

Proposed District Plan Change 39

TRANSPORT

Summary of Decisions Requested (Summary of Submissions and Further Submissions)

Updated to include all late submissions

SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

| | | |
|-----------------|---|-----------|
| DPC39/1 | Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited | 5 |
| DPC39/2 | Siegfried Bachler | 5 |
| DPC39/3 | Shayne Hodge | 6 |
| DPC39/4 | New Zealand Transport Agency..... | 6 |
| <i>DPC39F/1</i> | <i>Nick Ursin</i> | <i>14</i> |
| <i>DPC39F/2</i> | <i>Andrew Banks</i> | <i>15</i> |
| <i>DPC39F/5</i> | <i>Stride Investment Management Ltd</i> | <i>17</i> |
| DPC39/5 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited..... | 18 |
| <i>DPC39F/1</i> | <i>Nick Ursin</i> | <i>21</i> |
| <i>DPC39F/2</i> | <i>Andrew Banks</i> | <i>22</i> |
| <i>DPC39F/4</i> | <i>New Zealand Transport Agency.....</i> | <i>24</i> |
| DPC39/6 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga..... | 25 |
| DPC39/7 | Bikes Welcome Charitable Trust..... | 25 |
| <i>DPC39F/5</i> | <i>Stride Investment Management Ltd</i> | <i>31</i> |
| DPC39/8 | Andrew Banks | 32 |
| <i>DPC39F/4</i> | <i>New Zealand Transport Agency.....</i> | <i>35</i> |
| DPC39/9 | Petone Planning Action Group..... | 36 |
| <i>DPC39F/3</i> | <i>New Zealand Fire Service Commission</i> | <i>38</i> |
| <i>DPC39F/4</i> | <i>New Zealand Transport Agency.....</i> | <i>39</i> |
| DPC39/10 | Bruce and Claire Bengé..... | 39 |
| <i>DPC39F/4</i> | <i>New Zealand Transport Agency.....</i> | <i>39</i> |
| DPC39/11 | Simon Brown | 40 |
| <i>DPC39F/4</i> | <i>New Zealand Transport Agency.....</i> | <i>41</i> |
| DPC39/12 | Andrew Fox | 42 |
| DPC39/13 | Nick Ursin | 43 |
| DPC39/14 | Richard Beatson | 44 |
| <i>DPC39F/4</i> | <i>New Zealand Transport Agency.....</i> | <i>45</i> |
| DPC39/15 | David Tripp | 46 |
| DPC39/16 | Summerset Villages (Lower Hutt) Limited | 47 |
| DPC39/17 | Hutt Cycle Network | 47 |
| <i>DPC39F/5</i> | <i>Stride Investment Management Ltd</i> | <i>50</i> |
| DPC39/18 | New Zealand Fire Service Commission | 51 |
| DPC39/20 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | 52 |
| <i>DPC39F/4</i> | <i>New Zealand Transport Agency.....</i> | <i>58</i> |
| <i>DPC39F/5</i> | <i>Stride Investment Management Ltd</i> | <i>58</i> |
| DPC39/21 | Harriet Fraser Traffic Engineering and Transportation Planning..... | 59 |

| | | |
|-----------------|--|----|
| <i>DPC39F/5</i> | <i>Stride Investment Management Ltd</i> | 61 |
| DPC39/22 | Winstone Aggregates and Firth Industries | 62 |
| <i>DPC39F/4</i> | <i>New Zealand Transport Agency</i> | 63 |
| DPC39/23 | Firth Industries | 63 |
| <i>DPC39F/4</i> | <i>New Zealand Transport Agency</i> | 64 |
| DPC39/24 | Minister of Education | 65 |
| DPC39/26 | Tim Julian | 65 |

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED - PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 39

Any new text that is proposed to be added is underlined, while any text proposed to be deleted has been ~~struck through~~.

| DPC39/1 Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--|---|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 1.1 | Amendment 20 <i>Section 14A 5.1(c) - Rules</i> | Oppose | Policy 14A 4.5 implicitly requires activities to provide sufficient on-site parking so as to avoid adverse externalities on on-street parking. Retaining discretion over impacts on on-street parking in the Central Commercial Activity Area undermines the removal of parking requirements for the Activity Area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exclude the Central Commercial Activity Area from Policy 14A 4.5 and Rule 14A 5.1(c). Amend Rule 14A 5.1(c) as follows: <i>Any activity that exceeds the high trip generator thresholds specified in Appendix Transport 2 is a Restricted Discretionary Activity.</i> <i>Discretion is restricted to:</i> <i>i. The effects of the activity on the transport network including impacts on on-street parking <u>except this provision does not apply to activities within the Central Commercial Activity Area.</u></i> |
| 1.2 | Amendment 28 <i>Standard 4(a), Table 4-1 – Minimum Parking Standards</i> | Support | | Retain Table 4-1 as notified with regard to the Central Commercial Activity Area. |

| DPC39/2 Siegfried Bachler | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|--|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 2.1 | Amendment 37 <i>Standard 6(b) – Noise</i> | Oppose | If the council requires noise reduction from properties within 40m of the rail corridor, it should be the responsibility of the source of the noise. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete Plan Change 39 relating to noise. Put the onus for noise reduction from the rail corridor on the railway operators and not on the property owners. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a directive to require railways to control noise levels. • Noise level control can be 'Noise barriers' down the length of the Rail Corridor within 40m of private properties. |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| DPC39/3 Shayne Hodge | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|

| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
|-----------|---|------------------|---|--|
| 3.1 | Amendment 28 <i>Standard 4(a), Table 4-1 – Minimum Parking Standards</i> | Support | Carparking is largely driven by the underlying activities within these areas and allowing the market to decide these requirements is a practical outcome. | Support the planned change to car parking requirements Amendment 28 to nil for any activity in the Central and Petone Commercial Activity Areas. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| DPC39/4 New Zealand Transport Agency | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|

| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
|-----------|-----------------------|------------------|---|--------------------|
| 4.1 | General | - | <p>Plan Change 39 needs to enable and facilitate the development, management and operation of the transport network, to enable communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing. In proposing the amendments below, the submitter's objective has been to identify areas where there are gaps or areas that require further emphasis, focusing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognising and supporting the function of state highways; and • Recognising strategic issues that impact on development, operation and management of the Hutt | |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|----------------|---|--|
| | | | City transport network. | |
| 4.2 | Amendment 2 <i>Section 14A 1 Introduction</i> | Oppose in part | <p>Linkage between key urban development planning processes and future objectives and policies for transport development is insufficient and needs to be strengthened to ensure continuity and provide for non-statutory documents to be implemented.</p> <p>There should be stronger and clearer alignment between the district plan objectives and policies, the Regional Policy Statement and the Regional Land Transport Plan.</p> <p>Providing links to appropriate sections, particularly the utilities chapter will be helpful for plan users.</p> <p>It is important that District Plan users understand that the District Plan is only one of a suite of plans by which Council seeks to achieve its visions and desired outcomes.</p> <p>It is useful to decision-makers if they are directed to documents that provide useful context when considering complex applications.</p> | <p>Amend Introduction as follows:</p> <p><i><u>This transport chapter contains city-wide objectives, policies and rules relevant to the transport network. It seeks to implement transport related resource management solutions from various strategic documents such as Making Places, The Urban Growth Strategy 2012-2032, Walk and Cycle the Hutt Strategy and the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2015.</u></i></p> |
| 4.3 | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | <p>ECONOMIC PRODUCTIVITY</p> <p>Policies and objectives that facilitate and enable linkages between transport, urban growth and economic development will provide a useful link between the district plan and the various other strategic planning documents for Hutt City.</p> <p>The relevance of transport to economic wellbeing has been identified in Issue 14A 2.1. However, this connection has not been carried through to the objectives and policies.</p> | See submission point 4.7 (combines relief sought in submission points 4.3 to 4.6). |
| 4.4 | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | <p>RESILIENCE</p> <p>The Regional Land Transport Plan identifies resilience</p> | See submission point 4.7 (combines relief sought in submission points 4.3 to 4.6). |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|--------|--|--|
| | | | <p>as a key factor contributing to severance and place making issues in Hutt City. Resilience should be recognised on objectives and policies, and resilience issues should be key consideration for developers, infrastructure providers and decision makers.</p> <p>The Regional Land Transport Plan sets out a variety of expectations relating to resilience and is the predominant document for achieving a resilient transport network; however, the District Plan has a critical role to play. Resilience needs to be included in the District Plan so that decision-makers have a clear framework to assess proposals.</p> <p>This is to ensure that new development, and new and upgraded infrastructure, maintains or enhances the resilience of the transport network. This will help manage proposals that are detrimental to the resilience of the city. It is important that the District Plan provides clear expectations via the policy framework.</p> | |
| 4.5 | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | <p>IMPROVED REGIONAL CONNECTIVITY</p> <p>Hutt City has a number of directives within the Regional Policy Statement, which identifies the need to improve connectivity for the District.</p> <p>Clear objectives and policies around connectivity can help deliver improvement around the liveability of the City, particularly in terms of integration of transport and land use, and the delivery of key projects.</p> <p>The wording in the Proposed Plan Change 39 should be tightened to better reflect the intention of the Regional Policy Statement.</p> | See submission point 4.7 (combines relief sought in submission points 4.3 to 4.6). |
| 4.6 | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | <p>MULTI MODAL</p> <p>The District Plan should support the significant investment being made in cycling within the city through</p> | See submission point 4.7 (combines relief sought in submission points 4.3 to 4.6). |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|----------------|---|---|
| | | | <p>its objectives, policies and rules.</p> <p>There should be greater alignment with the Hutt Walking and Cycling strategy as well as stronger and more facilitative objectives and policies that call for active modes and multi modal choice.</p> <p>There are a number of cycling projects that will benefit from appropriate recognition in objectives and policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastern Bays Shared Path; • The Beltaway; and • Wainuiomata Hill Shared Path. <p>The Submitter supports minimum numbers of cycle parks and showers, but recommends some minor changes.</p> <p>The policy framework does not satisfy the expectations of either Walk and Cycle the Hutt Plan 2014- 2019 or the Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>Given that Walk and Cycle the Hutt Plan 2014-2019 was drafted on the basis that provision for implementation will be considered in the District Plan, greater specificity is required in the Proposed Plan Change.</p> | |
| 4.7 | <p>Amendment 3 <i>Issue 14A 2.1</i></p> <p>Amendment 8 <i>Objective 14A 3.1</i></p> <p>Amendment 13</p> | Oppose in part | | <p>Amend Issue 14A 2.1 as follows:</p> <p><i>A safe efficient, <u>resilient</u>, multi-modal transport network that is well integrated with land use and development is essential for both sustainable development and social and economic wellbeing.</i></p> <p><i><u>Opportunities exist for improving the transport network to ensure the continued development of the cycling network, and improving the resilience of the city's transport network and transport connections. There are particular opportunities to improve connections to and from State Highway 2 and east</u></i></p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Policy 14A 4.1</p> <p>Amendment 15</p> <p>Policy 14A 4.3</p> <p>Amendment 32</p> <p>Standard 4(e) – Cycle Parking and End of Trip Facility Requirements</p> | | | | <p><u>west connections across the southern half of the city and to the wider region. There is potential to improve safety for all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists.</u></p> <p>Amend Objective 14A 3.1 as follows:</p> <p><i>A safe, efficient and resilient transport network that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Is integrated with land use and development patterns,</i> • Meets <u>Provides for local, regional and national transport needs and provides for all modes of transport, including improved regional and cross valley connectivity,</u> • <u>Has particular regard for public transport and active travel modes,</u> • <u>Provides for economic wellbeing.</u> <p>Combine Policies 14A 4.1 and 4.3 as follows:</p> <p><i>Provide for the construction, use, operation, maintenance and development of the transport network in a manner which:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Improves safety with a focus on serious injury and fatal crashes,</i> • <i>Improves the efficiency of the network,</i> • <i>Improves regional and district connectivity,</i> • <i>Is designed to be resilient to, and enable appropriate restorations after, major events and is integrated to provide network options,</i> • <i>Contributes to the operation of an integrated multi-modal transport system including facilities such as park and rides,</i> • <i>Achieves an effective public transport system and provides for safe and convenient active travel,</i> • <i>Recognises the benefits to Hutt City, regional and national economic wellbeing brought by an effective transport network, particularly through providing for the efficient</i> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | <p><i>movement of freight.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Appropriately manages adverse effects on adjacent land.</i> <p>Consider increasing the number of cycle parks to an equivalent ratio of 2 per 10 staff members ;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifying the provision of lockers on a 1 per 10 ratio alongside the provision of lockers for storing bike gear; • There is also benefit in specifying design standards for cycle parking e.g. in situations where 10 or more bicycle parks are required it would be more practical for bicycle stands to be provided; and • Consider provisions to support cycle parking in retail areas, based on the expected number of visitors per hour e.g. 1 cycle park per 20 persons visiting per hour. |
| 4.8 | Amendment 21 <i>Standard 1(a), Table 1-1 – Transport Network Hierarchy</i> | - | It is the Submitter’s preference that the District Plan aligns with the Transport Agency’s One Network Road Classification. | Amend Table 1-1: Transport Network Hierarchy to align with the One Network Road Classification. |
| 4.9 | Amendment 23 <i>Standard 2 – Site Access and Manoeuvring Area</i> | - | <p>Limited Access Roads (LARs) are managed under the Government Roding Powers Act 1989.</p> <p>A LAR is a state highway or part of a state highway that the Submitter has declared as such. Under the Government Roding Powers Act, the Submitter has the authority to approve or refuse activities that front or directly access a LAR.</p> <p>The management of LARs has implications for many plan users. Accordingly, it is helpful for those users to find the necessary information in one place and this also helps ensure alignment across legislation.</p> <p>It is most efficient if this Crossing Place Approval</p> | <p>Add the following advice note to Standard 2:</p> <p><i>Advice Note:</i></p> <p><u><i>Any activity requiring access to a road which is a Limited Access Road will require an approved Crossing Place notice. If the Limited Access Road is a state highway, the crossing place notice would need to be approved by the New Zealand Transport Agency.</i></u></p> |

| | | | | |
|------|---|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | | process is aligned with the resource consent process. | |
| 4.10 | General | Oppose | The Proposed Plan Change should include reference to consulting with the Transport Agency, particularly in respect of land use development that may not be adjacent to the state highway but because of the location, scale or nature of the activity may impact on the road network. | No specific decision requested. |
| 4.11 | Objectives and Policies | Oppose | Current park and ride facilities in Hutt Valley are full, with spill over parking occurring on residential streets. With rail passenger growth for the past three years averaging 4% per annum, it is prudent for Council to include objectives and policies that clearly reflect the importance of park and ride facilities. | No specific decision requested. |
| 4.12 | Amendment 14 <i>Policy 14A 4.2</i> | Oppose in part | Policy 10 of the Regional Policy Statement specifically requires the promotion of travel demand management to be covered in District Plans and the Regional Land Transport Strategy. | Amend Policy 14A 4.2 as follows: <i>Land use, subdivision and development should not cause significant adverse effects on the connectivity, accessibility and safety of the transport network, and particular regard should be given to travel demand management as a mitigation measure.</i> |
| 4.13 | Amendment 35 <i>Standard 6 – Development within the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays</i> | Support, with amendments | It would be useful for plan users to understand the compliance mechanisms available when undertaking construction within the 40 metre wide State Highway and Railway Buffer Overlays. This would improve clarity of the plan and reduce confusion around proof of compliance with permitted activity standards. | Amend Permitted Activity Standard 6(b) as follows: <u><i>In order to achieve this standard either:</i></u> (i) <u><i>An acoustic design report must be provided to the Council prior to the commencement of the use. The acoustic design report must be prepared by a person qualified and experienced in acoustics. The report is to indicate the means by which the noise limits specified in this standard will be complied with and is to contain a certificate by its author that the means given therein will be adequate to ensure compliance with the acoustic design requirements specified in this standard; or</i></u> (ii) <u><i>Compliance with the requirements in the following table will be deemed to achieve the required insulation standard specified in this rule. A report must be provided to the Council</i></u> |

prior to any building consent being granted or, where no building consent is required, prior to commencement of the use, demonstrating compliance with the requirements listed in the following table and will form part of the building consent application (if any). The report must be prepared by the person responsible for undertaking the building work.

| <u>Building Element</u> | <u>Requirement</u> |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <u>Wall</u> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>20mm timber weather boards exterior cladding: Internal lining two layers of 10mm thick gypsum plasterboard. Minimum 75mm thick fibreglass or polyester or wool insulation in wall cavity.</u> <u>Brick veneer: Internal lining 1 layer of 10mm thick gypsum plasterboard.</u> |
| <u>Window</u> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Up to 20% of wall area 7mm laminated glazing (1mm interlayer).</u> <u>Up to 50% of wall area 11mm laminated glazing (1mm interlayer).</u> |
| <u>Roof</u> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Pitched roof greater than 20°: Steel cladding of 0.5mm or greater or tiles. Ceiling lining of two layers of minimum 10mm thick gypsum plasterboard. Minimum 75mm thick fibreglass or polyester or wool insulation of 14kg/m³ in ceiling cavity.</u> <u>Skillion roof: Steel cladding of 0.5mm or greater. Ceiling lining of two layers of minimum 13mm thick gypsum plasterboard. Minimum 75mm thick fibreglass or polyester or wool insulation of 14kg/m³ in ceiling cavity.</u> |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| <u>Floor</u> | 1. <u>On grade slab.</u> 2. <u>Two layers of 20mm thick particle board.</u> |
|--------------|--|

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| DPC39F/1 | Nick Ursin |
|-----------------|-------------------|

| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
|------|-----------------------|------------------|---|---|
| F1.1 | Not specified | Oppose | <p>While the submissions of NZTA and KiwiRail may be regarded by the agencies as operational, the Submitter believes their promotion and support of the proposal are putting the Government and Ministers in a position of supporting the subversion of natural justice and changes to policies relating to justice, resource management and local body precedents which may not be enforceable.</p> <p>Given NZTA's comment that they are prepared to work with Council on the proposed changes the Submitter believes that the views of the relevant Ministers should be canvassed before proceeding further, as it is obvious that policies could be involved.</p> <p>The Ministers views should be made public.</p> <p>As an example of who is leading any changes, NZTA in its submission under Ref 11, 3.11 makes reference to noise and building consents and lays down new standards. As such it would be interesting to learn whether the standard sought were drafted by a person qualified and experienced in acoustics and who that expert was? And how readily available is the expertise and at what cost?</p> <p>It is clear to the Submitter and others that the State Agencies involved are not interested in natural justice and that they are trying to use the Council by way of Proposed District Plan Change 39 to transfer</p> | <p>The Submitter seeks the views of Government and appropriate Ministers, and requests that the proposed and suggested changes be rejected and the council re-draft appropriate noise, vibration and ventilation requirements to reflect that the responsibility for any nuisance created within the road and rail corridors lies solely with controlling agencies and their Ministers.</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| | | | responsibility for noise, vibration and ventilation from their corridors to the affected public. | |
| DPC39F/2 Andrew Banks | | | | |
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| F2.1 | 4.13 | Oppose | <p>In the Submitter's opinion, a certificate as described in the NZTA submission provides no practical benefit with respect to the ability for users of the District Plan to demonstrate compliance with the proposed standard. In the Submitter's opinion, the important and useful requirements are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that a report is prepared indicating the means by which the standard is to be complied with; • that this report is prepared by a person qualified and experienced in acoustics. <p>No information is provided in the submission as to whether the acoustic design industry has the ability to provide the certificate requested as a matter of course, or whether such a certificate is 'insurable' with respect to the type of professional indemnity insurance cover typically held by acoustic design professionals.</p> <p>Were it the case that acoustic design professionals were not able to provide such a certificate as a matter of course, this may have the effect of limiting the ability of property owners to engage an acoustic design professional, should the professional not be commercially willing to provide such a certificate. Additionally, this may have the effect of further increasing the cost of acoustic design services to effected property owners, where acoustic design professionals may be required to take out more</p> | That the requirement to provide a certificate is not included in the proposed standard. |

| | | | | |
|------|------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | expensive insurance policies that cover the issuing of such certificates (if indeed such a policy exists). | |
| F2.2 | 4.13 | Support in part | <p>The Submitter supports generally the approach of the NZTA to provide a list of ‘deemed to comply’ solutions as part of the proposed standard. In the Submitter’s opinion, this is an efficient means of implementing the intent of the standard, as it would have the effect of reducing the additional design and reporting costs associated with complying with the standard, should effected property owners wish to use any of the ‘deemed to comply’ solutions.</p> <p>However, with respect to glazing, the Submitter notes that only single glazing is included in the list of ‘deemed to comply’ glazing. The use of double glazed units is common with respect to new house construction (as well as additions or alterations to existing dwellings), particularly given the compliance requirements of Acceptable Solution H1/AS1 to Clause H1 (Energy Efficiency) of the New Zealand Building Code. The Submitter notes that in residential construction, single glazing generally does not comply with the requirements of H1/AS1, unless it is high-performance glass installed in timber or PVC window frames¹. In the Submitter’s opinion, inclusion of suitable market-available double glazed units would significantly increase the practical ability for property owners to use the ‘deemed to comply’ solutions for glazing.</p> | That suitable double glazed units are included in any list of ‘deemed to comply’ glazing. |
| F2.3 | 4.13 | Support in part | In the Submitter’s opinion, there is no practical use in implementing a ‘deemed to comply’ approach for floor construction under proposed standard 6(b) Noise, where compliance with the Norwegian Standard referenced under proposed standard 6(a) Vibration may require some other design solution. Under section 4 of the Submitter’s submission (DPC39/8), the Submitter opposed standard 6(a) Vibration partly because there | That deemed to comply solutions for floor construction are included that also comply with Standard 6(a) Vibration. |

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p>was insufficient information provided in the Section 32 Evaluation as to how the application of the Norwegian Standard would affect the design and construction of buildings, particularly with respect to foundation and flooring design.</p> <p>The Submitter supports in principle the use of ‘deemed to comply’ solutions. However in the case of floor construction, it is unclear whether the ‘deemed to comply’ solutions proposed are consistent with the requirements of proposed standard 6(a) Vibration. In the Submitter’s opinion, a ‘deemed to comply’ approach for floor construction that also complied with standard 6(a) Vibration would be useful for users of the District Plan, as this would mean that all aspects of standard 6 could be complied with through ‘deemed to comply’ methods.</p> | |
| DPC39F/5 <i>Stride Investment Management Ltd</i> | | | | |
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| F5.1 | 4.7 | Oppose | <p>There is no evidence provided to support the submission to increase the number of cycle parks to 2 per 10 people, or cycle parks of 1 per 20 visitors for retail centres.</p> <p>Provisions should not be required to provide cycle spaces or end of trip facilities for existing retail developments.</p> <p>The Submitter has three key concerns with the proposed Standard 4(e) Cycle Parking and End of Trip Facility Requirements:</p> <p>(a) The provisions apply to “changes to existing activities”. This would capture where an activity changes from one type to another, and where an existing building is redeveloped no matter the scale</p> | <p>Amend Standard 4(e) as follows:</p> <p>(a) Be consistent with the Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 and the requirement for cycle spaces and end of trip facilities be only required for “new buildings and development”, and not for changes in activities or redevelopment of existing buildings;</p> <p>(b) The number of cycle parking facilities required be reduced, and appropriate rates be applied that recognise the different demand rates for different activities; and</p> <p>(c) The requirement for showers to be limited to specific activities where these facilities can be accommodated, including office, education, and hospitals, and not apply to retail activities.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>or nature of the redevelopment.</p> <p>(b) The number of cycle spaces for staff members are set at a single rate for all activities and do not take into account the difference in demand for cycle spaces for difference activities.</p> <p>(c) The number of showers are set at a single rate for all activities and do not take into account that it is impractical to provide end of trip facilities for some activities.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| DPC39/5 KiwiRail Holdings Limited | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 5.1 | Amendment 4 <i>Issue 14A 2.2</i> | Support | Recognition that there are potential effects, including noise and vibration, that can arise from the operation and maintenance of a transport network, and that the management of these effects is required, is supported by KiwiRail. | Retain Issue 14A 2.2 as notified. |
| 5.2 | Amendment 5 <i>Issue 14A 2.3</i> | Support | The acknowledgement of the issue of reverse sensitivity in relation to transport networks is supported by KiwiRail. | Retain Issue 14A 2.3 as notified. |
| 5.3 | Amendment 7 <i>Issue 14A 2.5</i> | Support | The safety and efficiency of the transport network, and the effects that inappropriately designed transport facilities can have on these as being an issue, is supported by KiwiRail. | Retain Issue 14A 2.5 as notified. |
| 5.4 | Amendment 8 <i>Objective 14A 3.1</i> | Support | Seeking to provide for a safe and efficient transport network that is integrated with land use patterns and provides for all modes of transport is supported by KiwiRail. | Retain Objective 14A 3.1 as notified. |
| 5.5 | Amendment 10 | Support | This Objective links to Issue 14A 2.3, and for similar | Retain Objective 14A 3.3 as notified. |

| | | | | |
|------|--|----------------|--|---|
| | <i>Objective 14A 3.3</i> | | reasons is also supported by KiwiRail. | |
| 5.6 | Amendment 12 <i>Objective 14A 3.5</i> | Support | This Objective links to Issue 14A 2.5, and consistent with the discussion on that Issue, this Objective is supported by KiwiRail. | Retain Objective 14A 3.5 as notified. |
| 5.7 | Amendment 14 <i>Policy 14A 4.2</i> | Support | The policy direction that land use, subdivision and development should not cause significant adverse effects on the transport network is supported by KiwiRail. | Retain Policy 14A 4.2 as notified. |
| 5.8 | Amendment 15 <i>Policy 14A 4.3</i> | Oppose in part | In relation to the rail corridor there is limited practical ability to change the location of this. While slight adjustments in boundary location can sometimes occur, the rail corridor is not able to be moved. Avoiding, mitigating or remedying adverse effects is not always practical. | Amend Policy 14A 4.3 as follows: <i>Policy 14A 4.3</i> <i>The transport network should be located and designed to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on adjacent land <u>where practicable</u>.</i> |
| 5.9 | Amendment 16 <i>Policy 14A 4.4</i> | Support | | Retain Policy 14A 4.4 as notified. |
| 5.10 | Amendment 18 <i>Policy 14A 4.6</i> | Support | | Retain Policy 14A 4.6 as notified. |
| 5.11 | Amendment 24 <i>Standard 2(b) – Separation Distances from Intersections</i> | Oppose in part | The amendment requested would ensure that in the event of a train approaching, that vehicle accesses are not impeded by queuing vehicles waiting to cross the level crossing, and that vehicles turning across the traffic into a vehicle access are less likely to be obstructed by queuing vehicles, thereby less likely to cause vehicles to queue behind them. | Amend Permitted Activity Standard 2(b) as follows: <i>The distance between new vehicle accesses and all intersections must be at least:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Primary or Major Distributor Road: 30m</i> • <i>Minor District Distributor Road: 20m</i> • <i>Local Distributor Road: 15m</i> • <i>Access or Pedestrian Road: 10m</i> • <i><u>Level Crossing: 30m</u></i> |

| 5.12 | Amendment 27 <i>Standard 3 – Minimum Sight Distances at Railway Level Crossings</i> | Support | | Retain Permitted Activity Standard 3 as notified. | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 5.13 | Amendment 35 <i>Standard 6 – Development within the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer</i> | Support | | Retain Permitted Activity Standard 6 as notified. | | | | | | |
| 5.14 | Amendment 36 <i>Standard 6(a) - Vibration</i> | Oppose in part | The proposed standard restricts the extent of vibration from road and rail, rather than the extent of vibration that occupants of the building are affected by, from the road and rail network. The control should be on the building mitigation. | Amend Permitted Activity Standard 6(a) as follows: <i>Road and rail traffic vibration levels</i> <u><i>Buildings must comply with class C of Norwegian Standard 8176 E:2005 (Vibration And Shock - Measurement Of Vibration In Buildings From Landbased Transport And Guidance To Evaluation Of Its Effect On Human Beings).</i></u> | | | | | | |
| 5.15 | Amendment 37 <i>Standard 6(b) - Noise</i> | Supports with amendment | The specific mitigation required would not achieve practical mitigation of rail noise as the characteristics of road and rail noise are different. Noise mitigation should be provided to a suitable standard to mitigate rail noise, independent of road noise. | Amend Permitted Activity Standard 6(b) as follows: <i>(b) Noise</i> <i>Indoor design noise level as a result of noise from road and rail traffic must not exceed 45dB LAeq(24hr).</i> <u><i>Indoor design noise level as a result of noise from rail traffic must not exceed:</i></u> <table border="1" data-bbox="1357 1214 2074 1406"> <thead> <tr> <th><u><i>Receiving Environment</i></u></th> <th><u><i>LAeq, 1 hour</i></u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u><i>Residential – Bedrooms</i></u></td> <td><u><i>35 dB</i></u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u><i>Residential – Habitable</i></u></td> <td><u><i>40 dB</i></u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | <u><i>Receiving Environment</i></u> | <u><i>LAeq, 1 hour</i></u> | <u><i>Residential – Bedrooms</i></u> | <u><i>35 dB</i></u> | <u><i>Residential – Habitable</i></u> | <u><i>40 dB</i></u> |
| <u><i>Receiving Environment</i></u> | <u><i>LAeq, 1 hour</i></u> | | | | | | | | | |
| <u><i>Residential – Bedrooms</i></u> | <u><i>35 dB</i></u> | | | | | | | | | |
| <u><i>Residential – Habitable</i></u> | <u><i>40 dB</i></u> | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--|--|---------------|--|------------------------|--------------|--|---|
| | | | | <table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Spaces</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Teaching spaces</u></td> <td><u>40 dB</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td> <u>All other sensitive activity building spaces e.g.:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Hospital and Dementia Care Spaces</u> <u>Commercial Spaces</u> </td> <td><u>To comply with satisfactory sound levels AS/NZS 2107:2000 (nearest specified equivalent)</u></td> </tr> </table> | <u>Spaces</u> | | <u>Teaching spaces</u> | <u>40 dB</u> | <u>All other sensitive activity building spaces e.g.:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Hospital and Dementia Care Spaces</u> <u>Commercial Spaces</u> | <u>To comply with satisfactory sound levels AS/NZS 2107:2000 (nearest specified equivalent)</u> |
| <u>Spaces</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Teaching spaces</u> | <u>40 dB</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>All other sensitive activity building spaces e.g.:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Hospital and Dementia Care Spaces</u> <u>Commercial Spaces</u> | <u>To comply with satisfactory sound levels AS/NZS 2107:2000 (nearest specified equivalent)</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.16 | Amendment 38 <i>Standard 6(c) – Ventilation</i> | Support | | Retain Permitted Activity Standard 6(c) as notified. | | | | | | |
| 5.17 | Amendment 42 <i>District Plan Maps</i> | Support | | Retain District Plan Maps as notified with regard to the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays. | | | | | | |
| DPC39F/1 Nick Ursin | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested | | | | | | |
| F1.1 | Not specified | Oppose | <p>While the submissions of NZTA and KiwiRail may be regarded by the agencies as operational, the Submitter believes their promotion and support of the proposal are putting the Government and Ministers in a position of supporting the subversion of natural justice and changes to policies relating to justice, resource management and local body precedents which may not be enforceable.</p> <p>Given NZTA's comment that they are prepared to work with Council on the proposed changes the Submitter believes that the views of the relevant Ministers should be canvassed before proceeding further, as it is obvious</p> | The Submitter seeks the views of Government and appropriate Ministers, and requests that the proposed and suggested changes be rejected and the council re-draft appropriate noise, vibration and ventilation requirements to reflect that the responsibility for any nuisance created within the road and rail corridors lies solely with controlling agencies and their Ministers. | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p>that policies could be involved.</p> <p>The Ministers views should be made public.</p> <p>As an example of who is leading any changes, NZTA in its submission under Ref 11, 3.11 makes reference to noise and building consents and lays down new standards. As such it would be interesting to learn whether the standard sought were drafted by a person qualified and experienced in acoustics and who that expert was? And how readily available is the expertise and at what cost?</p> <p>It is clear to the Submitter and others that the State Agencies involved are not interested in natural justice and that they are trying to use the Council by way of Proposed District Plan Change 39 to transfer responsibility for noise, vibration and ventilation from their corridors to the affected public.</p> | |
| DPC39F/2 | | Andrew Banks | | |
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| F2.4 | 5.14 | Oppose | The Submitter opposes the proposed revision to the vibration standard for the reason as that they oppose the inclusion of Standard 6(a) Vibration, as stated in the Submitter's initial submission (Submission DPC/8, Sub. Ref. 8.3). | The Submitter opposes the revision to Standard 6(a) Vibration. |
| F2.5 | 5.15 | Oppose | <p>In section 2 of the Submitter's original submission (DPC39/8), he opposes the application of all standards proposed by standard 6 to properties near rail corridors in Lower Hutt. Some of the reasons for this position included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent, nature and/or existence of reverse sensitivity effects associated with rail corridors in | That the proposed revision is not included in the District Plan. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Lower Hutt was not established in the Section 32 Evaluation accompanying the proposed plan change;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential adverse effects on urban design, character and the safety of the street environment as a result of the proposed standards being implemented had not been assessed; • The Section 32 Evaluation did not include sufficient cost-benefit analysis, or any analysis of alternative approaches, to demonstrate whether it is reasonable or practical for property owners within the proposed buffer zone to bear all costs for managing reverse sensitivity effects associated with the rail corridor. <p>The KiwiRail submission appears to seek a higher noise standard for rail traffic than that proposed by the original proposed plan change. Apart from stating that “the characteristics of road and rail noise are different”, no information is provided as to why this is a reasonable requirement.</p> <p>The KiwiRail submission contains no information as to whether the noise standards proposed by their submission can be reasonably or practicably implemented through building design and construction. In the example of residential construction, it is unclear whether conventional methods of construction could be used, or whether non-conventional materials, systems or construction details would be required. Further, the submission contains no information on whether the methods of construction required to achieve the noise standards proposed are readily available to the design and construction industry, or whether they would be compatible with the requirements of the New Zealand Building Code. Of particular concern to the Submitter would be compatibility with the requirements of clause E2 of the Building Code (External Moisture). It is unclear whether or not the requirements proposed by the</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|------|---|-------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| | | | <p>KiwiRail submission would mean that affected property owners were unable to use the Acceptable Solutions to clause E2, as the Acceptable Solutions may not comply with the requirements of the KiwiRail submission. The absence of any information on how the noise standard proposed by the KiwiRail submission would affect building design and construction means that there is no certainty as to whether the standard could be reasonably complied with.</p> <p>The revised noise standards proposed by the KiwiRail submission could introduce a further cost burden to affected property owners in the form of additional design and construction costs. The KiwiRail submission provides no information or analysis to quantify this. The Submitter notes that the cost analysis contained in the NZTA Guide to the management of effects on noise sensitive land use near to the state highway network (referred to in the Section 32 Evaluation) is based on acoustic standards that are different to those proposed by the KiwiRail submission. In the absence of any information on the potential cost burden applied to affected property owners by the revised noise standard, it is not clear whether the potential costs imposed by the standard on property owners are reasonable with respect to managing reverse sensitivity effects.</p> | |
| | <p>DPC39F/4 New Zealand Transport Agency</p> | | | |
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| F4.1 | 5.14 | Support | The standard applies directly to new buildings, not the road and rail network. The Submitter agrees with KiwiRail's reasons: that the control should be expressed as being on new building design, not the existing road and rail network. | As per KiwiRail's submission |

| | | | | |
|------|------|---------|---|--------------------|
| F4.2 | 5.16 | Support | - | Retain as notified |
| F4.3 | 5.17 | Support | Maps will provide an immediate visual indication to plan users. This will be particularly useful to first time or infrequent plan users. It will provide a useful indication that there are specific rules on a site. | Retain as notified |

| DPC39/6 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|---|--|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 6.1 | Amendment 28 <i>Standard 4(a) – Car Parking Requirements</i> | Opposes in part | Meeting on site parking requirements can be prohibitively expensive for heritage resources due to lot size and building layout. The resulting modifications to the heritage resource and its setting can result in significant adverse effects on historic heritage values and significant costs to developers. | Amend Permitted Activity Standard 4(a) as follows: <i>(a) Car Parking Requirements</i> <i>For all new activities and changes to existing activities, <u>with the exception of historic heritage as set out below, car parking spaces must be provided in accordance with the minimums calculated under Table 4-1.</u></i> <i><u>New activities and changes to existing activities, where that activity occurs within or on the site of a heritage building or structure included in Appendix Heritage 1 or 2 of Chapter 14F, are exempt from the minimums calculated under Table 4-1.</u></i> |

| DPC39/7 Bikes Welcome Charitable Trust | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 7.1 | Amendments 8-12 <i>Section 14A 3 - Objectives</i> | Oppose in part | | Transport plan objectives should include the prioritisation of active and public transport along with the integration of transport modes, and reduced reliance on private vehicles. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|----------------|---|--|
| 7.2 | Amendments 8-12 <i>Section 14A 3 - Objectives</i> | Oppose in part | | In addition to the objectives of safety and efficiency, the transport network should put people first and be integrated, liveable, accessible, sustainable, resilient, and supportive of a healthy connected community. |
| 7.3 | Amendment 17 <i>Policy 14A 4.5</i> | Oppose in part | | Requirements for the evaluation of high trip generating activities (Amendment 17) should include three key criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will this reduce carbon emissions? • will this reduce overall congestion in the city? • will this promote healthy lifestyles? |
| 7.4 | Amendment 25 <i>Standard 2(c) – Manoeuvring Area</i> | | | Standards for manoeuvring areas should make a real difference to walkability and pedestrian safety, especially around schools and areas of high pedestrian traffic volumes. Visibility around driveways should be addressed. |
| 7.5 | Amendment 31 <i>Standard 4(d) – Car Parking Design Standards</i> | Oppose in part | | Pedestrian safety and convenience, and the priority of pedestrian / active transport access within new developments needs to be prioritised. |
| 7.6 | Amendment 28 <i>Standard 4 – Car and Cycle Parking and End of Trip Facilities</i> | Oppose | Cycle parking and end of trip facility requirements are inadequate and a missed opportunity to proactively 'build' active transport into our environment. The focus on cycling to places of employment is too limiting and does not reflect the opportunities for active transport in other journeys / activities. | No specific decision requested. |
| 7.7 | Amendment 39 <i>Appendix Transport 2 – High Trip</i> | Oppose in part | | High trip generation activities should include provision for temporary / periodic activities such as markets. |

| | | | | |
|------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | <i>Generator Thresholds</i> | | | |
| 7.8 | Amendment 17 <i>Policy 14A 4.5</i> | Seeks amendment | | The council's role in encouraging active transport uptake should be reflected in its role, objectives and powers. This should include stronger requirements for provision for active travel within neighbourhoods and subdivision developments and clear direction to prioritise active transport modes within Integrated Transport Assessment |
| 7.9 | General | - | Integration of multiple transport modes should be supported. Consideration should be given to charging facilities for electric bikes and allocation of space for car sharing. | No specific decision requested. |
| 7.10 | General | - | The Proposed Plan Change should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connectivity; • Information; • Productivity; and • Community. | No specific decision requested. |
| 7.11 | General | - | | With an aging population, and an a decrease in the number of younger persons driving, it is important that a hierarchy of transportation alternatives prioritise and provide for people whose main source of mobility is not private motor vehicles but rather active and public transport. |
| 7.12 | General | - | | The only truly sustainable transport is active transport, and this should be clearly prioritised in the Transport Chapter of the District Plan. Complementary schemes such as car sharing should be actively encouraged by making special parking provisions available/required. |

| | | | | |
|------|---------|---|--|--|
| 7.13 | General | - | | Resilience is an important consideration that requires further attention in both objectives and policy. |
| 7.14 | General | - | <p>An integrated plan for Hutt City must reflect the health needs of its residents both responsively and proactively.</p> <p>Walking and biking have a significant impact on residents' physical health.</p> | <p>The following aspects of the Regional Policy Statement should be reflected in the Proposed Plan Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthy community; and • Quality lifestyle. <p>Not only should all development prioritise active transport, facilities designed to promote and support healthy lifestyles should provide the best possible facilities for pedestrians and bike users.</p> <p>Special provision should be made in the plan for medical centres and hospitals to provide bike parking for visitors.</p> |
| 7.15 | General | - | <p>People should be the first priority of the transport chapter, both in terms of health and safety, but also in the wider context of active transport and the health and community benefits it brings.</p> <p>The high cost of free vehicle parking needs to be recognised.</p> <p>On-street parking takes up road space that could be used for cycling and walking, it needs to be maintained and monitored, and it creates vehicle movements that contribute to congestion.</p> <p>The Submitter states that "Although we like to associate parking provision with boosting business, in practice this doesn't happen."</p> | <p>New developments should be required to make pedestrian and cycle access a priority. It should be safe, accessible, obvious, and where possible, separated from parking. Such access should be sited so as to maximise use of active and public transport options.</p> <p>Design aspects such as access ways, signage and site traffic management should make pedestrian and cycle access the first priority.</p> <p>New residential developments should prioritise the movement of people via active transport into, out of and within the development.</p> <p>Appropriate design should enable and encourage active transport and community engagement.</p> <p>Access should be prioritised over parking to send the message that other modes of transport (other than vehicular) are possible and attractive.</p> <p>A people focused transport hierarchy should be proactively applied to schools.</p> |

| | | | | |
|------|--|----------------|--|--|
| 7.16 | Amendment 25 <i>Standard 2(c) – Manoeuvring Area</i> | Oppose in part | | <p>This addition is insufficient to ensure pedestrian safety. This standard should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rear sites and long driveways (per Auckland DP). • School zones: vehicles must reverse into driveways if unable to turnaround in order to exit in forward facing direction. • Allowance for use of audible and visual warning devices. • Areas of high foot traffic. • Driveways crossing cycle paths / lanes. <p>Visibility (enabling drivers exiting driveways to be able to see footpath users) needs to be addressed. This is particularly pertinent when talking about EV's and aged users, as footpath users cannot rely on being able to hear the exiting vehicle.</p> <p>Sight distance provisions could be added for example some european countries restrict driveway fence height adjacent to the property boundary to enable visibility.</p> |
| 7.17 | Amendment 32 <i>Standard 4(e) – Cycle Parking and End of Trip Facility Requirements</i> | - | Cycle parking requirements based on staff numbers could cause confusion, and is out of step with approaches used elsewhere. How would a developer be able to estimate the number of staff the facility would accommodate without having secured a tenant / fit out design / purpose / nature of business to be undertaken? | <p>Replace the standards with those of the Proposed Christchurch Replacement District Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quantities based on GLFA unless there is strong evidence that staff number based quantities are the best practice. Separate staff and visitor cycle parking supply rates. 2. End of trip facilities for staff should include showers and lockers (per Hamilton and ChCh plans). Drying facilities should also be included. 3. Visitor cycle parking should be provided in addition to staff cycle parking. (AKL, HAM, CHCH). 4. Requirements around location, secure facilities and manoeuvring should be included (per AKL, CHCH). 5. Quality requirements should be included to ensure serviceable bike parking is provided (CHCH). |

| | | | | |
|------|--|----------------|--|---|
| 7.18 | Amendment 32 <i>Standard 4(e) – Cycle Parking and End of Trip Facility Requirements</i> | - | | <p>It is commendable to include cycle parking minimums in the plan. To ensure cycle parking is used effectively in needs to be of sufficient quality. There are 6 Important aspects: Type of stand, weather protection, security, convenience, distance, visibility. These aspects should be addressed by specific requirements for design, location and provision.</p> <p>Covered parking for staff/residents and at transport hubs.</p> <p>Inclusion of end of trip facilities: not only showers but also: lockers, drying facilities.</p> |
| 7.19 | General | - | | <p>The Proposed Plan Change focuses on encouraging people to cycle to places of employment. This is insufficient and out of step with prioritising active transport for short trips, and limits the economic, health and community benefits which can accrue with increased active transport uptake.</p> <p>People can and will cycle to more places than just the workplace, which is desirable and beneficial to health, environment and perceptions of 'liveability'.</p> |
| 7.20 | Amendment 39 <i>Appendix Transport 2 – High Trip Generator Thresholds</i> | Oppose in part | | <p>The Submitter questions why 50 children has been chosen as the threshold for High Trip Generators in Appendix Transport 2, when previous requirements were based on 30, and states that even 30 children result in a significant number of vehicle movements in a higher risk setting.</p> |
| 7.21 | Amendment 51 <i>Chapter 5A - Central Commercial Section 5A 1.2.5 - Carparking</i> | Oppose | | <p>The text 'Also, provide for car parking in a way that reduces the reliance on private vehicles and encourages use of sustainable transport modes' should remain here or be incorporated into an overall objective. Similarly, policy 'a' should remain, especially with regard to pedestrian safety and convenience.</p> <p>Preferably there should be an overall objective, similar to Christchurch's replacement district plan, which "reduces the dependency on private motor vehicles and promotes the use of public and active transport". A road use hierarchy, as defined</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | within ChCh Transport Strategic plan would help reinforce this commitment. |
| 7.22 | Amendment 77 <i>Chapter 13 – Network Utilities</i> <i>Section 13.3.3 – Matters in which Council Seeks to Control</i> | Oppose in part | The decision requested would enable Council to take a proactive role and ensure development decisions / direction support its vision. | Add in 'impact on active transport use / uptake'. This would enable to council to take a proactive role and ensure development decisions / direction support its vision (such as the walking and cycling strategy). |
| DPC39F/5 Stride Investment Management Ltd | | | | |
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| F5.2 | 7.17 | Support in part and oppose in part | <p>Reference needs to be given to other district plans, including the Auckland Unitary Plan.</p> <p>The Auckland Unitary Plan only requires end of trip facilities for offices, education facilities and hospitals.</p> <p>The Submitter has three key concerns with the proposed Standard 4(e) Cycle Parking and End of Trip Facility Requirements:</p> <p>(a) The provisions apply to “changes to existing activities”. This would capture where an activity changes from one type to another, and where an existing building is redeveloped no matter the scale or nature of the redevelopment.</p> <p>(b) The number of cycle spaces for staff members are set at a single rate for all activities and do not take into account the difference in demand for cycle spaces for difference activities.</p> <p>(c) The number of showers are set at a single rate for all activities and do not take into account that it is impractical to provide end of trip facilities for some</p> | <p>Amend Standard 4(e) as follows:</p> <p>(a) Be consistent with the Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 and the requirement for cycle spaces and end of trip facilities be only required for “new buildings and development”, and not for changes in activities or redevelopment of existing buildings;</p> <p>(b) The number of cycle parking facilities required be reduced, and appropriate rates be applied that recognise the different demand rates for different activities; and</p> <p>(c) The requirement for showers to be limited to specific activities where these facilities can be accommodated, including office, education, and hospitals, and not apply to retail activities.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------|--|
| | | | activities. | |
|--|--|--|-------------|--|

DPC39/8 Andrew Banks

| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
|-----------|---|------------------|--|--|
| 8.1 | <p>Amendments 35 - 38</p> <p><i>Standard 6 – Development within the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays</i></p> <p>Amendment 42</p> <p><i>District Plan Maps</i></p> | Oppose in part | <p>There is insufficient detail contained in the Section 32 Evaluation to establish the nature, extent or existence of reverse sensitivity effects adjacent to rail corridors in Lower Hutt, or whether the measures contained in proposed standard 6 are the most appropriate means of mitigating reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>When multiplied over the total number of properties affected by the proposed standard, the potential future costs to landowners associated with meeting the noise insulation standard becomes significant.</p> <p>There is no certainty as to whether reverse sensitivity effects exist along the rail corridor, the extent and nature of these effects, or whether the proposed standard is an appropriate way to address these effects.</p> <p>The standards could have an effect on urban design (through both building setbacks that cause inefficient development of sites and solid acoustic barriers that adversely affect neighbourhood character, sightlines for vehicles reversing onto busy streets, and passive surveillance).</p> <p>The standard has the effect of requiring all costs for the mitigation of reverse sensitivity effects to be borne by affected property owners, while providing no limitations or controls on the source of the effects.</p> <p>In three years of living within the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlay, the Submitter has not observed any discomfort or property dilapidation</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Permitted Activity Standard 6 to remove reference to rail traffic. • Amend Permitted Activity Standard 6 to remove the railway corridor from the <i>State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays</i>. • Amend the District Plan Maps to remove buffer of the railway corridor from the <i>State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlay</i>. |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|--------|---|---|
| | | | associated with rail traffic vibration. | |
| 8.2 | Amendment 36 <i>Standard 6 – Development within the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays</i> | Oppose | <p>The requirement to maintain a building to comply with the standards could be unreasonably onerous and impractical, due to the fact that there are no limits set in the District Plan on the amount of vibration or noise emission from the state highway or corridor and that noise and vibration could increase over time.</p> <p>The costs and inconvenience of compliance monitoring for the standards could be a significant on-going burden for affected property owners and the Council.</p> <p>It is unreasonable that a burden of maintenance to meet the standards is applied only to the surrounding environment, and not the source of the noise and vibration.</p> | <p>Amend Permitted Activity Standard 6 as follows:</p> <p><i>Within the 40 metre wide State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays, all new buildings containing noise sensitive activities, or existing buildings with new noise sensitive activities, must be designed, <u>and</u> constructed and maintained to meet the following standards.</i></p> |
| 8.3 | Amendment 36 <i>Standard 6(a) - Vibration</i> | Oppose | <p>There is no certainty that buildings could be reasonably designed and constructed to comply with the proposed standard.</p> <p>There is a risk that the proposed standard implicitly prohibits particular land uses by requiring property owners to comply with a standard that may not be able to be reasonably complied with.</p> | Delete Permitted Activity Standard 6(a). |
| 8.4 | Amendment 35 <i>Standard 6 – Development within the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays</i> | Oppose | The proposed standard needs to be clear that it applies to the effects of State Highway traffic, and not traffic from other roads. | Amend Permitted Activity Standard 6 to refer to “State Highway traffic” in place of “road traffic”. |
| 8.5 | Amendment 38 <i>Standard 6(c) –</i> | Oppose | There is no benefit to measuring the noise generated by ventilation systems at exterior grilles or diffusers. | <p>Amend Permitted Activity Standard 6(c) as follows:</p> <p><i>If windows must be closed to achieve the design noise levels in (b), the building must be ventilated to meet clause G4 of the</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|--------|---|---|
| | Ventilation | | | <i>Building Code (Schedule 1 of the Building Regulations 1992). The sound of the ventilation system must not exceed 30dB $L_{Aeq(30s)}$ when measured 1m away from any <u>internal</u> grille or diffuser.</i> |
| 8.6 | Amendment 35-38 <i>Standard 6 – Development within the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays</i> Amendment 42 <i>District Plan Maps</i> | Oppose | If a clear method of calculating the boundary of the buffer area is included in the standard e.g. 40m from the marked edge of the nearest State Highway carriageway or similar, a visual overlay is not required. The use of a visual overlay could be confusing to one-time or unexperienced users of the District Plan. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays from the District Plan Maps. • Amend Permitted Activity Standard 6 to clarify the method of calculating the boundary of the buffer area. |
| 8.7 | Amendment 42 <i>District Plan Maps</i> | Oppose | There is an inconsistent use of terminology between the district plan maps and the proposed standard. The standard refers to a ‘State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlay’. However, the district plan maps refer to a ‘State Highway and Railway Corridor Overlay’, while omitting the critical word ‘Buffer’. A ‘corridor overlay’ could be misinterpreted as being a potential future widening of the transport corridor, rather than as a buffer area for managing reverse sensitivity effects on the transport corridor. | Amend the legend of the District Plan Maps to refer to “State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays”, instead of “State Highway and Railway Corridor Overlay”. |
| 8.8 | Amendment 35-38 <i>Standard 6 – Development within the State Highway and</i> | Oppose | A clearly articulated means of demonstrating compliance with the proposed standard is important in order to provide certainty for designers and property owners as to the information requirements expected by the Council in order to demonstrate that the proposed activity complies with the proposed standard. | Amend Permitted Activity Standard 6 to provide clear guidance on how compliance with the standard is to be demonstrated. |

| | | | | |
|------|--|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | <i>Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays</i> | | It is unclear when in the overall design and construction process this information would be required by Council. | |
| | DPC39F/4 <i>New Zealand Transport Agency</i> | | | |
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| F4.4 | 8.2 | Oppose | <p>The Submitter understands the intention of the wording “and maintained” was to signal the expectation that new buildings would be designed and constructed so the long-term compliance with the applicable vibration, noise and ventilation standards would be achieved. The standard (and rule) would only apply to the construction of new buildings.</p> <p>Additionally, the Submitter’s reverse sensitivity guide provides guidelines around predicting future traffic noise: design and construction should allow an addition 3dB to existing or predicated noise levels. The purpose of the Submitter’s Reverse Sensitivity guide is to promote good practice for the management of noise sensitive land uses near to state highways. The good practice this guide promotes recognises the social, economic and health benefits of managing interior working and living environments located near to state highways and other land transport networks. Relieving stress related illness and other sleep deprivation related health effects, reduces both individual and collective expenditure on health care. Careful and considered planning also balances the aspirations and wellbeing of landowners with New Zealanders’ desire to have access to a safe and efficient road transport network.</p> <p>Reverse sensitivity is the legal vulnerability of an established activity to complaint from a new land use. This can occur in situations where different land uses/activities are located in close proximity to each</p> | Retain Standard 6 as notified. |

| | | | | |
|------|-----|---------|---|--|
| | | | <p>other, resulting in conflict between the activities. The term ‘reverse sensitivity’ generally relates to the effects of the development of a sensitive activity in an area that is already affected by established activities. For land transport network operators, including the Transport Agency, there is a risk that new activities (such as house and schools) that choose to locate near to established roads or railways may object to the effects of the land transport network (such as noise and vibration) and take action against the operator. Therefore, reverse sensitivity provisions are required in district plans as a way to appropriately manage activities.</p> <p>Standard 6 is consistent with that good practice approach.</p> | |
| F4.5 | 8.3 | Oppose | The Submitter provides detailed guidance on this matter: “Guide t the management of effects on noise sensitive land use near to the state highway network”. | Retain Standard 6(a) as notified. |
| F4.6 | 8.5 | Oppose | The Submitter has detailed guidance that supports the measuring of noise vibration as per the proposed plan change. | Retain Standard 6(c) as notified. |
| F4.7 | 8.6 | Oppose | Maps wil provide an immediate visual indication to plan users. This will be particularly useful to first time or infrequent plan users. It will provide a usefull indication that there are specific rules on asite. | Retain proposed changes to District Plan Maps as notified. |
| F4.8 | 8.7 | Support | The Submitter agrees that the terminology used on the Plan Maps should be consistent with that in the rule and standard. | Ensure District Plan Maps refer to “ <i>State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlay</i> ” |

| DPC39/9 Petone Planning Action Group | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|----------------|---|---|
| 9.1 | General | Oppose | <p>The Proposed Plan Change does not actively promote active, public or other shared systems of transport.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan Change concentrates on achieving sustainable development without promoting sustainable transport.</p> | No specific decision requested. |
| 9.2 | Amendment 2 <i>Section 14A 1 - Introduction</i> | Neutral | The submitter assumes that the intent of the last sentence of section 14A 1 is that activities which generate significant volumes of traffic should be subject to the resource consent process. If this is the case the submitter suggests the insertion of the word “that” before “generate significant volumes...”. | <p>Amend paragraph 6 of the Introduction as follows:</p> <p><i>Activities that do not meet the standards or <u>that</u> generate significant volumes of traffic are assessed on a case by case basis through the resource consent process.</i></p> |
| 9.3 | Amendment 3 <i>Issue 14A 2.1</i> | Oppose in part | The submitter questions whether this is an issue, rather than an Objective and suggest that the words “and the wellbeing of the physical environment” be added at the end. | <p>Amend Issue 14A 2.1 as follows:</p> <p><i>A safe, efficient, multi-modal transport network that is well integrated with land use and development is essential for both sustainable development and social and economic wellbeing <u>and the wellbeing of the physical environment.</u></i></p> |
| 9.4 | Amendment 8 <i>Objective 14A 3.1</i> | Oppose in part | The Proposed Plan Change should overtly promote active transport. | <p>Amend Objective 14A 3.1 as follows:</p> <p><i>A safe and efficient transport network that is integrated with land use patterns, meets local, regional and national transport needs and provides for all modes of transport <u>in particular walking, cycling and use of public and shared transport.</u></i></p> |
| 9.5 | Amendment 15 <i>Policy 14A 4.3</i> | Oppose in part | | <p>Amend the policy as follows:</p> <p><i>The transport network should be located and designed to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on adjacent land <u>and the general environment.</u></i></p> |
| 9.6 | Amendment 20 <i>Rule 14A 5.1(c)</i> | Oppose in part | | <p>Amend the matter of discretion of Rule 14A 5.1(c) as follows:</p> <p><i>The effects of the activity on the transport network including impacts on on-street parking, <u>pedestrians, cyclists and public transport.</u></i></p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--|--|
| 9.7 | Amendment 23 <i>Standard 2(a) – Vehicle Access (excluding separation distances from intersections)</i> | Oppose in part | | Add a permitted activity standard of a maximum of one crossing to any residential site, with a maximum width that is sufficient for one passenger vehicle. |
| 9.8 | General | Oppose in part | The standards referred to in the Proposed Plan Change will become superseded by updated versions. | Amend all references to engineering standards to include the phrase “ <i>and any subsequent standard</i> ”. |
| 9.9 | Amendment 32 <i>Standard 4(e) – Cycle Parking and End of Trip Facility Requirements</i> | Support | | The Submitter believes the provision for cycle parking and end-of-trip facility requirements is a positive step. |
| 9.10 | General | Oppose | | Issue 11 – Pedestrian connectivity Issue 11 states that pedestrian connectivity could be enhanced by consideration of the way in which developments cater for pedestrians. The word could should be replaced by should, and the plan should make specific provision for pedestrian connectivity. Further any retail or industrial development involving a parking area should be made to provide safe access for pedestrians walking from the street to the facility. |
| DPC39F/3 New Zealand Fire Service Commission | | | | |
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| F3.1 | 9.7 | Oppose | In the event of a fire, there should be sufficient room for NZFS vehicles and appliances to access the subject site. This is stated in the NZFS Fire Fighting Code of Practice, and also within the Commissions submission | Refuse |

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| | | | on Proposed Plan Change 39, where they have requested all access ways shall be 4m wide. In addition, there are instances where non-residential activities are appropriately developed on residential sites; these activities may require more than one crossing in a site or a wider crossing point. | |
| DPC39F/4 New Zealand Transport Agency | | | | |
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| F4.9 | 9.3 | Oppose in part | The meaning of the proposed additional term “wellbeing of the physical environment is not clear. Given the reference to “sustainable development” in Issue 14A 2.1, there is no need for this additional reference. | The Submitter prefers its wording supplied in its primary submission. |
| F4.10 | 9.5 | Oppose | The meaning of the proposed additional term “general environment” is not clear. | The Submitter prefers its wording supplied in its primary submission. |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|---|---|
| DPC39/10 Bruce and Claire Benge | | | | |
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 10.1 | Amendment 35 <i>Standard 6 – Development within the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays</i> | Oppose in part | <p>The proposed standard will cause additional costs to rebuild existing dwellings located within this corridor.</p> <p>As there are no additional effects on the environment than those now experienced by the current inhabitants, property owners should be given the option of rebuilding to normal building standards.</p> <p>The same outcome as anticipated by the proposed standard can be achieved by adding in the option of a ‘non-complaints’ covenant as an alternative to complying with the proposed standard.</p> | <p>Amend Permitted Activity Standard 6 as follows:</p> <p><i>Within the 40 metre wide State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays, all new buildings containing noise sensitive activities, or existing buildings with new noise sensitive activities, must be <u>either</u> designed constructed and maintained to meet the following standards <u>or have a no complaints covenant registered against the title.</u></i></p> |
| DPC39F/4 New Zealand Transport Agency | | | | |

| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
|-------|-----------------------|------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| F4.11 | 10.1 | Oppose | <p>The meaning of the term “no complaints covenant” is unclear. Nor is it clear who would be party to such covenants, and who would be responsible for their enforcement through the RMA.</p> <p>It would not be good practice for the Council to rely on landowners to make use of no complaints covenants, where there is a resource management issue that should properly be dealt with by plan provisions. Standard 6 (and the associated rule and policies) is an appropriate planning method for promoting good practice for the management of noise sensitive land uses near to state highways.</p> | Retain Standard 6 as notified. |

| DPC39/11 Simon Brown | | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------|---|--|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 11.1 | <p>Amendments 35-38</p> <p><i>Standard 6 - Development within the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays</i></p> | Oppose | <p>Management of vibration and noise should be with the source of the vibration and noise, not those affected by it.</p> <p>Building to meet the proposed standard will increase building compliance costs.</p> <p>The proposed standard will create uncertainty and conflict as to how to meet the standard.</p> <p>It will not be possible to maintain buildings to the noise standard over time if the noise and vibration from transport are allowed to increase. Once built, it will be un-reasonably expensive to carry out further work to continue to meet the standard.</p> <p>The ventilation requirement (30dB Laeq(30s)) sounds like a “gold” standard that may be difficult to meet, and</p> | <p>To not proceed with this Proposed District Plan Change 39: Transport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop a policy to manage transport noise and vibration at source that will benefit the many existing residents in this zone. This policy should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Maintenance of pot-holes. o A high standard of repair for road trenching. o The type of road surfacing used. o Promotion of electric vehicles as an example of new quieter transport technology. o As a bulk funder of rail services, use influence to get rail to address the pollution, noise and vibration caused by rail services. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of continuous track • Get rail to look for a solution to the noise and |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>may not be met by any of the popular commercially sold systems.</p> <p>If there is to be a requirement for ventilation systems to be this quiet, it should be equally important regardless of where it is installed.</p> <p>Under section (a) Vibration the notice reads “Road and rail traffic vibration levels must comply with class C of Norwegian Standard” This clearly (as it should) requires road and rail traffic vibration levels to not exceed the proposed standard. Any re re-wording of this to apply it to buildings instead of road and rail would be a major change.</p> <p>The proposed plan change will do nothing to reduce the exposure to noise and vibration of the residents in the overlay areas. Only management of the source of the noise and vibration will achieve the reduction.</p> <p>Noise and vibration can be managed through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road maintenance; • Using fine chip or bitumen for road surfaces; • New quieter vehicles (the council could help influence the attractiveness of electric vehicles in the region with policy changes); • Continuous track where there are (almost) no track joins. • Modernised trains rather than heavy diesel trains. | <p>vibration generated by points in the rail network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modernize the passenger services pulled by heavy, noisy diesel locos designed for freight trains so that they meet modern pollution and noise and vibration standards. <p>- Drop the ventilation requirement from this change. If needed at all, this should be applied to all properties not just properties in this zone.</p> <p>- Do not change the wording of the Vibration clause under section (a) Vibration. The notice reads “Road and rail traffic vibration levels must comply with class C of Norwegian Standard” Management of this belongs with road and rail transport, not building standards.</p> |
| DPC39F/4 | | New Zealand Transport Agency | | |
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| F4.12 | 11.1 | Oppose | The purpose of the Submitter's Reverse Sensitivity guide is to promote good practice for the management | Retain Standard 6 as notified. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>of noise sensitive land uses near to state highways. The good practice this guide promotes recognises the social, economic and health benefits of managing interior working and living environments located near to state highways and other and transport networks. Relieving stress elated illness and other sleep deprivation related health effects, reduces both individual and collective expenditure on health care. Careful and considered planning also balances the aspirations and wellbeing of landowners with New Zealanders' desire to have access to a safe and efficient road transport network.</p> <p>Reverse sensitivity is the legal vulnerability of an established activity to complaint from a new land use. This can occur in situations where different land uses/activities are located in close proximity to each other, resulting in conflict between the activities. The term 'reverse sensitivity' generally relates to the effects of the development of a sensitive activity in an area that is already affected by established activities. For land transport network operators, including the Transport Agency, there is a risk that new activities (such as house and schools) that choose to locate near to established roads or railways may object to the effects of the land transport network (such as noise and vibration) and take action against the operator. Therefore, reverse sensitivity provisions are required in district plans as a way to appropriately manage activities.</p> <p>Standard 6 is consistent with that good practice approach.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| DPC39/12 Andrew Fox | | | | |
| Sub. | Amendment & | Support / | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |

| Ref. | Provision | Oppose | | |
|------|---|--------|--|----------------------------------|
| 12.1 | Amendments 35-38 <i>Standard 6 - Development within the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays</i> | Oppose | The measurement of vibration is unclear and open to abuse. A 40m buffer from the State Highway and railway corridor is too wide. The proposed standard tries to make the victims liable. | Reject the proposed plan change. |

| DPC39/13 Nick Ursin | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|------------------|--|---|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 13.1 | Amendments 35-38 <i>Standard 6 - Development within the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays</i> | Oppose | The submitter believes that the creation of noise and the effects of vibration are or can be regarded as the creation of a “nuisance”. As such, the Submitter believes that the perpetrators of a nuisance are committing an offence and could be charged in law and/or be asked to desist. What is proposed essentially deals with noise and traffic vibration and transfers the responsibility of dealing with the nuisance from perpetrator to victim. The proposed standards could have an effect on market values of properties in the overlay area. Many of the properties within the overlay area are in the council’s long term plans for higher density development, particularly those proximate to railway stations. The proposed standards go against natural justice and leaves council in possible costly litigation. If public health and/or safety issues are at stake the | Reject the proposal and introduce appropriate provisions to deal with noise and/or vibration that make those responsible for creating the noise and/or vibration responsible for their effects. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>council should have approached the roads board and railways and asked them to do what is done overseas and that is to construct appropriate noise deadening barriers.</p> <p>There have been cases where developments have taken place and the vibrations have not only caused a nuisance but damage to neighbouring properties.</p> <p>This should be dealt with by council in terms of legal responsibilities not transferred to those affected.</p> <p>There are at least two examples of vibration effects and in both cases they are outside the corridor areas.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| DPC39/14 Richard Beatson | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------|---|--|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 14.1 | <p>Amendments 35-38</p> <p><i>Standard 6 – Development within the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays</i></p> <p>Amendment 42</p> <p><i>District Plan Maps</i></p> | Oppose | <p>Enforced 'Maintenance' is possibly beyond the remit of the District Plan.</p> <p>The proposed standards could become unreasonably onerous for property owners.</p> <p>There seems to be no real practical method or measure nominated in terms of vibration or acoustics or data on the likely additional cost to property owners.</p> <p>The Submitter questions how making a building 'vibration'-proof or acoustically suitable deemed reasonably practical within adjacent residential properties.</p> <p>Possible mitigation solutions may have negative urban design affects.</p> <p>The Submitter questions where the New Zealand Transport Agency documentation cited suitable for</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Permitted Activity Standard 6 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Within the 40 metre wide State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays, all new buildings containing noise sensitive activities, must be designed, <u>and</u> constructed and maintained to meet the following standards: ...</i> Add requirement for the road/rail assets to make reasonable efforts to reduce noise along the state highway and railway corridor. Remove references to rail traffic from Permitted Activity Standard 6. Remove the Railway Corridor Buffer Overlay from the District Plan Maps. |

| | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | | <p>calculation of effects of rail as well as roading?</p> <p>The effects of the proposed standard may be contrary to the values of Historic Residential Activity Areas (for example, Riddlers Crescent, Petone).</p> | |
| <p>DPC39F/4 <i>New Zealand Transport Agency</i></p> | | | | |
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| F4.13 | 14.1 | Oppose | <p>The Submitter understand the intention of the wording “and maintained” was to signal the expectation the new buildings would be designed and constructed so that long-term compliance with the applicable vibration, noise and ventilation standards would be achieved. The standard (and rule) would only apply to the construction of new buildings.</p> <p>The purpose of the Submitter's Reverse Sensitivity guide is to promote good practice for the management of noise sensitive land uses near to state highways. The good practice this guide promotes recognises the social, economic and health benefits of managing interior working and living environments located near to state highways and other and transport networks. Relieving stress elated illness and other sleep deprivation related health effects, reduces both individual and collective expenditure on health care. Careful and considered planning also balances the aspirations and wellbeing of landowners with New Zealanders' desire to have access to a safe and efficient road transport network.</p> <p>Reverse sensitivity is the legal vulnerability of an established activity to complaint from a new land use. This can occur in situations where different land uses/activities are located in close proximity to each other, resulting in conflict between the activities. The</p> | Retain Standard 6 as notified. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>term ‘reverse sensitivity’ generally relates to the effects of the development of a sensitive activity in an area that is already affected by established activities. For land transport network operators, including the Transport Agency, there is a risk that new activities (such as house and schools) that choose to locate near to established roads or railways may object to the effects of the land transport network (such as noise and vibration) and take action against the operator. Therefore, reverse sensitivity provisions are required in district plans as a way to appropriately manage activities.</p> <p>Standard 6 is consistent with that good practice approach.</p> <p>Additionally, the Submitter’s reverse sensitivity guide provides guidelines around predicting future traffic noise: design and construction should allow an additional 3dB to existing or predicated noise levels.</p> <p>Maps will provide an immediate visual indication to plan users. This will be particularly useful to first time or infrequent plan users. It will provide a useful indication that there are specific rules on a site.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| DPC39/15 David Tripp | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 15.1 | General | - | <p>The health benefits of active transport (cycling and walking) are substantial. The draft Transport Chapter completely ignores the health of the people of the Hutt Valley entirely.</p> <p>The Submitter advocates for a much greater focus on active transport in the Transport Chapter of the District</p> | A much greater focus on active transport. |

| | | | | |
|------|---------|--------|---|--|
| | | | <p>Plan. It should be a clear focus of our transport network and be acknowledged as a priority in the District Plan.</p> <p>The Submitter urges Council to consider the approach taken by other forward looking councils (for example Christchurch) and make sure that the Transport Chapter has at its core the promotion of a transport network that supports the health of its people.</p> | |
| 15.2 | General | - | Active transport is fundamental to the health of urban populations. | <p>Policies designed to affect a population-level modal shift to more active modes of work commuting therefore present major opportunities for public health improvement.</p> <p>The proposed transport chapter makes no reference to the health of communities.</p> |
| 15.3 | General | Oppose | The Resource Management Act clearly supports health as an objective of our planning documents. | No specific decision requested. |

| DPC39/16 Summerset Villages (Lower Hutt) Limited | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 16.1 | Amendment 28 <i>Standard 4, Table 4-1 – Minimum Parking Standards</i> | Support | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain Table 4-1 as notified with regard to Housing for the elderly. Such other necessary consequential amendments to ensure consistency throughout the District Plan, including Plan Change 35, for minimum car parking standards for “housing for the elderly”, including “housing for the elderly” within the area identified in Appendix General Residential 22. |

| DPC39/17 Hutt Cycle Network | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|------|--|--------|---|--|
| 17.1 | General | Oppose | <p>Transport planning must actively encourage active transport (public transport, walking and cycling) to make our city more liveable, our people healthier, reduce council costs and care for our environment.</p> <p>The proposed plan change falls well short of Council's original intent to shift the focus from private car transport to active travel modes.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan Change is a conservative and underwhelming attempt to provide for an efficient transportation network that meets the needs of a vibrant community with commercial and active transport needs which are forward focused towards the 2020's.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan Change falls well short of the intention of sustainable management under the Resource Management Act.</p> <p>Section 58 to 73 of the s32 Report (Analysis of Other Recent Plans) gives the Submitter the impression of a "game change" in the Councils mentioned, and that those Councils wish to clearly promote shifts in how transport is to be considered in their cities. That is not evident in the Proposed Plan Change.</p> <p>An efficient transport plan is required to ensure the future prosperity of this city. Cycling, and other active transport modes, are essential elements of a modern transport system and a healthy community. They need to be integrated into our City's transport plan and given a clear priority.</p> | Redraft the Transport Chapter. The objectives should - but do not - actively promote safe and inviting active transport modes. |
| 17.2 | Amendment 21 <i>Standard 1, Table 1-1 – Transport Network Hierarchy</i> | Oppose | | The proposed roading hierarchy should – but does not – make mention of cycling and public transport in what remains a car-centric hierarchy. |

| | | | | |
|------|--|--------|--|---|
| 17.3 | Amendment 32 <i>Standard 4(e) – Cycle Parking and End of Trip Facility Requirements</i> | Oppose | | Proposed trip-end facilities are well short of best practice. |
| 17.4 | General | - | | Transport priorities should be clearly stated as reducing dependence on private motor vehicles, and enhancing public transport, cycling and walking. |
| 17.5 | General | Oppose | | <p>Despite the requirements of the Hutt Corridor Plan, Regional Cycling Plan, Regional Travel Demand Management Plan and Walking and Cycling Strategy and the clear intent from HCC itself, the issues, objectives and policies of the Proposed Plan Change makes no mention of cycling, walking or public transport.</p> <p>The issues and objectives in the Proposed Plan Change make no mention of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preventing death from obesity and diabetes because of inactivity; • reducing the potentially devastating impacts on our city from global warming; • creating liveable, people centred communities free of traffic congestion; or • improving the uptake of active transport modes. <p>The neutrality and narrow focus of the proposed objectives does not give voice to Council's intent, and gives no guidance, and therefore broad discretion, to council officers.</p> |
| 17.6 | Amendment 21 <i>Standard 1 – Standards for New Roads,</i> | Oppose | The Transport Network Hierarchy is a bland restatement of a motor-vehicle centric approach to transport. It is about cars and commercial vehicles. It makes no mention of cycling or public transport. Motorways rather than people, their health or the environment are 'at the | The inclusion of bus routes and cycle networks into a city transport hierarchy is seen by the Hutt Cycle Network as a sensible way to achieve integration of systems |

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--|---|
| | <i>Table 1-1 Transport Network Hierarchy</i> | | top of the food chain'. Neither does it accommodate the growing number of elderly people who no longer drive, nor the increasing number of young people who do not drive. | |
| 17.7 | Amendment 32 <i>Standard 4(e) – Cycle Parking and End of Trip Facility Requirements</i> | Oppose | The proposed trip end facilities for cyclists fall well short of best practice. | Trip-end facilities should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covered, secure cycle parking for employees; • Cycle parking at specified ratios for all other individuals attending a site (students at educational institutions, residents, shoppers/customers, public transport interchanges and stations, etc.); • Cycle facilities to be closer to key entrances than car parks (except for disabled car parking); and • CCTV surveillance of all cycle parking where the organization has CCTV surveillance systems. |
| DPC39F/5 <i>Stride Investment Management Ltd</i> | | | | |
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| F5.3 | 17.1 | Support in part and oppose in part | Amendments to Standard 4(e), and appropriate controls for cycle parking and end of trip facilities are required to achieve best practice. | - |
| F5.4 | 17.3 | Support in part | End of trip facilities should only be required for new buildings not to “changes to existing activities”. | - |
| F5.5 | 17.7 | Oppose in part and support in part | End of trip facilities should not be required for all types of activity, and should only be required for those activities where facilities can be accommodated and are practical, including offices, education facilities and hospitals. The Submitter has three key concerns with the proposed Standard 4(e) Cycle Parking and End of Trip | Amend Standard 4(e) as follows: (a) Be consistent with the Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 and the requirement for cycle spaces and end of trip facilities be only required for “new buildings and development”, and not for changes in activities or redevelopment of existing buildings; (b) The number of cycle parking facilities required be reduced, |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>Facility Requirements:</p> <p>(a) The provisions apply to “changes to existing activities”. This would capture where an activity changes from one type to another, and where an existing building is redeveloped no matter the scale or nature of the redevelopment.</p> <p>(b) The number of cycle spaces for staff members are set at a single rate for all activities and do not take into account the difference in demand for cycle spaces for difference activities.</p> <p>(c) The number of showers are set at a single rate for all activities and do not take into account that it is impractical to provide end of trip facilities for some activities.</p> | <p>and appropriate rates be applied that recognise the different demand rates for different activities; and</p> <p>(c) The requirement for showers to be limited to specific activities where these facilities can be accommodated, including office, education, and hospitals, and not apply to retail activities.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|---|

| DPC39/18 New Zealand Fire Service Commission | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|--|--|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 18.1 | Amendment 23 <i>Standard 2 – Site Access and Manoeuvring Area</i> | Oppose | The Commission provided feedback on the Draft Plan Change on the 3rd of September 2015. The letter outlined that the Commission would like to take this opportunity to promote the inclusion of access ways that meet the provisions of the NZFS Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 for Fire Fighting water supplies (“the Code”) which outlines the access requirements for all developments to enable a fire appliance to access a property that may be on fire. The access requirements within the code state that four metres clearance is needed in terms of height and width for all properties that are further than 132 metres from a fire hydrant. This is to enable the fire appliance to effectively access the property and have enough room to manoeuvre around the appliance to connect hoses and access other | Amend Permitted Activity Standard 2 to add a minimum width requirement of four metres for all new site accesses. |

| | | | | |
|------|--|---------|---|---|
| | | | <p>compartments of the vehicle.</p> <p>The proposed standard states that “site access must be designed and constructed in accordance with Section 3 of AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 Parking facilities Part 1: Off-street car parking”. The Submitter is unsure as to whether or not this standard provides for access widths that are more than four metres wide to enable fire appliances to access in accordance with the Code. The Submitter would like to see more clarity in this rule regarding the minimum standards for new access ways. Ensuring that there is a four metre minimum requirement for all new site access points will enable Commission to attend a fire and operate in an effective and efficient manner when attending emergencies.</p> | |
| 18.2 | Amendment 28 <i>Standard 4, Table 4-1 – Minimum Parking Standards</i> | Support | Two parking spots per 100m ² GFA is practical in terms of the requirements of a fire station. | Retain Table 4-1 as notified with regard to Emergency facilities. |

| DPC39/20 Greater Wellington Regional Council | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|--|--|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 20.1 | Amendment 2 <i>Section 14A 1 - Introduction</i> | Seeks amendment | The description of the transport network can be improved to be consistent with the Regional Public Transport Plan. | <p>Seeks following amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>pedestrian and <u>cycling facilities within the road corridor, and off-road where primarily for transport purposes; cycle routes, whether they be within a road corridor or not;</u></i> • <i>public transport <u>services and their associated infrastructure (including bus, commuter railway train and ferry services, and their associated stops, stations and terminals <u>train stations, harbour ferry wharfs, bus stops and Park and Ride</u></u></i> |

| | | | | |
|-------|--|---------|--|--|
| | | | | <u>car parks at train stations).</u> |
| 20.2 | Amendments 3-7 <i>All of Section 14A 2 - Issues</i> | Support | | Retain Issues 14A 2.1-2.5 as notified. |
| 20.3 | Amendment 8 <i>Objective 14A 3.1</i> | Support | Objective is consistent with Policy 57 of the Regional Policy Statement. | Retain Objective 14A 3.1 as notified. |
| 20.4 | Amendment 9 <i>Objective 14A 3.2</i> | Support | | Retain Objective 14A 3.2 as notified. |
| 20.5 | Amendment 10 <i>Objective 14A 3.3</i> | Support | | Retain Objective 14A 3.3 as notified. |
| 20.6 | Amendment 11 <i>Objective 14A 3.4</i> | Support | Objective is consistent with Policy 8 of the Regional Policy Statement. | Retain Objective 14A 3.4 as notified. |
| 20.7 | Amendment 12 <i>Objective 14A 3.5</i> | Support | Objective is consistent with the direction in Policy 8 of the Regional Policy Statement. | Retain Objective 14A 3.5 as notified. |
| 20.8 | Amendment 13 <i>Policy 14A 4.1</i> | Support | | Retain Policy 14A 4.1 as notified. |
| 20.9 | Amendment 14 <i>Policy 14A 4.2</i> | Support | Policy is consistent with Policy 8 of the Regional Policy Statement. | Retain Policy 14A 4.2 as notified. |
| 20.10 | Amendment 15 <i>Policy 14A 4.3</i> | Support | | Retain Policy 14A 4.3 as notified. |
| 20.11 | Amendment 16 <i>Policy 14A 4.4</i> | Support | Policy is consistent with Policy 8 of the Regional Policy Statement. | Retain Policy 14A 4.4 as notified. |

| | | | | |
|-------|--|------------------------|--|---|
| 20.12 | Amendment 17 <i>Policy 14A 4.5</i> | Support | Policy is consistent with the direction provided in Policy 8 of the Regional Policy Statement. | Retain Policy 14A 4.5 as notified. |
| 20.13 | Amendment 18 <i>Policy 14A 4.6</i> | Support | | Retain Policy 14A 4.6 as notified. |
| 20.14 | Amendment 19 <i>Policy 14A 4.7</i> | Support with amendment | The use of 'all modes' rather than 'multiple modes' is recommended as these have slightly different meanings and the former is what should be sought through this policy. Also for consistency with Objective 14A 3.1. | Amend Policy 14A 4.7 as follows: <i>The transport network, land use, subdivision and development should provide for multiple <u>all modes of transport modes</u>.</i> |
| 20.15 | Amendment 20 <i>Section 5 - Rules</i> | Support | Consistent with Policy 57 of the Regional Policy Statement with regard to Integrated Transport Assessments for high trip generators. | Retain Rule 5.1 as notified. |
| 20.16 | Amendment 22 <i>Standard 1(b) - Engineering Standards</i> | Support | Consistent with Policy E.5 of the Regional Land Transport Plan. | Retain Permitted Activity Standard 1(b) as notified. |
| 20.17 | Amendment 27 <i>Standard 3 – Minimum Sight Distances at Railway Level Crossings</i> | Support | Consistent with the Regional Land Transport Plan objective of “A safer system for all users of the regional transport network” and the associated outcome of “Improved regional road safety”. | Retain Permitted Activity Standard 3 as notified. |
| 20.18 | Amendment 28 <i>Standard 4 – Car Parking Requirements</i> | Support | Parking is an important consideration in achieving the agreed direction of the Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 and the Regional Policy Statement as it can influence the uptake of public transport and active modes, influence travel behaviour and travel demand, and the efficient use of the transport network. Strongly support the removal of any parking requirements in Central Commercial Activity Area and | Retain Table 4-1 as notified with regard to Central Commercial and Petone Commercial Activity Areas and Dwelling houses. |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>the Petone Commercial Area.</p> <p>The Submitter welcomes this deliberate approach which seeks to encourage residential and small businesses in these areas, while managing the impact of larger commercial activities as High Trip Generators through the new Rule 14 5.1(c) requirement to provide and Integrated Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Strongly support the reduction in the minimum parking spaces for residential from 2 spaces to 1 space.</p> <p>This is consistent with:</p> <p>Policy E.7 of the Regional Land Transport Plan which states that ‘Parking provisions in district plans should be reviewed to ensure they provide flexibility and do not result in an oversupply of parking as part of new residential or commercial development’.</p> <p>Policy 10 and Policy 57 of the Regional Policy Statement in relation to promoting travel demand management and integrated land use and transport.</p> | | | |
| 20.19 | Amendment 28 <i>Standard 4(a) – Car Parking Requirements</i> | Seeks amendment | The number of parking spaces per student for Tertiary or adult education outside the Tertiary Education Precinct seems high. | <p>Amend Table 4-1 as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Tertiary or adult education (outside the Tertiary Education Precinct)</i></td> <td><i>1 per staff member* and 1 per 2.5 3 students</i></td> </tr> </table> | <i>Tertiary or adult education (outside the Tertiary Education Precinct)</i> | <i>1 per staff member* and 1 per 2.5 3 students</i> |
| <i>Tertiary or adult education (outside the Tertiary Education Precinct)</i> | <i>1 per staff member* and 1 per 2.5 3 students</i> | | | | | |
| 20.20 | Amendment 28 <i>Standard 4(a) – Car Parking Requirements</i> | Seeks amendment | | Amend Permitted Activity Standard 4(a) to include a requirement to have a minimum of 2 bus parks at both new secondary schools and tertiary or adult education facilities (both within the Tertiary Education Precinct and outside it). | | |
| 20.21 | Amendment 30 <i>Standard 4(e) –</i> | Support in part | Strongly support the new standard requiring minimum provision of cycle parking and end of trip facilities. | Seek further consideration of several additional provisions in relation to cycle parking and end of trip facilities: | | |

| | | | | |
|-------|---|---------|--|--|
| | <i>Cycle Parking and End of Trip Facility Requirements</i> | | <p>Cycle parking and end of trip facilities are an important factor in supporting the Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 outcome that seeks to increase the number of people who travel by bike.</p> <p>The requirement is consistent with Policy I 10 of the Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 which states that cycling will be provided for as part of new land use development, consistent with best practice standards.</p> <p>It is also consistent with Policy 10 of the Regional Policy Statement which promotes travel demand management and a reduction in transport generated carbon dioxide and fuel use.</p> <p>The Submitter commends the proposed inclusion of these provisions in the Hutt City District Plan.</p> <p>The Submitter also seek some further consideration of several additional provisions in relation to cycle parking and end of trip facilities that could build upon these minimum requirements to support cycling uptake.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including requirements for 'quality' aspects of cycle parking that meet best practice guidelines. e.g. a stand required as a minimum to provide support for the bike and something to lock it to, location close to the main entrance, sheltered/covered, secure (natural surveillance or CCTV), located so as not to impede pedestrians or vehicle movements. • Extending the requirement to apply to new multi-unit residential developments (e.g. 20 or more units). • Including cycle parking rates for visitors (short stay). |
| 20.22 | <i>Amendment 35 Development within the State Highway and railway Corridor Buffer Overlays</i> | Support | The Permitted Activity Standard is consistent with Policy 8 of the Regional Policy Statement. | Retain Permitted Activity Standard 6 as notified. |
| 20.23 | <i>Amendment 40 Appendix Transport 3 – Transport Network Hierarchy</i> | - | The Submitter would expect to see some consideration to the pedestrian / bus conflict on Bunny Street plus Queens Drive from Bunny Street to Waterloo Road. | Amend Appendix Transport 3 to include a list of additional street locations that have a high pedestrian/bus conflict in Hutt City. |
| 20.24 | <i>Section 32</i> | - | The Section 32 Report includes reference to the | No specific decision requested. |

| | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | Report | | <p>following documents that have been superseded by the Regional Land Transport Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corridor Plan; • Regional Road Safety Plan; • Regional Cycling Plan; • Regional Walking Plan; • Regional Travel Demand Management; and • Regional Freight Plan. | |
| 20.25 | Section 32 Report | - | The submitter requests that the Section 32 evaluation is revisited to include an analysis of the plan against the requirements in the Regional Public Transport Plan, and therefore include the reference of the Regional Public Transport Plan and Regional Rail Plan. | No specific decision requested. |
| 20.26 | Chapter 3 - Definitions | Seeks amendment | A new definition for transport network should be included in the plan change to make it clear what the objectives and policies are trying to achieve. | <p>Add a new definition for “transport network”, as follows:</p> <p><i>The transport network comprises the following components and transport modes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>All road corridors (including both State Highways and Local Roads);</i> • <i>Pedestrian and cycling facilities within the road corridor, and off-road where primarily used for transport purposes.</i> • <i>All railway corridors;</i> • <i>Car and cycle parking facilities;</i> • <i>Loading facilities; and</i> • <i>Public transport services and their associated infrastructure (including bus, train and ferry services, and their associated train stations, harbour ferry wharfs, bus stops and Park and Ride car parks at train stations).</i> |

| DPC39F/4 <i>New Zealand Transport Agency</i> | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| F4.14 | 20.1 | Support | <p>The Submitter particularly supports the amendment to the first bullet point.</p> <p>At this point the Submitter has no fixed position on where the amendment is located in the plan (either introduction or definitions); however for succinctness it should not be duplicated.</p> | As per Greater Wellington Regional Council's specified relief. |
| DPC39F/5 <i>Stride Investment Management Ltd</i> | | | | |
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| F5.6 | 20.21 | Oppose | Cycle parking rates for visitors are inappropriate unless a new activity or development is establishing which can provide these facilities. | - |
| F5.7 | 20.21 | Support in part | <p>The RLTP supports the provision of quality pedestrian and cycle facilities within new developments that are well connected to adjacent networks and local centres.</p> <p>The RLTP recognises that new land use developments should provide for cycle parking and end of trip facilities, but this policy does not apply to changes of activities or redevelopment.</p> <p>The Submitter has three key concerns with the proposed Standard 4(e) Cycle Parking and End of Trip Facility Requirements:</p> <p>(a) The provisions apply to “changes to existing activities”. This would capture where an activity changes from one type to another, and where an existing building is redeveloped no matter the scale or nature of the redevelopment.</p> | <p>Amend Standard 4(e) as follows:</p> <p>(a) Be consistent with the Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 and the requirement for cycle spaces and end of trip facilities be only required for “new buildings and development”, and not for changes in activities or redevelopment of existing buildings;</p> <p>(b) The number of cycle parking facilities required be reduced, and appropriate rates be applied that recognise the different demand rates for different activities; and</p> <p>(c) The requirement for showers to be limited to specific activities where these facilities can be accommodated, including office, education, and hospitals, and not apply to retail activities.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>(b) The number of cycle spaces for staff members are set at a single rate for all activities and do not take into account the difference in demand for cycle spaces for difference activities.</p> <p>(c) The number of showers are set at a single rate for all activities and do not take into account that it is impractical to provide end of trip facilities for some activities.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| DPC39/21 Harriet Fraser Traffic Engineering and Transportation Planning | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--|--|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 21.1 | Amendment 23 <i>Standard 2(a) – Vehicle Access (excluding separation distances from intersections)</i> | Seeks amendment | <p>The provision of pedestrian splays (from Section 3 of AS/NZS 2890.1) for low trafficked driveways across footpaths with low pedestrian volumes may be overly onerous on a developer.</p> <p>Section 3 of AS/NZS 2890.1 (included by reference in Permitted Activity Standard 2(a)) includes separation distances between one-way entry and exit driveways but does not include separation distances between two frontage two-way driveways as permitted by the Proposed Plan Change, or to a driveway on a neighbouring site.</p> | <p>Amend the requirement for pedestrian visibility to link to the receiving traffic environment. In particular, the pedestrian environment.</p> <p>Add a minimum separation distance between site accesses to achieve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid long combined vehicle crossings; • Allow for the provision of pedestrian visibility splays; • Provide holding space for pedestrians between driveways; and • Allow for inter-visibility and separation between vehicles on neighbouring driveways. |
| 21.2 | Amendment 24 <i>Standard 2(b) – Separation Distances from Intersections</i> | Seeks amendment | | Add clarification with regard to whether the separation distances apply to driveways along the frontage opposite the intersection. |
| 21.3 | Amendment 25 <i>Standard 2(c) –</i> | - | It may not be safe or appropriate for vehicles to reverse onto or off busier streets. | <p>Seeks following amendment:</p> <p><i>Sufficient area must be provided to allow vehicles to enter and</i></p> |

| | <i>Manoeuvring Area</i> | | | <i>exit the site in a forward direction except where the access is to a <u>single</u> dwelling and the posted speed limit is less than 80kph.</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------|---|---|---------------------|---|---|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 21.4 | Amendment 28 <i>Standard 4(a) – Car Parking Requirements</i> | - | <p>The proposed plan change results in a requirement for new dwellings to provide one rather than two parking spaces. This assumes that either one space is sufficient for all parking needs of residents and their visitors or that overspill parking can be readily accommodated. In the 2013 Census 44% of Hutt City households had two or more cars. On top of this, consideration needs to be given to visitor parking demands.</p> <p>Parts of the city have very little kerbside/public parking available close to suburban and commercial centres and train stations. In these areas additional overspill parking will exacerbate existing parking pressures.</p> | <p>It is important that where there are existing parking pressures that on-site parking can reasonably meet the parking demands generated by the site.</p> <p>Multi-unit developments providing one space per dwelling with no on-site visitor parking could result in significant overspill parking.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21.5 | Amendment 28 <i>Standard 4(a) – Car Parking Requirements</i> | - | <p>The requirement of one parking space per on-site staff member for childcare centres does not properly allow for the parking associated with drop-off and pick-up.</p> <p>The requirement of one parking space per new dwelling may not be a problem where overspill parking is not a problem but there are areas of the City where kerbside parking is very heavily used.</p> | Reconsider parking requirements for childcare centres. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21.6 | Amendment 32 <i>Standard 4(e), Table 4-2 - Minimum Cycle Parks and Showers</i> | Seeks amendment | Providing cycle parking facilities for around 4% of staff would be more reasonable and still allows for some variation and growth. | <p>Amend Table 4-2 as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Number of Staff Members</th> <th>Number of Cycle Parks</th> <th>Number of Showers</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 – 5</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6 - 4025</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4025 or more</td> <td>1 per 4025 staff members <u>or part thereof</u></td> <td>1 per 100 staff members</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Number of Staff Members | Number of Cycle Parks | Number of Showers | 1 – 5 | 0 | 0 | 6 - 4025 | 1 | 1 | 4025 or more | 1 per 4025 staff members <u>or part thereof</u> | 1 per 100 staff members |
| Number of Staff Members | Number of Cycle Parks | Number of Showers | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 – 5 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 - 4025 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4025 or more | 1 per 4025 staff members <u>or part thereof</u> | 1 per 100 staff members | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|-------|--|-----------------|---|--|
| 21.7 | Amendment 33 <i>Standard 5(a) – Loading and Unloading Requirements for Non-Residential Activities</i> | Seeks amendment | The loading and unloading requirements for different activities vary enormously. Many activities can be fully serviced by cars and vans where others require articulated trucks. Some design provision should be included for when servicing occurs by either van or articulated trucks. | Add a new permitted activity standard as follows: <i>All reasonable provision for loading/unloading activities associated with the activity be met on site.</i> |
| 21.8 | Amendment 25 <i>Standard 2(c) – Loading and Unloading</i> | | It is unclear whether Permitted Activity Standard 2(c) Manoeuvring Area applies to both car and truck access. | It might be useful to include a similar provision under Permitted Activity Standard 5. |
| 21.9 | Amendment 22 <i>Standard 1(b) - Engineering Standards</i> | Seeks amendment | | Either: Include a cross reference to the access provision for private accesses in Chapter 11 Subdivision. Or: Amend Permitted Activity Standard 1(b) as follows: <i>All roads <u>and private ways</u> must be designed ...</i> |
| 21.10 | Other | | | It might be useful to include provision for a rubbish collection point for multi-unit residential developments. |

DPC39F/5 **Stride Investment Management Ltd**

| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
|------|-----------------------|------------------|--|--|
| F5.8 | 21.6 | Support in part | A more reasonable provision of cycle parks is proposed based on how many people were shown to cycle to work in the 2013 Census. The Submitter has three key concerns with the proposed Standard 4(e) Cycle Parking and End of Trip Facility Requirements: | Amend Standard 4(e) as follows: (a) Be consistent with the Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 and the requirement for cycle spaces and end of trip facilities be only required for “new buildings and development”, and not for changes in activities or redevelopment of existing buildings; (b) The number of cycle parking facilities required be reduced, |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>(a) The provisions apply to “changes to existing activities”. This would capture where an activity changes from one type to another, and where an existing building is redeveloped no matter the scale or nature of the redevelopment.</p> <p>(b) The number of cycle spaces for staff members are set at a single rate for all activities and do not take into account the difference in demand for cycle spaces for different activities.</p> <p>(c) The number of showers are set at a single rate for all activities and do not take into account that it is impractical to provide end of trip facilities for some activities.</p> | <p>and appropriate rates be applied that recognise the different demand rates for different activities; and</p> <p>(c) The requirement for showers to be limited to specific activities where these facilities can be accommodated, including office, education, and hospitals, and not apply to retail activities.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|

| DPC39/22 Winstone Aggregates and Firth Industries | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|--|---|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 22.1 | <p>Amendment 17 <i>Policy 14A 4.5</i></p> <p>Amendment 20 <i>Section 14A 5 - Rules</i></p> <p>Amendment 39 <i>Appendix Transport 2 – High Trip Generator Thresholds</i></p> | Oppose | <p>Appendix Transport 2 – High Trip Generator Thresholds could have the effect of capturing existing permitted and well-established activities in the Extraction Activity Area where there is a minor expansion of buildings, activities or operations.</p> <p>The proposed provisions:</p> <p>a) will not promote sustainable management of resources, will not achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act and are contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act;</p> <p>b) will not enable the social and economic wellbeing of the community in the City;</p> <p>c) will not sustain the potential of the physical resource represented by the Submitters' assets in</p> | <p>Amend PC39 to exempt the Extraction Activity Area (including mineral extraction activities and industries located within the zone) from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Policy 14A 4.5 (Amendment 17); ii. Rule 14A 5 (Amendment 20); iii. Appendix Transport 2 – High Trip Generator Thresholds (Amendment 39). <p>Amend PC39 to exempt the Extraction Activity Area from the provisions of PC39.</p> <p>Alternative relief to satisfy the Submitter's concerns.</p> <p>Additional or consequential relief to satisfy the Submitter's concerns.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>the City for the future;</p> <p>d) are not adequate to protect and enable the Submitters' operations in the City generally;</p> <p>e) do not have sufficient regard to the efficient use and development of the Submitters' assets and of those resources which are dependent on, or benefit from, the Submitters' assets and operations; and</p> <p>f) do not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means, and do not discharge the Council's duty under section 32 of the Resource Management Act.</p> | |
| DPC39F/4 <i>New Zealand Transport Agency</i> | | | | |
| | Sub. Ref. referred to | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| F4.15 | 22.1 | Oppose | The notified provisions will not affect the application of existing use rights under the RMA (including section 10). Any activities that do not benefit from existing use rights should be subject to the provisions in the same way as other activities. | Retain Policy 14A 4.5, Section 14A 5 and Appendix Transport 2 as notified. Standard 6 as notified. |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| DPC39/23 <i>Firth Industries</i> | | | | |
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 23.1 | Amendment 17 <i>Policy 14A 4.5</i> | Oppose | Appendix Transport 2 – High Trip Generator Thresholds could have the effect of capturing existing permitted and well-established activities in the Extraction Activity Area where there is a minor expansion of buildings, activities or operations. | Amend PC39 to exempt the Extraction Activity Area (including mineral extraction activities and industries located within the zone) from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Policy 14A 4.5 (Amendment 17); |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Amendment 20 <i>Section 14A 5 - Rules</i></p> <p>Amendment 39 <i>Appendix Transport 2 – High Trip Generator Thresholds</i></p> | | <p>The proposed provisions:</p> <p>a) will not promote sustainable management of resources, will not achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act and are contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act;</p> <p>b) will not enable the social and economic wellbeing of the community in the City;</p> <p>c) will not sustain the potential of the physical resource represented by the Submitters' assets in the City for the future;</p> <p>d) are not adequate to protect and enable the Submitters' operations in the City generally;</p> <p>e) do not have sufficient regard to the efficient use and development of the Submitters' assets and of those resources which are dependent on, or benefit from, the Submitters' assets and operations; and</p> <p>f) do not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means, and do not discharge the Council's duty under section 32 of the Resource Management Act.</p> | <p>ii. Rule14A 5 (Amendment 20);</p> <p>iii. Appendix Transport 2 – High Trip Generator Thresholds (Amendment 39).</p> <p>Amend PC39 to exempt the Extraction Activity Area from the provisions of PC39.</p> <p>Alternative relief to satisfy the Submitter's concerns.</p> <p>Additional or consequential relief to satisfy the Submitter's concerns.</p> |
| <p>DPC39F/4 <i>New Zealand Transport Agency</i></p> | | | | |
| | <p>Sub. Ref. referred to</p> | <p>Support / Oppose</p> | <p>Reason/Comment</p> | <p>Decision Requested</p> |
| <p>F4.16</p> | <p>23.1</p> | <p>Oppose</p> | <p>The notified provisions will not affect the application of existing use rights under the RMA (including section 10). Any activities that do not benefit from existing use rights should be subject to the provisions in the same way as other activities.</p> | <p>Retain Policy 14A 4.5, Section 14A 5 and Appendix Transport 2 as notified. Standard 6 as notified.</p> |

| DPC39/24 Minister of Education | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|---|
| Sub. Ref. | Amendment & Provision | Support / Oppose | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |
| 24.1 | - | - | The Submitter supports the inclusion of issues, objectives and policies which help provide a safe, efficient, and multi-modal transport network; protect the surrounding environment from the effects from the construction, maintenance and development of the transport network; and locate and design a transport network to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on adjacent land. | No specific decision requested. |
| 24.2 | Amendment 3 <i>Issue 14A 2.1</i> | Support | A safe, efficient, multi-modal transport network enables the provision of key social infrastructure (and therefore wellbeing). | Retain Issue 14A 2.1 as notified. |
| 24.3 | Amendment 9 <i>Objective 14A 3.2</i> | Support | The Submitter is keen to ensure all/any reverse sensitivity effects of the provision of transport on existing schools are appropriately addressed, including those on people and the community. | Retain Objective 14A 3.2 as notified. |
| 24.4 | Amendment 15 <i>Policy 14A 4.3</i> | Support with amendment | 'Environment' as defined in the Resource Management Act includes people and communities along with natural and physical resources. 'Land' does not provide this level of coverage. | Amend Policy 14A 4.3 as follows: <i>The transport network should be located and designed to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on <u>the adjacent land environment</u>.</i> |
| 24.5 | Amendment 19 <i>Policy 14A 4.7</i> | Support | The Submitter supports a transport network that provides for multiple transport mode options for school students and school community. | Retain Policy 14A 4.7 as notified. |

| DPC39/26 Tim Julian | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Sub. | Amendment & | Support / | Reason/Comment | Decision Requested |

| Ref. | Provision | Oppose | | |
|------|---|--------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 26.1 | Amendments 35-38 <i>Standard 6 - Development within the State Highway and Railway Corridor Buffer Overlays</i> | Oppose | <p>The submitter states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The noise from the railways is obvious and has been in place for many decades. Increases in traffic volumes are also obvious. • Imposing costs on property owners removes freedom of choice regarding the use of property owner's resources. • A property owner will decide whether to spend money on mitigating the noise, which could involve a range of measures that the individual owner is best able to assess and implement. This could involve fencing, planting or more expensive measures such as double glazing and acoustic treatment of walls, and not necessarily an imposed solution from the Council. • It is obvious to prospective tenants as to noise and vibration impact from rail and vehicle traffic and their decisions regarding whether to rent in affected locations will be determined having regard to this noise and vibration, the amenity and utility offered by the property, and the proposed rent. The market will determine the rent which will reflect the impacts of noise and vibration. • Owners may not be able to afford the cost associated with alterations and additions to dwellings on their properties, and the Proposed Plan Change may inhibit property owners' ability to enjoy the full benefits of property ownership. • A simple addition to a dwelling could become more complex, as the Council could require an upgrade of other window joinery, walls and installation of a ventilation system in order to comply with the noise rules, making the proposed work beyond the reach of | Reject Permitted Activity Standard 6. |

| | | | | |
|------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>the property owner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property owners were well aware of the rail noise when purchasing their properties. The price that was paid suited the property owner's budgets and reflected all of the costs and benefits of that property. If a property owner wishes to mitigate noise then the submitter believes that this is a matter for the property owner alone and not something that the Council should impose. • Council should focus on matters that truly make a difference to the citizens of Lower Hutt. • Permitted Activity Standard 6 increases the complexity of consent applications for building work by increasing the number of rules to be complied with and issues to be considered by council officers, with no net benefit to the applicant or citizens of Lower Hutt. • Permitted Activity Standard 6 would likely stop property owners from making improvements to their properties as applications may trigger work for which the applicant sees limited utility and amenity. • The party that is affected by noise and vibration is the same party as is being required to pay for rectification of the noise and vibration. • There would be no general community benefit from Permitted Activity Standard 6. | |
| 26.2 | Amendment 3 <i>Issue 14A 2.1</i> | Seeks amendment | - | If the Proposed Plan Change must proceed, then proposed Permitted Activity Standard 6 should only apply to new dwellings, and not to existing dwellings. |

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE – PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 39

| Submission No. | Name/Organisation | Address |
|---------------------|---|--|
| DPC39/1 | Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited | C/- Haines Planning Consultants Limited PO Box 90842 Victoria Street West AUCKLAND 1142 Attention: Daniel Shao Daniel.Shao@hainesplanning.co.nz |
| DPC39/2 | Siegfried Bachler | 176 Cambridge Terrace Fairfield LOWER HUTT 5011 Siegfried.Bachler46@gmail.com |
| DPC39/3 | Seaview HP Limited | 354 Lambton Quay Wellington Central WELLINGTON 6011 Attention: Shayne Hodge shayne@thehodgegroup.co.nz |
| DPC39/4 DPC39F/4 | New Zealand Transport Agency | PO Box 5084 Lambton Quay WELLINGTON 6145 Attention: Kathryn Barrett wroplanning@nzta.govt.nz |
| DPC39/5 | KiwiRail Holdings Limited | PO Box 593 WELLINGTON 6140 Attention: Rebecca Beals Rebecca.Beals@kiwirail.co.nz |
| DPC39/6 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | PO Box 2629 WELLINGTON 6140 Attention: Finbar Kiddle HAPlanningCR@heritage.org.nz |

| Submission No. | Name/Organisation | Address |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| DPC39/7 | Bikes Welcome Charitable Trust | 5 Epuni Street Hutt Central LOWER HUTT 5011 Attention: Jo Clendon Jo.Clendon@bikeswelcome.org |
| DPC39/8 DPC39F/2 | Andrew Banks | 68 Oxford Terrace Epuni LOWER HUTT 5011 Andrew.Banks7@gmail.com |
| DPC39/9 | Petone Planning Action Group | B12/25 Graham Street Petone LOWER HUTT 5012 Attention: Frank Sviatko frank_s@top.net.nz |
| DPC39/10 | Bruce and Claire Benge | 21 Walnut Way Maungaraki LOWER HUTT 5010 Claire.Benge@xtra.co.nz |
| DPC39/11 | Simon Brown | 54 Cambridge Terrace Waiwhetu LOWER HUTT 5010 visibro@outlook.co.nz |
| DPC39/12 | Andrew Fox | 1A Nikau Grove Woburn LOWER HUTT 5010 a.Lfox@hotmail.com |
| DPC39/13 DPC39F/1 | Nick Ursin | 358 Cambridge Terrace Naenae LOWER HUTT 5010 |

| Submission No. | Name/Organisation | Address |
|----------------------|--|--|
| DPC39/14 | Richard Beatson | 45 Riddlers Crescent Petone LOWER HUTT 5012 Rich.Beatson@gmail.com |
| DPC39/15 | David Tripp | 3 High Street Petone LOWER HUTT 5012 David.Tripp@xtra.co.nz |
| DPC39/16 | Summerset Villages (Lower Hutt) Limited | PO Box 5187 WELLINGTON 6140 Peter.Chrisp@summerset.co.nz |
| DPC39/17 | Hutt Cycle Network | 58 Wakefield Street Alicetown LOWER HUTT 5010 Attention: Timon Bakker Timon.Bakker@gmail.com |
| DPC39/18 DPC39F/3 | New Zealand Fire Service Commission | C/- Beca Limited PO Box 3942 WELLINGTON 6140 Attention: Claire Fell Claire.Fell@beca.com |
| DPC39/20 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | PO Box 41 MASTERTON 5840 Attention: Caroline Watson Caroline.Watson@gw.govt.nz |
| DPC39/21 | Harriet Fraser Traffic Engineering and Transportation Planning | 2021 Akatarawa Road Akatarawa Valley UPPER HUTT 5372 Harriet@harrietfraser.co.nz |

| Submission No. | Name/Organisation | Address |
|----------------|--|--|
| DPC39/22 | Winstone Aggregates and Firth Industries | PO Box 17-195 Greenlane AUCKLAND 1546 Attention: Dan McGregor Dan.McGregor@winstoneaggregates.co.nz |
| DPC39/23 | Firth Industries | Private Bag 99904 Newmarket AUCKLAND 1149 Attention: James Willoughby James.Willoughby@firth.co.nz |
| DPC39/24 | Minister of Education | C/- Beca Ltd 85 Molesworth Street WELLINGTON 6011 Attention: Tom McKnight Tom.McKnight@beca.com |
| DPC39/26 | Tim Julian | 41 Cambridge Terrace Waiwhetu LOWER HUTT 5010 Tim.Julian@colliers.com |
| DPC39F/5 | Stride Investment Management Ltd | C/- Minter Ellison Rudd Watts PO Box 3798 AUCKLAND 1140 Attention: Bianca Tree Bianca.Tree@minterellison.co.nz |