

HUTT CITY COUNCIL

KOMITI ITI AROTAKE MAHERE Ā-ROHE |  
DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held in the Council Chambers,  
2nd Floor, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt on  
Thursday 10 February 2022 commencing at 2.20pm

---

**PRESENT:** Cr S Edwards (Chair) Cr K Brown  
Cr B Dyer Deputy Mayor T Lewis  
Cr N Shaw

**APOLOGIES:** Ms M Dentice

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Ms H Oram, Director Environment and Sustainability (part meeting)  
Ms P Rotherham, Head of Planning (via audio visual link)  
Mr N Geard, Senior Environmental Policy Analyst (via audio visual link)  
Mr S Davis, Policy Planner (via audio visual link)  
Ms E Campbell, Tikanga Māori Policy Planner (via audio visual link) (part meeting)  
Mr C Page, Intermediate Policy Planner (via audio visual link) (part meeting)  
Ms M Schwalger, Senior Communications Advisor (via audio visual link) (part meeting)  
Ms K Stannard, Head of Democratic Services (via audio visual link)  
Ms K Glanville, Senior Democracy Advisor (via audio visual link)  
Mrs A Doornebosch, Democracy Advisor

**PUBLIC BUSINESS**

**1. OPENING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA**

Ki a tau ki a tātou katoa  
Te atawhai o tō tatou  
Ariki o Ihu Karaiti  
Me te Aroha o te Atua  
Me te whiwhinga tahitanga  
Ki te wairua tapu  
Ake ake ake  
Amine

2. **APOLOGIES**

**RESOLVED:** (Cr Edwards/Cr Dyer)

**Minute No. DPRS22101**

*"That the apology received from Ms Dentice be accepted and leave of absence be granted."*

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

4. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS**

There were no conflict of interest declarations.

5. **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** (Cr Edwards/Deputy Mayor Lewis)

**Minute No. DPRS 22102**

*"That the minutes of the meeting of the District Plan Review Subcommittee held on Monday, 6 December 2021, be confirmed as a true and correct record."*

6. **RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (ENABLING HOUSING SUPPLY AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT ACT 2021 AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW (22/11)**

Report No. DPRS2022/1/1 by the Senior Environmental Policy Analyst

The Senior Environmental Policy Analyst elaborated on the report.

In response to questions from members, the Senior Environmental Policy Analyst highlighted that Council was required to give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPSUD) by August 2022. He noted that due to recent changes to the Resource Management Act (RMA), the development of the Intensification Planning Instrument (IPI) was also now a requirement under the RMA. He advised Policies 3 and 4 of the NPSUD would now be incorporated into the new IPI. He noted these were the primary portions of the NPSUD in relation to intensification. He said some other parts of the NPSUD fell outside of these policies and would not be given effect to before August 2022. He said if the remainder of the review of the District Plan was delayed, some qualifying matters not already included in the current District Plan, would create some risk. He advised Council would need to decide whether to continue with the remainder of the review of the District Plan in conjunction with the IPI, or after. He advised there would likely be some financial repercussions as the District Plan Review would now be two formal processes.

In response to questions from members the Director, Environment and Sustainability highlighted possible risks to Council if the August 2022 deadline for the NSPUD was not met. She noted this could include reputational risk as a Tier 1 Council, and it could also create risks to the development industry in Lower Hutt. She said officers understood several planning consultants had been instructed to prepare applications for developments that would comply with the new IPI in line with the August 2022 deadline. She said this work had been completed in the belief that they would meet the statutory timeframe. She considered running the two processes together would be confusing for people taking part in the process.

In response to questions from members, the Head of Planning highlighted an important part of the review of the District Plan included sites of significance to Māori. She highlighted the current shortage of iwi available to engage in the process. She said if Council chose to condense timeframes this may have an impact on this part of the review. She advised officers could provide estimated cost differences between separate or joint processes. She said the cost of the parallel process would likely be higher.

Cr Dyer spoke against Option 2 and preferred Option 1, which was that both the full District Plan Review be undertaken alongside the development of the Intensification Planning Instrument. Cr Dyer noted he was concerned that the 12 to 18 month time lapse between these two processes would lead to negative outcomes without the full qualifying matters being included in the District Plan.

The Chair foreshadowed his intention to move an additional recommendation that the item be considered by the Policy, Finance and Strategy Committee on Tuesday, 22 February 2022.

<b>RECOMMENDED:</b>	(Cr Edwards/Cr Brown)	<b>Minute No. DPRS 22103</b>
---------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------

*"That the Subcommittee recommends that the Policy, Finance and Strategy Committee recommends that Council:*

- (1) *receives the information contained in the report; and*
- (2) *proceeds with the District Plan Review through Option 2: An Intensification Planning Instrument plan change followed by full new District Plan."*

7. **INTENSIFICATION PLANNING INSTRUMENT - INITIAL OPTION IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS (22/22)**

Report No. DPRS2022/1/2 by the Senior Environmental Policy Analyst

The Senior Environmental Policy Analyst elaborated on the report. He provided a presentation explaining the colour coding on the Zone Maps on slides 1 and 2. He noted that lighter and darker yellow areas on slide 1 were areas in the current General Residential Activity Area, which would be impacted by the Intensification Planning Instrument (IPI). He advised brown areas around railway stations were Medium Density Residential Areas, and would also be affected by IPI. He said orange zones were the equivalent of Large Lot Residential Areas and would be excluded from the IPI. He advised slides 4 and 5 compared the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) that must be incorporated into the District Plan through the IPI, with the standards that are currently applied. He highlighted a summary of IPI requirements was included in the table on page 55 of the Agenda, and said that officers had based their recommendations to align with these requirements.

In response to questions from members, the Policy Planner advised the recommendations for commercial areas that were also historic areas such as Jackson Street in Petone were specific to city and suburb centres. He highlighted that Petone did have intensification requirements and also the option to use qualifying matters. He advised officers had recommended to use historic heritage as a qualifying matter including retaining the heritage aesthetic for Jackson Street. He noted this would prevent developers from building six storey developments in Jackson Street after the introduction of the IPI, even though they were within a walkable distance from a railway station. He said officers had not yet assessed the level of development to recommend for areas in Petone outside of Jackson Street. He noted officers were expecting to provide a report to the Subcommittee meeting to be held on 17 March 2022, relating to the Petone and Jackson Street precincts. He noted that Suburban Mixed Use Zones that were areas next to railway stations within a walkable catchment would enable six storey developments in the IPI. He said sites of key demand in these areas would also be enabled for greater than six storey developments. He advised areas that did not need six storey developments that were not candidates for intensification, would retain their existing height limits.

In response to questions from members, the Senior Environmental Policy Analyst advised that there would be no value in retaining Comprehensive Residential Developments (CRD) under the IPI. He said the level of standards required for this to be incorporated under the IPI would be higher than what was currently provided for. He advised the removal of the CRD could be achieved by a consequential amendment under the IPI. He noted site boundaries for the MDRS would remain at 1 metre for all side boundaries. He said front site boundaries would be amended from 2 metres to 1.5 metres. He noted Council could modify this so that front boundaries were more enabling as long as the capacity was not diminished. He said officers had recommended that existing provisions relating to outdoor space, landscape area and permeable surfacing of the MDRS added through Plan Change 43 be retained. He said the Community Iwi Activity Area was a zone currently included in the District Plan. He advised provisions for papakāinga could be included as an additional provision in the IPI. He noted officers were holding ongoing meetings with Iwi partners and would report back on this matter. He said infrastructure constraints such as sensitive water urban designs could be managed through current building consent processes. He advised officers could provide

more information to the next meeting on MDRS options RZ4.2 and RZ4.3 for residential zones.

In response to a question from a member, the Head of Planning noted a number of planning consultants had been advised to start preparing applications for developments above the current three storey height provisions under the new MDRS. She said she considered three to four storey developments under the new standards would be economically feasible for apartment developments.

Cr Dyer left meeting at 4.00pm and rejoined the meeting at 4.03pm.

Deputy Mayor Lewis left meeting at 4.04pm and rejoined the meeting at 4.06pm.

In response to questions from members, the Director, Environment and Sustainability noted the current rules for overall building height limits was 10 metres. She said the new indicated rules set by government would be 11 metres, plus a 1 metre allowance for roofing. She said the indicative standards from government had no design criteria set around them. She noted officers could provide an update on the percentage of development criteria to sites to the next meeting.

The Chair foreshadowed his intention to move an additional motion asking officers to provide more information on option RZ4.3.

**RECOMMENDED:** (Cr Edwards/Cr Dyer)

**Minute No. DPRS 22104**

*"That the Subcommittee recommends that the Policy, Finance and Strategy Committee recommends that Council:*

- (1) *receives the information contained in the report, including the identification and evaluation of options for the Intensification Planning Instrument;*
- (2) *requests officers to prepare a draft Intensification Planning Instrument for consideration at the District Plan Review Subcommittee meeting on 17 March 2022, through the following approach:*

*Commercial zones*

- (a) *in the city centre, no specific building height and density limits in the Core and Riverfront (Core) Precincts and increased height limits in other precincts to six storeys (Option CZ1.1); and*
- (b) *in suburban centres, provide for varying heights based on commercial and community services and access to public and active transport, which would be above six storeys in some areas, and below six storeys in others (Option CZ2.2);*

*Residential zones*

- (a) *a 1200m walkable catchment for the city centre and Petone metropolitan centre, and a 800m walkable catchment for train stations on the Hutt Valley and Melling Lines (Option RZ1.2); and*
- (b) *in walkable catchments of the city centre, Petone metropolitan centre and train stations on the Hutt Valley and Melling Lines:*
  - 1) *permit buildings of up to three storeys, subject to standards of the Medium Density Residential Standard; and*
  - 2) *require resource consent for buildings of four or more storeys, with provisions supporting buildings up to six storeys (Option RZ2.2);*
- (c) *align building heights for residential areas adjacent to Neighbourhood, Local and Town centre zones with the building height and density provisions of other residential areas with similar levels of access to commercial activities and community services (Option RZ3.2); and*
- (d) *modify the Medium Density Residential Standards to align them with the existing District Plan standards for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area but asks officers to provide more information on Options RZ4.2 and RZ4.3;*

*Qualifying matters*

- (a) *modify the Medium Density Residential Standards and building height and density requirements under Policy 3 of the NPS-UD to accommodate the following:*
  - 1) *the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development;*
  - 2) *the management of significant risks from natural hazards; and*
  - 3) *open space provided for public use, but only in relation to land that is open space."*

8. QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

There being no further business the Chair declared the meeting closed at 4.29pm.

Cr S Edwards  
CHAIR

**CONFIRMED as a true and correct record**  
**Dated this 17th day of March 2022**