

HUTT CITY COUNCILDISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held in the Council Chambers, 2nd Floor, 30 Laings Road,
Lower Hutt on

Wednesday 26 July 2017 commencing at 5.30pm

PRESENT: Cr L Bridson (Chair) Cr C Milne
Cr C Barry Cr J Briggs
Cr T Lewis

APOLOGIES: An apology was received from Cr Cousins.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr T Stallinger, Chief Executive
Ms K Kelly, General Manager, Strategic Services
Mr A Cumming, Divisional Manager, Environmental Policy
Ms C Tessoroff, Senior Environmental Policy Analyst
Mr N Geard, Environmental Policy Analyst
Mr J Hoyle, Communications and Marketing Advisor
Ms S Haniel, Committee Advisor

PUBLIC BUSINESS1. OPENING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA TIMATANGA

A karakia timatanga was said to open the meeting.

2. APOLOGIES

RESOLVED: (Cr Bridson/Cr Barry)

Minute No. DPC 17301

"That the apology received from Cr MJ Cousins be accepted and leave of absence be granted."

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Comments are recorded under the item to which they relate.

4. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS

There were no conflict of interest declarations.

5. **RESIDENTIAL INTENSIFICATION** (17/1033)

Report No. DPC2017/3/163 by the Divisional Manager Environmental Policy

Speaking under public comment, **Mr M Shierlaw** said that home owners had bought their properties with an understanding that the District Plan allowed a maximum height of a building to be eight metres. He further said that changing the allowed height of a building to allow three storey houses to be built, would be interfering with property ownership rights. He showed a picture of a three storey house next to a single storey house on The Terrace in Wellington. He added that there was a large public response opposing the proposed changes and the District Plan should reflect community consultation. He said that it was his understanding that the Panel was hand-picked and not representative of the population.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms S Lafrentz** said that greater community consultation needed to be undertaken because there were significant implications for home owners. She requested that there be consultation via letter-box drops, and provision for people to be able to ask questions on how the changes would affect them. She also requested a longer consultation period. She showed pictures of a development in Park Avenue where she said the ground had been significantly excavated to allow the building to fit under the height restrictions. She further said that the proposed changes would bring pockets of ghetto buildings.

In response to questions from members, Ms Lafrentz said that she had not spoken to the residents in the Park Avenue apartments about whether they felt like they lived in a ghetto or whether their garages had flooded. She further said that she would support "green field" developments depending on where they were. She said that she supported residential intensification if increased height was spread out along the street and not all in one area. She further said houses would be devalued if they were affected by shading or loss of privacy.

The Divisional Manager Environmental Policy elaborated on the report. He said that Council had a contract with an engagement specialist called Public Voice. Public Voice had selected the Panel to be representative of the community.

In response to Mr Shierlaw's observation that the proposed changes did not reflect the public response, Cr Milne said that the Hutt City Views Panel (the Panel) and the public responses initially had similar results. After pamphlets opposing the proposal were delivered to mailboxes, the Panel and public results diverged sharply.

In response to Mr Shierlaw's picture of a townhouse development on The Terrace, Wellington, the Divisional Manager Environmental Policy said that under the proposed changes a building of that height would not be a permitted activity. He added that it would require a resource consent and also be required to comply with the design guide. He presented a powerpoint show which illustrated the approximate height recession planes in relation to the house on The Terrace.

MOVED: (Cr Bridson/Cr Lewis)

That the recommendations contained in the report be endorsed, and that option four in recommendation part(i)f.4. to 'Defer CBD Edge for consideration as part of Lower Hutt

2040 project be endorsed.

The motion was declared LOST on the voices.

Cr Milne said that he supported option one, to support the amendments proposed in the online survey because Council could move forward with consultation. He said that option four was inappropriate because it sectioned off a portion of the Central Business District (CBD) and would undermine the consultation process.

Cr Briggs said that he supported Cr Milne's comments.

Cr Lewis said that she supported option four because the plan would include quality design with a spatial plan from the Lower Hutt 2040 project.

Cr Barry said that he did not support options two or three because they supported "Not In My Back Yard-ism" (Nimbyism). He said that option four would delay a decision on the CBD for a year. He supported option one because he did not want the CBD to be treated any differently to the rest of City.

The Chair said that she supported option four, however, she was not opposed to option one if it was the preference of the majority of members. She noted that officers would report back to the Committee after consultation.

Members noted that Council needed to consider the future needs of residents' children and grandchildren. They further noted that consultation needed to inform the public with accurate information. They considered that first home buyers who were not able to afford a home could have input into the consultation. Members agreed that the Youth Council should also be involved in the consultation. Members noted that Lower Hutt 2040 would affect the spatial plan in the Central Business District. However, work on the proposed Plan Change could continue pending the recommendations of Lower Hutt 2040.

MOVED: (Cr Milne/Cr Briggs)

That the Committee:

- (i) requests officers to prepare Proposed Plan Change 43 Residential and Suburban Mixed Use for consideration at the District Plan Committee meeting of 20 September 2017. The Plan Change approach is confirmed as the approach that was consulted on in the Public Voice online survey of May/June 2017 and is summarised as:
 - (a) intensive residential development requiring resource consent must follow a design guide;
 - (b) new Suburban Mixed Use zone in targeted areas, with a maximum building height standard of 10 metres;
 - (c) new Medium Density Residential zone in targeted areas, with a maximum building height standard of 10 metres and height to boundary standard of 2.5 metres vertically at the side and rear boundaries with a 45 degree recession plane;
 - (d) comprehensive Residential Development enabled on General Residential sites

- of 1400m² or larger;
- (e) enabling infill development provisions including tiny houses; and
 - (f) targeted area maps amended, and Option 1 for the CBD Edge targeted area as attached as Appendix 2 to the report, and as proposed in the online survey with amendments at north end and east of Cornwall Street;
- (ii) approves a submission period in the plan change process of at least three months; and
- (iii) requests officers to prepare a comprehensive communications plan to accompany the proposed Plan Change.

RESOLVED: (Cr Milne/Cr Briggs)

Minute No. DPC 17302

"That the Committee:

- (i) *requests officers to prepare Proposed Plan Change 43 Residential and Suburban Mixed Use for consideration at the District Plan Committee meeting of 20 September 2017. The Plan Change approach is confirmed as the approach that was consulted on in the Public Voice online survey of May/June 2017 and is summarised as:*
 - (a) *intensive residential development requiring resource consent must follow a design guide;*
 - (b) *new Suburban Mixed Use zone in targeted areas, with a maximum building height standard of 10 metres;*
 - (c) *new Medium Density Residential zone in targeted areas, with a maximum building height standard of 10 metres and height to boundary standard of 2.5 metres vertically at the side and rear boundaries with a 45 degree recession plane;*
 - (d) *comprehensive Residential Development enabled on General Residential sites of 1400m² or larger;*
 - (e) *enabling infill development provisions including tiny houses; and*
 - (f) *targeted area maps amended, and Option 1 for the CBD Edge targeted area as attached as Appendix 2 to the report, and as proposed in the online survey with amendments at north end and east of Cornwall St;*
- (ii) *approves a submission period in the plan change process of at least three months; and*
- (iii) *requests officers to prepare a comprehensive communications plan to accompany the proposed plan change."*

Cr Lewis requested that her dissenting vote be recorded against part (i)f. above.

6. INFORMATION ITEM

District Plan Update (17/1032)

Report No. DPC2017/3/102 by the Divisional Manager Environmental Policy

The Divisional Manager Environmental Policy elaborated on the report. He said that the High Court had dismissed the appeal for Plan Change 36 (PC36) in favour of Council. He added that two issues on PC36 were yet to be decided by the court.

RESOLVED: (Cr Bridson/Cr Milne)

Minute No. DPC 17303

"That the report be noted and received."

7. **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

8. **CLOSING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA WHAKAMUTUNGA**

A karakia whakamutunga was said to close the meeting.

There being no further business the Chair declared the meeting closed at 7.15 pm.

Cr L Bridson
CHAIR

CONFIRMED as a true and correct record

Dated this 15th day of August 2017