



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

10 March 2022

Order Paper for the meeting to be held via Zoom on:

## **Thursday 17 March 2022 commencing at 12.30pm**

Members of the public wishing to speak to items on the agenda are asked to contact [democraticserviceteam@huttcity.govt.nz](mailto:democraticserviceteam@huttcity.govt.nz)

### **Membership**

Cr S Edwards (Chair)

Cr K Brown

Cr B Dyer

Deputy Mayor T Lewis (Deputy  
Chair)

Cr N Shaw

Maiora Dentice (endorsed by Te Rūnanganui o Te Ati Awa)

For the dates and times of Council Meetings please visit [www.huttcity.govt.nz](http://www.huttcity.govt.nz)

#### **Have your say**

[You can speak under public comment to items on the agenda to the Mayor and Councillors at this meeting. Please let us know by noon the working day before the meeting. You can do this by emailing \[DemocraticServicesTeam@huttcity.govt.nz\]\(mailto:DemocraticServicesTeam@huttcity.govt.nz\) or calling the Democratic Services Team on 04 570 6666 | 0800 HUTT CITY](#)

## DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

**Membership:** Chair of Policy, Finance and Strategy Committee  
4 other councillors  
Up to 2 representatives appointed by Iwi

**NOTE:**

Elected members should hold current certification under the Making Good Decisions Training, Assessment and Certification Programme for RMA Decision-Makers. The Chair should in addition hold Chair certification. Standing Orders 30 and 31 outlining provisions for Tangata Whenua and Taura Here do not apply to this Subcommittee, and Iwi appointees will have full voting rights as members of the Subcommittee under Standing Orders.

**Meeting Cycle:** As required  
**Quorum:** 4

**Reports to:** Policy, Finance and Strategy Committee

### **PURPOSE:**

To make recommendations to the Policy, Finance and Strategy Committee, for recommendation to Council on the matters to be addressed in the full review of the District Plan and development of a Proposed District Plan.

### **Provide:**

Direction to Council officers on all matters relating to the drafting of content for the review of the District Plan. This includes but is not limited to:

- scoping and investigation of the issues
- engagement on possible content
- development of discussion documents and other draft documents for consultation
- development of a Draft District Plan for consultation
- development of a Proposed District Plan for statutory consultation.

### **General:**

Any other matters delegated to the Subcommittee by Council in accordance with approved policies and bylaws.

**HUTT CITY COUNCIL**

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

Meeting to be held via audio visual link on  
Thursday 17 March 2022 commencing at 12.30pm.

**ORDER PAPER**

**PUBLIC BUSINESS**

**1. OPENING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA (22/36)**

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**

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Generally up to 30 minutes is set aside for public comment (three minutes per speaker on items appearing on the agenda). Speakers may be asked questions on the matters they raise.

**4. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS**

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

**5. MINUTES**

Meeting minutes District Plan Review Subcommittee, 10 February 2022 5

**6. INTENSIFICATION PLANNING INSTRUMENT - DRAFT SUMMARY DOCUMENT (22/523)**

Report No. DPRS2022/1/54 by the Principal Environmental Policy Analyst 11

**CHAIR'S RECOMMENDATION:**

“That the recommendations contained in the report be discussed.”

## 7. QUESTIONS

With reference to section 32 of Standing Orders, before putting a question a member shall endeavour to obtain the information. Questions shall be concise and in writing and handed to the Chair prior to the commencement of the meeting.

## 8. CLOSING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA WHAKAMUTUNGA

Unuhia!

Unuhia!

Unuhia i te uru-tapu-nui

Kia wātea, kia māmā

Te ngākau, te tinana, te wairua i te ara takatū. Koia rā e Rongo whakairihia ake ki runga Kia wātea, kia wātea!

Ae rā, kua wātea!

Hau, pai mārire.

Annie Doornebosch  
Democracy Advisor

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 B Dyer  
Cr N Shaw

Cr K Brown  
Deputy Mayor T Lewis

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.

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**

02 March 2022

File: (22/523)

---

**Report no: DPRS2022/1/54**

## **Intensification Planning Instrument - Draft Summary Document**

### **Purpose of Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval of the Subcommittee to undertake consultation on a 'Draft' Intensification Planning Instrument (District Plan change) in the form of a summary document.

### **Recommendations**

That the Subcommittee:

- (1) receives the information contained in the report, including the summary document on the 'Draft' Intensification Planning Instrument attached as Appendix 1 to the report; and
- (2) approves the summary document on the 'Draft' Intensification Planning Instrument for consultation.

### **Background**

2. As reported to the Subcommittee on 10 February 2022, in December 2021, Parliament passed the *Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021* (the Housing Supply Act).
3. This Act seeks to accelerate the supply of housing in urban areas where demand for housing is high, which includes the Lower Hutt urban area, by amending the *Resource Management Act 1991* (RMA) and *National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020* (NPS-UD).
4. As a result of these amendments, territorial authorities are required to:
  - Prepare an Intensification Planning Instrument (IPI) – a specific district plan change to enable greater building heights and density of urban form, primarily in residential areas.

- Process the IPI through an Intensification Streamlined Planning Process - a new district plan change process that is more streamlined and condensed than the standard plan change process.
5. Given these new requirements, officers are preparing an IPI for the City of Lower Hutt District Plan. While the new requirements have delayed the full review of the District Plan, work that has been done to date on the review of the District Plan (including technical assessments) will be used to inform the IPI and will remain relevant for the full District Plan review when it proceeds.
  6. At its 10 February 2022 meeting, the Subcommittee was briefed by officers on the requirements of the IPI and the options available to Council. While the Subcommittee discussed the approach Council could take in the IPI, and in some cases gave an indication of the preferred options, no formal decisions were made at that meeting on the options that were presented.
  7. Officers have prepared a summary document for a draft IPI, based on the options recommended at that meeting, for the purposes of community and stakeholder engagement, and now seek the Subcommittee's direction regarding this summary and engagement.

## **Discussion**

### Community and Stakeholder Engagement for the District Plan Review

8. Community and stakeholder engagement has been undertaken on the District Plan Review throughout 2020 and 2021. This engagement has sought to better understand whether the Operative District Plan is achieving its objectives and whether it still reflects the community views and aspirations. In addition, this engagement has sought to further understand the workability and implementation issues with the Operative District Plan.
9. Community engagement on the District Plan Review to date has been focused on the key topics of housing, natural hazards, historic heritage, natural environment and business development. Stakeholder engagement on the District Plan Review to date has been more targeted relating to the areas or topics of interest to individual stakeholders.
10. This engagement has used a variety of methods, including open days/ drop-in sessions, summary brochures and website information, online webinars, online surveys, one-on-one meetings, phone calls and social media.

### Process Requirements in Preparing the Intensification Planning Instrument

11. From a process perspective, the key requirement is that the IPI (the Plan Change) is publicly notified by 20 August 2022. The Housing Supply Act also states that Council must not notify more than one IPI or withdraw the IPI.
12. In preparing the IPI, the same obligations apply as preparing any standard plan change. These obligations include consultation prior to notification, including supplying iwi authorities with a copy of the draft plan change prior to notification for comment.

13. The Minister for the Environment is expected to issue a direction shortly setting out the requirements for the process following notification of the IPI, including the number and composition of the hearing panel.

Content Requirements in Preparing the Intensification Planning Instrument

14. The IPI is a change to a district plan that *must*:
- Incorporate specific *Medium Density Residential Standards* (MDRS) as set out in the Housing Supply Act; and
  - Give effect to Policies 3, 4 and 5 of the NPS-UD.
15. In addition, the IPI *may* amend or include:
- Provisions relating to financial contributions,
  - Provisions to enable papakāinga housing; and
  - Related provisions (including objectives, policies, rules, standards and zones) that support or are consequential to the MDRS or Policies 3, 4 and 5 of the NPS-UD.

*Note: As Policy 5 of the NPS-UD relates solely to tier 2 and 3 territorial authorities, it is not relevant to Hutt City Council (as a tier 1 territorial authority) and is therefore not discussed in this report.*

16. The details of these requirements were set out in the report to the Subcommittee meeting held on 10 February 2022.

Summary document for the 'Draft' Intensification Planning Instrument

17. A summary document has been prepared for the draft IPI. The summary document is based on the recommended options presented to the Subcommittee at its 10 February 2022 meeting.

18. Table 1 includes a summary of these recommended options.

<b>Table 1. Recommended options for the Intensification Planning Instrument.</b>
<b>Recommended options for Commercial zones</b>
<p><u>Building heights and density in the City centre zone</u> Provide for no specific building height and density limits in the Core and Riverfront (Core) Precincts and increase height limits in the other precincts to six storeys. Building heights and densities could be indirectly restricted (e.g. protections for heritage buildings, sunlight access to key public spaces like Andrews Avenue).</p>
<p><u>Building heights and density in Suburban centres</u> Provide for heights varying based on commercial and community services and access to public and active transport, which would be above six storeys in some (e.g., the largest centres around key train stations), and below six storeys in others (e.g. small, isolated blocks of shops in distant suburbs with smaller catchments and less public transport access).</p>
<b>Recommended options for Residential zones</b>
<p><u>Location and extent of walkable catchment areas</u> 1200m walkable catchment for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The city centre,</li> <li>• The Petone metropolitan centre, and</li> </ul> <p>800m walkable catchment for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Train stations on the Hutt Valley and Melling Lines.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Enabling buildings of at least six storeys in walkable catchment areas</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permit buildings of up to three storeys, subject to standards of the MDRS.</li> <li>• Resource consent required for buildings of four or more storeys, with provisions supporting the buildings up to six storeys.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Building heights and density in areas adjacent to suburban centres</u> 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.</p>
<p><u>Modifying Medium Density Residential Standards to be more enabling of development</u> Modify the Medium Density Residential Standards to align them with the existing District Plan standards for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area, including the omission of standards on Landscaped areas, Outlook space and Window requirements for street facing facades.</p>
<b>Recommended options for Qualifying matters</b>
<p>Modify the Medium Density Residential Standards and building height and density requirements under Policy 3 of the NPS-UD to accommodate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.</li> <li>• The management of significant risks from natural hazards</li> <li>• Open space provided for public use, but only in relation to land that is open space.</li> </ul>

## Options

19. There are two primary options for consulting on the Intensification Planning Instrument (Plan Change):

**a. Option 1: Consult on a non-statutory summary Draft IPI prior to notification of the Proposed IPI (Recommended)**

This option enables the community to be informed on the key changes in the IPI and provide feedback. As a non-statutory process and summary document, the consultation is less adversarial compared with the statutory RMA process. This consultation enables potential issues to be identified early and changes to be made to the IPI. In turn, this consultation can reduce the need for submissions or appeals in the formal statutory process, reducing time and costs at that stage. Consultation on non-statutory draft district plans/ plan changes is best practice.

This is the recommended option.

**b. Option 2: Consult only on the Proposed IPI**

This option involves consultation that is prescribed by the RMA and Housing Supply Act with no consultation on a Draft District Plan Change. Community consultation would commence with the public notification of the Proposed District Plan Change. At this point it is a statutory process and some rules will have legal effect. While this process still allows anyone to make a submission, this is a more formal process which can be costly and time-consuming for submitters and consequently can have the effect of excluding groups or individuals from the process. Relying on this statutory consultation can also result in additional time and costs (both for submitters and the Council) to resolve matters that could have been resolved earlier.

20. In addition to these two primary options, there are potentially other options involving different engagement methods. For example, in lieu of general community consultation on a draft document, a community reference group could be established, or existing community groups be used for testing and feedback on draft provisions. Alternatively, another option could be no consultation on a draft document and running a series of engagements (most likely online) such as surveys or online forums seeking feedback on specific aspects of the IPI. These other options have been discounted given the IPI is of city-wide significance, the inter-connected aspects of the issues, and the short period of time to prepare the plan change.

## Next Steps

21. Depending on whether the Sub-committee decides to consult on a non-statutory draft plan change, the next steps would be:

- a. April 2022: IPI Engagement on the 'draft' IPI, by informing the community and stakeholders of the IPI and its requirements, and engaging on the aspects of the IPI where there are options (does not occur if Option 2 selected);

- b. May 2022: Review feedback on 'draft' IPI Plan Change (does not occur if Option 2 selected);
- c. April and May 2022: Concurrent with engaging on the 'draft' IPI Plan Change (if Option 1 selected), ongoing drafting of the detailed provisions of the IPI Plan Change. In addition, ongoing evaluation of qualifying matters;
- d. May 2022: Iwi authorities sent a copy of the full draft IPI for feedback as required by Clause 4A Schedule 1 RMA;
- e. 12 May 2022: District Plan Review Subcommittee meeting to receive summary of feedback from engagement and consider a 'working draft' IPI and provide direction;
- f. 23 June 2022: District Plan Review Subcommittee meeting to receive and consider 'final' Proposed IPI for adoption to public notification;
- g. 5 July 2022: Policy, Finance and Strategy Committee Meeting to consider recommendation from the District Plan Review Subcommittee for adopting Proposed IPI for public notification;
- h. 5 July 2022 (TBC): Additional Council meeting to consider the recommendation from the Policy, Finance and Strategy Committee to adopt Proposed IPI for public notification;
- i. By 20 August 2022: Publicly notify the Proposed IPI;
- j. August – September 2022: Submission period;
- k. September – December 2022: Prepare summary of submissions and public notify for further submissions; and
- l. January 2023 to mid-2023: Hearings held and decisions on submissions notified.

### **Climate Change Impact and Considerations**

- 22. The matters addressed in this report have been considered in accordance with the process set out in Council's Climate Change Considerations Guide.
- 23. There are no specific climate change impact considerations associated with this matter in terms of whether to consult on a draft plan change. However, there are climate change considerations associated with the IPI itself which will be considered as part of its preparation.

### **Engagement**

- 24. An initial Communications and Engagement Plan has been prepared on the basis of Option 1. If the Subcommittee choose Option 2, this plan would be updated to reflect that decision.

### Legal Considerations

25. The key legal consideration for the IPI Plan Change is the necessity for Council to meet the requirements of the RMA. The key considerations are meeting the requirement to notify an IPI by 20 August 2022, and to ensure that the IPI Plan Change is prepared in accordance with the requirements set out in the Housing Supply Act. These specific requirements will be reported to the Subcommittee when it is considering the IPI Plan Change content.

### Financial Considerations

26. Engagement under options 1 and 2 can be undertaken within the current District Plan review budget for the 2021/22 financial year.

### Appendices

No.	Title	Page
<a href="#">1</a>	Draft Intensification Planning Instrument - Summary Document	18

**Author:** Nathan Geard  
Principal Environmental Policy Analyst

**Author:** Hamish Wesney  
Policy Planner

---

**Reviewed By:** Parvati Rotherham  
Head of Planning

**Approved By:** Helen Oram  
Director Environment and Sustainability

## Hutt City Council

### Draft Intensification Planning Instrument – Enabling More Housing in Lower Hutt

Lower Hutt's population is increasing and we have residents facing difficulties in finding suitable places to live. We need to accommodate more houses to provide warm, safe and affordable places to live.

Over the last five years Council has implemented a series of actions to support the development of more housing in Lower Hutt. These actions include direct investment in housing projects (through Council-Controlled Organisation called Urban Plus Ltd), supporting community housing providers, efficient regulatory services, and amending the District Plan to enable more land use and subdivision.

The government has now directed Councils in the main cities in New Zealand, including Lower Hutt, to change their District Plan (the document which sets the rules for housing developments) to enable more housing.

Therefore, Council is now preparing proposed Plan Change 56 (PC56) to the District Plan.

This document outlines the background, scope and key changes proposed in PC56. The primary purpose of this plan change is to enable more housing in Lower Hutt. In particular, in urban areas, it will allow up to three homes of up to three storeys to be built on most sites without the need for a resource consent.

This Plan Change will be the Intensification Planning Instrument ('IPI') under s80E of the Resource Management Act.

#### Key draft proposals

Plan Change 56 (PC56) is a suite of changes to enable more housing through specific rule and policy changes and through rezoning specific sites. Key changes to the District Plan are:

- Allow three dwellings, up to three storeys in height throughout the majority of residential areas, including enabling taller dwellings closer to property boundaries
- Allow up to six storey apartment buildings in the following areas:
  - o Within 1200m of the Central Business District and the Petone commercial area
  - o Within 800m of railway stations on the Hutt Valley and Melling Lines
  - o In residential areas adjacent to Avalon, Eastbourne, Moera, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata suburban commercial centres
- Allow papakāinga (housing on ancestral Maori land)
- Amend financial contributions to fund upgrades to infrastructure and reserves resulting from increased housing
- Limiting building heights and density where necessary to manage impacts on historic heritage values and natural hazard risk

The table below sets out more details on the key changes.

## Details on Key Changes Proposed to the Planning Rules

Residential zones		
Zones		
Current District Plan	Proposed changes	Reasons for change
<p>Six residential zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General Residential Activity Area</li> <li>• Medium Density Residential Activity Area</li> <li>• Special Residential Activity Area</li> <li>• Historic Residential Activity Area</li> <li>• Hill Residential Activity Area</li> <li>• Landscape Protection Residential Activity Area</li> </ul>	<p>Four residential zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General Residential Activity Area</li> <li>• Medium Density Residential Activity Area</li> <li>• Hill Residential Activity Area</li> <li>• Landscape Protection Residential Activity Area</li> </ul> <p>Properties within the Special Residential and Historic Residential Activity Areas would be rezoned to a combination of General Residential and Medium Density Residential Activity Area.</p>	<p>The Medium Density Residential Standards must be applied to all residential zones other than large lot residential zones.</p> <p>In addition, buildings of at least six storeys must be enabled within walkable catchment areas.</p> <p>As a result, the District Plan will provide for the same level of development on properties currently in the Special Residential and Historic Residential Activity Areas as what it provides for on properties in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential Activity Areas.</p> <p>The Hill Residential and Landscape Protection Residential Activity Area are retained as they are large lot residential zones.</p>
Medium Density Residential Activity Area		
Current District Plan	Proposed changes	Reasons for change
<p><b>Location:</b> Applies to residential areas near the following suburban centres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avalon</li> <li>• Epunui</li> <li>• Naenae</li> <li>• Stokes Valley</li> </ul>	<p><b>Location:</b> Applies to the following residential areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas within 1200m of the Lower Hutt city centre and Petone commercial centre,</li> <li>• Areas within 800m of train stations on the Hutt Valley and Melling Lines</li> </ul>	<p>Buildings of at least six storeys must be enabled within walkable catchments of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City centre zones,</li> <li>• Metropolitan centres, and</li> <li>• Rapid transit stops.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taita</li> <li>• Wainuiomata</li> <li>• Waiwhetū</li> <li>• Waterloo</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific areas adjacent to the Avalon, Eastbourne, Moera, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata suburban centres.</li> </ul> <p>This includes all areas currently in the Historic Residential Activity Area and some areas currently in the Special Residential and Hill Residential Activity Areas.</p>	<p>1200m (a 15-minute walk for most people) has been chosen as a walkable catchment for city centre and metropolitan centre zones as these are likely to be destinations of a journey.</p> <p>800m (a 10-minute walk for most people) has been chosen for rapid transit stops as a rapid transit stop is less likely to be the destination of a journey.</p> <p>For areas adjacent to Avalon, Eastbourne, Stokes Valley, Moera, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata suburban centres, the District Plan must enable building heights and density of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activities and community services. The level of commercial activities and community services in these five suburban centres is similar to that of many of the larger suburban centres within the walkable catchment areas.</p>
<p><b>Development provided for:</b></p> <p>Three-storey buildings are permitted, subject to other development standards on the design of a development, including boundary setbacks and outdoor living space.</p> <p>Buildings with more than three storeys require resource consent.</p>	<p><b>Development provided for:</b></p> <p>Three-storey buildings are permitted, subject to other development standards on the design of a development, including boundary setbacks and outdoor living space.</p> <p>Buildings with more than three storeys require resource consent, but with policies and other provisions that ensure that resource consent can be obtained for six-storey buildings in the zone.</p>	<p>The District Plan must permit buildings of at least three storeys and at least three residential units per site in these areas.</p> <p>In addition, the District Plan must enable buildings of at least six storeys in walkable catchment areas, and for residential areas adjacent to suburban centres, must enable building heights and density of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activities and community services.</p>
<p><b>General Residential Activity Area</b></p>		
<p><b>Current District Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed changes</b></p>	<p><b>Reasons for change</b></p>

<p><b>Location:</b> Applies to all residential areas unless one of the other residential zones that seek a specific development outcome (Medium Density Residential, Special Residential and Landscape Protection Residential Activity Areas) is more appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Applies to all residential areas unless one of the other residential zones that seek a specific development outcome (Medium Density Residential, Hill Residential and Landscape Protection Residential Activity Areas) is more appropriate.  This includes some areas currently in the Special Residential Activity Area.</p>	<p>The only change to the location of the General Residential Activity Area is that some properties previously in the Special Residential Activity Area would now be in this zone. This is because the District Plan is required to permit the same level of development in the areas currently in the Special Residential Activity Area as what is enabled in the General Residential Activity Area.</p>
<p><b>Development provided for:</b> Two-storey buildings and two residential units per site are permitted, subject to other development standards on the design of a development, including boundary setbacks and outdoor living space.  Buildings with more than two storeys require resource consent.</p>	<p><b>Development provided for:</b> Three-storey buildings and three residential units per site are permitted, subject to other development standards on the design of a development, including boundary setbacks and outdoor living space.  Buildings with more than three storeys require resource consent.</p>	<p>The District Plan must permit buildings of at least three-storeys and at least three residential units per site in these areas.</p>
<p><b>Residential development standards</b> <i>The following is a summary of the proposed development standards. If a development meets these standards, it would be permitted (no resource consent required). Otherwise, resource consent would be required. Appendix 1 includes a table that compares these standards with the current standards of the District Plan.</i></p>		
<p><b>Development standard</b></p>		
<p><b>Maximum units per site</b></p>	<p><b>General Residential: Activity Area:</b> Three units per site <b>Medium Density Residential Activity Area:</b> No maximum unit per site standard</p>	<p><b>Explanation</b>  The District Plan must incorporate a development standard of three units per site for relevant zones. However, it can include a more lenient standard or omit the standard.  The more lenient approach for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area (no maximum</p>

		unit per site standard) is the current District Plan approach for this zone.
<b>Maximum building height</b>	11m + 1m roof allowance	The District Plan must incorporate this development standard for relevant zones. However, it can include a more lenient standard or omit the standard.
<b>Maximum height in relation to boundary (recession plane standard)</b>	4m + 60° This standard does not apply to road boundaries, internal boundaries or site boundaries where there is a common wall between two buildings.	The District Plan must incorporate this development standard for relevant zones. However, it can include a more lenient standard or omit the standard.
<b>Minimum boundary setbacks (yard standard)</b>	<b>Front boundaries:</b> 1.5m <b>Side and rear boundaries:</b> 1m This standard does apply to site boundaries where there is a common wall between two buildings.	The District Plan must incorporate this development standard for relevant zones. However, it can include a more lenient standard or omit the standard.
<b>Building coverage (site coverage)</b>	<b>General Residential Activity Area:</b> 50% of the site <b>Medium Density Residential Activity Area:</b> 60% of the site	The District Plan must incorporate a building coverage standard of 50% for relevant zones. However, it can include a more lenient standard or omit the standard. The more lenient standard for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area (60% of the site) is the current District Plan standard for this zone.
<b>Minimum outdoor living space</b>	<b>Units at ground level:</b> 20m <sup>2</sup> per unit. If outdoor living space is provided at ground level, it must have a minimum dimension of 3m. If it is provided above ground level (such as balconies or roof terraces) it must have a minimum dimension of 1.8m. <b>Units above ground level:</b> 8m <sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 1.8m.	The District Plan must incorporate this development standard for relevant zones. However, it can include a more lenient standard or omit the standard.





















