well, and the risk of collisions would increase with the higher volumes.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 46

The submitter opposes the plan change. With limited off-street carparking, many residents park on the street, reducing it to one lane effectively at times – the submitter states that the potential increase in vehicles arising from the proposal would not be sustainable via one lane.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 53

The submitter opposes the plan change. Spenmoor Street has low visibility, with frequent near misses common. The submitter does not agree that the street could accommodate a further 500 homes in the area. Increased traffic volumes would lead to accidents or collisions with pedestrians and playing children. Further increasing traffic woes are the narrow nature of the road with cars parked on both sides, and the increased congestion from activity at the local Scout Hall.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application.

Submission 54

The submitter is seeking resolution between the local residents and the applicant over traffic issues. The submitter has concerns over the congestion and safety issues caused by the proposal.

Decision Requested:

That the Council decline the Private Plan Change application.

3. Stormwater, flooding & stability

Submission 2

The submitter notes that his residence has been flooded 3 times in the previous two years. He submits that the flooding is a direct effect of the stormwater runoff from the existing subdivision at 43 Spenmoor Street and that he did not have the problem prior to the initiation of the subdivision. The submitter states that an increase in the size of the subdivision will place additional pressure on a stormwater system that has already proven inadequate.

Decision Requested:

That the plan change be declined and that any future application to increase the residential capacity of the site be declined.

Submission 10

The submitters indicate that there has been an increase in the number of landslides in NZ in recent times due to poor planning, vegetation removal, etc, which has lead to many homes being damaged. They question the stability of the site and the potential increased risk of landslides affecting neighbouring properties. At present, the existing stormwater system on site seems to be inadequate, as drains have overflowed in recent months.

Decision Requested:

That the rezoning not be approved and that any further application to increase the number of lots on the site be declined.

Submission 11

The submitter states that her house has been flooded a number of times in recent years by stormwater runoff from #43. At present, the existing stormwater system on site seems to be inadequate, as drains have overflowed in recent months. It is submitted that an increase in size of the subdivision will place additional pressure on the already inadequate stormwater system.

Further, it is believed that the removal of further vegetation resulting from more intensive development would increase the risk of slips.

Decision Requested:

That the rezoning not be approved and that any further application to increase the number of lots on the site be declined. Should the plan change be supported, it should be subject to an amended plan incorporating a new road that enters/exists the site without use of Spenmoor Street.

Submission 15

The submitter states that the removal of more vegetation on the site would increase the risk of slips and flooding.

Decision Requested:

That the Council decline the Private Plan Change application.

Submission 16

The submitters state that the removal of more vegetation on the site would increase the risk of slips and flooding.

Decision Requested:

That the Council decline the Private Plan Change application.

Submission 20

The submitter notes the increase in landslips in recent years due to poor planning. It is submitted that the existing stormwater infrastructure on site is not adequate as drains have continuously overflowed through the winter – and poor drainage adds to the risk of slope landslides.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 21

The submitter states that the removal of more vegetation on the site would increase the risk of slips and flooding. Further, it is submitted that the proposed increase in housing would place additional strain on a poorly-performing stormwater system.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site

Submission 22

The submitters state that there have been numerous landslips in the area since earthworks began on the site, with potential consequential adverse effects on stormwater management systems in the area. More extensive study should be undertaken in the area if further earthworks are proposed.

Decision Requested:

The submitter seeks the following relief:

- that the application is declined;
 - if approved, that an alternative access to the subdivision be built and the current accessway be abandoned (to be completed before any construction begins);
 - that the land shown as 'area 200', 10.23ha on TSE plan 313-03-152B be covenanted or made as Council Reserve to prevent further development there;
 - if Council accepts a reserve contribution then those monies should be used for amenities or improvements in the local vicinity.
-

Submission 40

The submitter states that more vegetation removal on the site will increase the risk of landslips and flooding. It will also place additional pressure on a stormwater system that has recently proven inadequate under current circumstances.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 53

The submitter states that more vegetation removal on the site will increase the risk of landslips and flooding.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application.

4. Landscape

Submission 4

The submitter suggests that the subdivision would be unsightly. It is noted that the area is highly visible throughout the city, and future development would generate adverse visual effects to a large number of Wellington residents.

Decision Requested:

That the skyline be preserved and no rezoning be approved.

Submission 10

The submitters state that the area is one of the last remaining prominent hilltops in Wellington that maintains a rural outlook. It is noted that the hilltop is highly visible from Khandallah, Broadmeadows, Newlands & Johnsonville and contributes to the variety in outlook for residents and visitors alike.

It is submitted that the proposal could allow for a 300% increase in housing from the 40 dwellings already approved there. The submitters claim that, if approved, the rezoning would eradicate the rural outlook for the surrounding suburbs.

Decision Requested:

That the rezoning not be approved and that any further application to increase the number of lots on the site be declined.

Submission 11

The submitter notes that the development would change the appearance of one of the last remaining prominent hilltops in Wellington City. It is submitted that residents and visitors will deem the area less attractive and the charm and mixture of rural and urban views will be lost if the development is approved.

Decision Requested:

That the rezoning not be approved and that any further application to increase the number of lots on the site be declined. Should the plan change be supported, it should be subject to an amended plan incorporating a new road that enters/exists the site without use of Spenmoor Street.

Submission 14

The submitters state that the site is on a very prominent Wellington land mark with high visibility. The submit that the site is subject to Proposed District Plan Change 33, which should provide some protection to the landscape quality of the area and the sustainability of development there. The current consent allows for a small portion of houses to be visible from any one point – this would not be the case if the plan change is approved.

Decision Requested:

That the Council declines the application to change the zoning at 43 Spenmoor Street from Rural to Outer Residential.

Submission 15

The submitter notes that the development will change the appearance of one of the last remaining prominent hilltops in Wellington, compromising the mixed urban/rural charm of the city.

Decision Requested:

That the Council decline the Private Plan Change application.

Submission 16

The submitter notes that the development will change the appearance of one of the last remaining prominent hilltops in Wellington, compromising the mixed urban/rural charm of the city.

Decision Requested:

That the Council decline the Private Plan Change application.

Submission 20

The submitters note that the site is one of Wellington's last remaining prominent hilltops that maintain a rural outlook. If the site is further intensified, the size of the development there would eradicate this landscape quality.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 21

The submitter notes that the site is one of Wellington's last remaining prominent hilltops that maintain a rural outlook. If the site is further intensified, the size of the development there would eradicate this landscape quality.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site

Submission 22

The submitters state that an increased development on the site would create a blight on the landscape. The existing earthworks on the site have already left an unfavourable landscape quality on site.

Decision Requested:

The submitter seeks the following relief:

- that the application is declined;
 - if approved, that an alternative access to the subdivision be built and the current accessway be abandoned (to be completed before any construction begins);
 - that the land shown as 'area 200', 10.23ha on TSE plan 313-03-152B be covenanted or made as Council Reserve to prevent further development there;
 - if Council accepts a reserve contribution then those monies should be used for amenities or improvements in the local vicinity.
-

Submission 23

The submitter notes that the site is one of Wellington's prominent hilltops that maintain a rural outlook. If the site is further intensified, the size of the development there would eradicate this landscape quality.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site

Submission 25

The submitter states that the land is a highly visible from surrounding suburbs and that the green belt views will be compromised if the proposal is approved. The visible effect of an additional 300% increase in housing in the area would be significant.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site. Further, that the Council protect the land from further development to retain the character and heritage of Wellington City.

Submission 26

The submitter states that the site is a highly visible hilltop, and the proposal would compromise the green belt outlook there. The semi-rural character will be lost and local regenerating bush will be negatively impacted.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 40

The submitter is concerned that the proposal would ruin the Wellington Skyline, changing the appearance of one of Wellington's last remaining prominent hilltops. The subdivision would also eradicate the rural outlook for surrounding suburbs, and diminish the attractiveness of the city to residents and visitors alike.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 41

The submitter states that the site is a highly visible hilltop, and the proposal would compromise the green belt outlook there. The semi-rural character will be lost and local regenerating bush will be negatively impacted.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 42

The submitter states that the site is a highly visible hilltop, and the proposal would compromise the green belt outlook there. The semi-rural character will be lost and local regenerating bush will be negatively impacted.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 43

The submitter states that the site is a highly visible hilltop, and the proposal would compromise the green belt outlook there. The semi-rural character will be lost and local regenerating bush will be negatively impacted.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application, and decline any application to increase the number of lots on the site.

Submission 53

The submitter notes that the site is highly visible from many Wellington suburbs and an increase in 114 lots will have a significant and irreversible impact on the visual amenity of the land. The submitter believes that there are many sites in the western suburbs that are more appropriate for residential intensification.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the Private Plan Change application.

Submission 55

The submitter recommends that the special values of the land be protected through the plan change process. The submitter states that the subject site forms a significant component of the Wellington Harbour coastal escarpment (from an ecological and natural landscape perspective) and should be protected. It is recommended that future residential development be carefully considered to ensure the landscape and ecosystem are not compromised – the submitter notes that this has been considered in the plan change.

The submitter supports the vesting of 13.23 hectares as proposed. This area would support re-growth of native vegetation and provide a natural buffer to new residential areas. The submitter seeks for the plan change Appendix to reinforce the opportunity to link this covenanted area with Tyers Road Reserve and Homebush Park.

The submitter also seeks inclusion of provisions from the Rural Area Design guide (DPC33) into the plan change Appendix.

Decision Requested:

That the Council amend Plan Change 67 in accordance with the matters listed in submission.
