

Tania Sansom-Anderson

From:

Sent:

To:

Subject:

Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>

Thursday, 10 August 2023 9:40 PM


Policy Team

HDC - Plan Change 5 Submission Further Opportunity [#15]

Name *

Daniel Sankey

Postal



address *

1210 Kaiapo Road

Hastings 4120

New Zealand

Email

djs@greenleafnurseries.co.nz

address *

Phone

0212285006

number *

Contact

Daniel Sankey

name,

address,

email

address and

phone

number for


service of

person

making the

submission*

Postal



address

1210 Kaiapo Road

Hastings 4120

New Zealand

Email

djs@greenleafnurseries.co.nz

Phone

0212285006

number

Do you No
want to be
heard in
support of
your
submission?
(Hearings
will take
place later,
and we will
contact you
to arrange a
time only if
you wish to
be heard.
Please give
us your
contact
details in
the top
section.) *

If others No
make a
similar
submission,
would you
be prepared
to consider
presenting
a joint case
with them
at the
hearing? *

Could you No, I could not
gain an
advantage
in trade
competition

through this
submission?

*

Are you
directly
affected by
an effect of
the subject
matter of
the
submission
that:
(If trade
competition
applies,
select one
of these.)

- (a) Adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

1. Have you
already
made a
submission
on Plan
Change 5
(PC5)?

No (Go to question 3)

3. My
submission
relates to
the
following
proposed
elements of
plan change
5: (Tick all
that apply).

- The types or range of houses that can be built – townhouses, duplexe, terraced housing and low rise apartments
- The number of houses that can be built on a site
- The 3 storey height limit for houses
- The removal of the need for affected parties' consents or neighbor's approval

4. The
specific
chapter and

MRZ-01, MRZ-02, MRZ-R16

provisions
of the
proposed
plan change
my
submission
relates to
are:
(Please
reference
the specific
section or
part of the
planning
provision(s),
such as
Objective
MRZ-O1 or
Rule MRZ-
R16)

5. My submission is that:

(State in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)

I strongly oppose many aspects of Plan change 5 including the following;

The applications are precluded from following the standard procedure of being publicly notified or limited notified. This is a breach of basic human rights that neighbouring residents have no say in the type of housing that will be constructed in their area.

The building height could detract from the existing character of housing in the area and shade neighbouring properties. These medium density housing projects should be built in designated areas suited to them and not integrated throughout the city.

This will have an adverse affect on housing standards causing an exodus of business owners from Hastings which in turn will increase unemployment in the area resulting in an increase of crime .

6. I seek the following submission from Hastings District Council: To conclude Plan change 5 should be re drafted with consent from the citizens of Hastings after public consultation.
(Give precise details)

Submission for Plan Change 5. 8th August 2023

Directed to the Hastings District Council mayor, Sandra Hazlehurst and councillors of the Hastings District Council.

This submission on "Plan Change 5" is on behalf of the "Save the Plains" group, written by Richard Gaddum. Spokesperson for the "Save the Plains" group which includes:

John Bostock
Paul Paynter
Michael Donnelly
Richard Gaddum

This submission is also on behalf of the **"Save Our Fertile Soils" Society Incorporated** and its members.

The **National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land** is a document that although, in our opinion, didn't go far enough, it most certainly is better than what we had before, which in our opinion was "nothing"..! Absolutely no protection of our highly fertile Class 1, 2 and 3 LUC soils.

The reason the document isn't as tight as we would have liked it is because there are some exemptions which we feel are distasteful:

1. The legislation can potentially allow local councils to permit urban and industrial expansion over fertile soils, if there is no alternative.
2. The legislation allows for urban growth to creep over areas already designated, or reserved, for Greenfield development. On the Heretaunga Plains these areas are part of the Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy (HPUDS) and include:
 1. Kaiapo Rd. 73ha.
 2. Lyndhurst Extension. 34ha.
 3. Murdock and Copeland Rd areas. 23ha.
 4. Arataki Extension. 16ha.
 5. Total: 146ha. A huge area of our Golden Goose land..!!
 6. We as a group, as you know, are vehemently opposed to any of these areas being destroyed forever by concrete and asphalt and we will fight and do everything in our power to retain them as food producing land and/or areas of a buffer between urban and rural. We most definitely don't want a scrap with the HDC but we won't stand by and let these areas go into housing and be destroyed forever!
3. The legislation allows for Maori land to be developed for urban development regardless of soil type. With respect to the treatment of specified Māori land under the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL), the HDC advises that a person who is Māori or identified as Māori who recently purchases land with a land use classification of 1, 2 or 3, this would not be considered specified Māori land and as such subdivision of this land would not meet the exception under section 3.8 of the NPS-HPL.

Specified Māori land means land that is any of the following:

- (a) Māori customary land or Māori freehold land (as defined in Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993):
- (b) land vested in the Māori Trustee that—
 - (i) is constituted as a Māori reserve by or under the Māori Reserved Land Act 1955; and
 - (ii) remains subject to that Act:
- (c) land set apart as a Māori reservation under Part 17 of Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 or its predecessor, the Māori Affairs Act 1953:
- (d) land that forms part of a natural feature that has been declared under an Act to be a legal entity or person (including Te Urewera land within the meaning of section 7 of the Te Urewera Act 2014):
- (e) the maunga listed in section 10 of the Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014:
- (f) and held by or on behalf of an iwi or hapū if the land was transferred from the Crown, a Crown body, or a local authority with the intention of returning the land to the holders of the mana whenua over the land.

Avoiding subdivision of highly productive land

- (1) Territorial authorities must avoid the subdivision of highly productive land unless one of the following applies to the subdivision, and the measures in subclause (2) are applied:
 - (a) the applicant demonstrates that the proposed lots will retain the overall productive capacity of the subject land over the long term:
 - (a) the subdivision is on specified Māori land:
 - (b) the subdivision is for specified infrastructure, or for defence facilities operated by the New Zealand Defence Force to meet its obligations under the Defence Act 1990, and there is a functional or operational need for the subdivision.
- (2) Territorial authorities must take measures to ensure that any subdivision of highly productive land:
 - (a) avoids if possible, or otherwise mitigates, any potential cumulative loss of the availability and productive capacity of highly productive land in their district; and
 - (b) avoids if possible, or otherwise mitigates, any actual or potential reverse sensitivity effects on surrounding land-based primary production activities.
- (3) In subclause (1), **subdivision** includes partitioning orders made under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.
- (4) Territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and rules in their district plans to give effect to this clause.

There have been some awful decisions made by successive and previous councils that should never have been allowed to happen.

Examples are these areas of highly productive land that has been vandalised forever are:

- The Tomoana Food Hub. 10.5ha has been zoned industrial. It bounds Elwood Rd, Richmond Rd and Tomoana Warehousing. Some of the best soil on the Plains. This is a travesty and should never have been allowed to happen.
- The expansion of the industrial area on the northeastern side of Omahu Rd which stretches about 200m off Omahu Rd into the amazing Twyford soils and follows the Omahu Rd to almost Fernhill.
- The Rhyman James Wattie Rest Home on Te Aute Rd now sitting on beautiful soils next to the Karamu Stream
- Howard St development. 18ha.
- Lyndhurst. 28ha.
- Brookvale Rd / Romanes Dr. 36ha.
- Northwood. 4ha.
- The expansion of the industrial area at Whakatu. Whakatu sits on beautiful fertile soils; some of the best we have.
- Others include the Delegat Winery beside the expressway and opposite the Sports Park and pack houses that were built contravening the District Plan.

Sadly the HDC at the time had little or no regard for preserving our fertile soils on the Heretaunga Plains.

The National Policy Statement on Urban Development, (NPS-UD) although not popular with some, we, as a group, do support it 100%.

The thrust of the document of "Going UP instead of OUT" is the most positive solution to our housing shortage issues while retaining our most precious soils for future generations.

The HDC is doing incredible work in line with the NPS-UD; and I must congratulate Sandra Hazlehurst, Nigel Bickle and the rest of the Hastings District Council for being really proactive in creating a lot of new urban expansion within the city boundaries, both in Flaxmere and Hastings; work in this area is very impressive indeed.

Another success story is in Napier with the development of 207ha of land in the western hills for a residential development of an excess of 600 homes with a retail hub which will include a small supermarket and medical centre, environmental parkland and a reserve, and a network of walking and cycling paths. A fantastic project being developed by a consortium of property developers. This is a fantastic initiative.

These are the types of solutions we have got to do to prevent this crisis of destruction of our "Golden Goose" soils.

Adding to success stories is the initiative by the HDC, along with the HBRC, was to create a "Soil Symposium" 2022 Friday 15th July.

This was a fantastic all day event which highlighted the importance of our fertile soils on the Heretaunga Plains with speakers including Iwi, soil scientists, growers and a planner. Those that attended all came away with a much more appreciation of the amazing asset we have right here in Hawkes Bay and a directive to do much much more in its preservation.

Moving forward, we need to move our mindset away from the past approvals by the HDC of "carte blanche" applications to develop urban and industrial developments on Class 1, 2 and 3 LUC land and focus on building new residential and industrial communities within our existing town and city boundaries as well as on unproductive land and save what precious fertile soils we have left for future generations.

This is our ONLY sustainable option as the fertile soils we have now are all we are going to get. We can't imitate or make any more of it.

It is natural that people don't and won't like or accept change, but this is now the "new normal"; we all have to now accept it and we have to accept that the activities of past councils have got to stop and stop now...! Enough is Enough.

Thank you.

Richard Gaddum

021997097

Spokesperson for the Save the Plains Group.

Tania Sansom-Anderson


From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Thursday, 10 August 2023 4:00 PM
Policy Team
HDC - Plan Change 5 Submission Further Opportunity [#12]

Name *

Karla Senior

Postal address *



1019 Caroline Rd Mayfair
Hastings 4122
New Zealand

Email address *

karla@theseniors.co.nz

Phone number *

0212282489

Do you want to be heard in support of your submission?
(Hearings will take place later, and we will contact you to arrange a time only if you wish to be heard.
Please give us your contact details in the top section.) *

No

If others
make a
similar
submission,
would you
be prepared
to consider
presenting
a joint case
with them
at the
hearing? *

Could you
gain an
advantage
in trade
competition
through
this
submission?
*

1. Have you
already
made a
submission
on Plan
Change 5
(PC5)?

3. My
submission
relates to
the
following
proposed
elements of
plan change
5: (Tick all
that apply).

- The types or range of houses that can be built – townhouses, duplexe, terraced housing and low rise apartments
- The 3 storey height limit for houses
- The removal of the need for affected parties' consents or neighbor's approval

5. My submission is that:

(State in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)

I believe allowing 3 story housing to be built in existing neighborhoods of stand alone housing is a terrible idea. Hastings city is a beautiful place! 3 story housing randomly poked into our established residential areas looks appalling. Perhaps a better idea would be reclaiming commercial land as occasionally businesses move on and large buildings are vacated? They could be removed and 3 story housing could be an asset there. Or another solution should be found. I believe it is very short term thinking to destroy the historic vibes of our established residential areas. This decision will have unreversable implications to our city and I think all of our residents including those who would be living in the 3 story units would be negatively impacted by the loss of cohesion in our residential areas.

Tania Sansom-Anderson

From:

Sent:

To:

Subject:

Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>

Friday, 11 August 2023 10:57 AM


Policy Team

HDC - Plan Change 5 Submission Further Opportunity [#20]

Name *

Kevin Senior

Postal address *



208 Ikanui Road

Hastings 4120

New Zealand

Email address *

kevin@theseniors.co.nz


Phone number *

0212283284

Contact name, address, email address and phone number for service of person making the submission*

Kevin Senior

Postal address



208 Ikanui Road

Hastings 4120

New Zealand

Email

kevin@theseniors.co.nz

Phone number

0212283284

Do you want No
to be heard
in support
of your
submission?
(Hearings
will take
place later,
and we will
contact you
to arrange a
time only if
you wish to
be heard.
Please give
us your
contact
details in
the top
section.) *

If others No
make a
similar
submission,
would you
be prepared
to consider
presenting a
joint case
with them at
the hearing?
*

Could you No, I could not
gain an
advantage in
trade
competition
through this

submission?

*

Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:
(If trade competition applies, select one of these.)

- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

1. Have you already made a submission on Plan Change 5 (PC5)?

3. My submission relates to the following proposed elements of plan change 5: (Tick all that apply).

- The types or range of houses that can be built – townhouses, duplexes, terraced housing and low rise apartments
- The number of houses that can be built on a site
- The 3 storey height limit for houses
- The removal of the need for affected parties' consents or neighbor's approval
- The use of the Hastings Medium Density Design Framework as a key assessment tool

5. My submission is that:
(State in

I request that the changes proposed in the Plan Change 5 of the District Plan are withdrawn as I fear they will very detrimentally affect the city that many of us have called home for a number of decades.

summary
the nature
of your
submission.
Clearly
indicate
whether you
support or
oppose the
specific
provisions
or wish to
have
amendments
made, giving
reasons.)

6. I seek the following submission from Hastings District Council:

(Give precise details)

I have lived in Hastings for the last 69 years of my life. Over this time I have witnessed some Council rulings that have had long term negative affect upon myself and my family. My wife and I built our first home in Flaxmere in the earlier stages of the Flaxmere suburb development. We, along with many of our neighbours, cared for our homes and the development of our respective dwellings and section's with a lot of hard work. We took special pride in maintaining them to a standard that was conducive to our neighbourhood. However, with sales of sections slowing the Council of the day decided to bow to pressure from developers to cross-lease small residential sections to house those that didn't have the same values and work ethic that many others in the area had. We watched with dismay as the whole suburb gradually reduced from a pleasant place to live and raise a family, to a suburb with a reputation regularly negatively reported on in the news media of the day. In every street the sight of uncared for properties with multiple vehicles or vehicle wrecks parked on the front lawn or on the street, lawns seemingly never mown, broken windows just boarded up, painting maintenance never attended to etc. We witnessed the impact it had as this level of, what many of us felt was an unacceptable level of behaviour permeated into every part of the suburb. We lived there for 21 years then moved into Hastings to escape the perpetual downward spiral that infiltrated right to the schools and shopping areas. What a tragedy, that sadly has not improved over the time since we have left.

The changes proposed in Plan Change 5 of the District Plan is not what Hastings needs and I respectfully suggest that removing the requirements for not gaining the affected parties' consents or neighbor's approval is essential. It is indeed ironic that our current Councilors are ignoring the right of the very people that have entrusted them with


the care and upkeep of the city, those that will be most affected by these proposed changes. Surely our Council should be obligated to reflect on what has not worked and remain steadfast not to repeat such blunders. Why can they not devote their efforts in protecting the rights of rate payers rather than pushing for changes set on by people that do not live in our area and will never be exposed to the trauma that these proposed changes will inevitably deliver?

Tania Sansom-Anderson

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Friday, 11 August 2023 10:49 AM
To: Policy Team
Subject: HDC - Plan Change 5 Submission Further Opportunity [#19]

Name * Andrew Smith


Company name (if applicable) Andrew Smith, Grant Smith and Simon Taylor (joint submission)

Postal address * 
C/- PO Box 352 Mayfair
Hastings, Hawke’s Bay 4156
New Zealand

Email address * ajs@snz.net.nz

Phone number * 021 220 7307

Contact name, address, email address and phone number for service of person making the submission* Andrew Smith

Postal address 
As above

Email ajs@snz.net.nz

Phone number 021 220 7307

Do you Yes
want to be
heard in
support of
your
submission?
(Hearings
will take
place later,
and we will
contact you
to arrange a
time only if
you wish to
be heard.
Please give
us your
contact
details in
the top
section.) *

If others Yes
make a
similar
submission,
would you
be prepared
to consider
presenting
a joint case
with them
at the
hearing? *

Could you No, I could not
gain an
advantage
in trade
competition

through this
submission?

*

1. Have you already made a submission on Plan Change 5 (PC5)?

No (Go to question 3)

2. If you have already made a submission on PC5, do you want to:

3. My submission relates to the following proposed elements of plan change 5: (Tick all that apply).

- The types or range of houses that can be built – townhouses, duplexe, terraced housing and low rise apartments
- The number of houses that can be built on a site
- The 3 storey height limit for houses
- The removal of the need for affected parties' consents or neighbor's approval
- Other, please specify

- The above concerns are specific to these matters to be applied within General Residential Zones

4. The specific chapter and provisions of the proposed plan change

Chapter 7.2 Hastings Residential Environment:
Policy GRP3
Rules GR18, GR24, and add new rule
Specific Performance Standard 7.2.6E
Chapter 8.2 Havelock North Residential Environment:
Policy HNRP10

my Rules HNGR14, HNGR26, and add new rule
submission Specific Performance Standard 8.2.6F
relates to
are:
(Please
reference
the specific
section or
part of the
planning
provision(s),
such as
Objective
MRZ-O1 or
Rule MRZ-
R16)

5. My submission is that:

(State in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)

General Comments:

We oppose those provisions which are enabling of Comprehensive Residential Development in the General Residential Zones of Hastings and Havelock North without public or limited notification and no consideration of the potential adverse effects on neighbouring landowners.

As drafted Comprehensive Residential Development would be enabled over much of the General Residential Zones of Hastings and Havelock North, changing the character of those residential environments and adversely affecting those residents who take pride in the appearance of their properties and streets. Recent examples of Comprehensive Residential Development in Hastings are all lower cost housing developments, which are unlikely to be well maintained and tidily kept, and will therefore detract from the residential neighborhoods that other residents have invested time and resources in.

Concentrations of low-cost housing may lead to increased crime in existing residential neighbourhoods and may force a trend towards gated communities for people wanting to protect themselves and their properties as has occurred in other countries.

While in the metropolitan centres there is demand for apartment, town house, and generally higher intensity housing from a variety of demographic and socio-economic groups, this does not appear to be the case in Hastings District with the opportunity for Comprehensive Residential Development only being taken up for the provision of social housing. Where social housing is being provided at high residential densities there is a need for careful consideration of location and design so as not to lead to future social problems. The General Residential Zone

provisions in Plan Change 5 as drafted will not result in careful consideration of location as it opens up most of the zone to these types of housing options and offers no protection of the character that existing residents enjoy. Where a Comprehensive Residential Development is sited next door to an existing residential property the existing residents enjoyment of their section will be compromised by reduced privacy, potential shading and loss of solar access from the less restrictive height and recession plane standards, light spill from upper floors, and noise from the concentration of new residents over the boundary.

From a social and community perspective, meeting the needs for social housing and low cost housing is not appropriately achieved by the high intensity housing as proposed. Most of the social housing needs involve potentially large families with a wide spread of age ranges. Those families need space to relax, recreate, establish a garden and play safely just like any other New Zealand family. The social and community needs are not served by attempting to squeeze as many people as possible into high intensity housing. There is no correlation between the demographics in need and the proposed high intensity housing provisions.

Comprehensive Residential Development Policies:

We seek changes to policies GRP3 and HNRP10 as they are too enabling of Comprehensive Residential Development in the General Residential Zones of Hastings and Havelock North respectively. As it is drafted GRP3 will not give effect to objective GRO2 and provide for suitable intensification of housing in appropriate locations in Hastings. Similarly, as drafted policy HNRP10 will not give effect to objective HNRO6 in ensuring that the intensification of housing in Havelock North is designed to create a high-quality living environment for residents and neighbours.

Comprehensive Residential Development Rules:

Providing for Comprehensive Residential Development without the need for the consideration of the effects on neighbours as a Restricted Discretionary Non-Notified activity in the Hastings General Residential Zone under Rule GR18 and in the Havelock North General Residential Zone under Rule HNGR14, is strongly opposed. Such an approach does not allow for any consideration of different circumstances where for example due to the size and shape of a site and the nature of the street it can't be developed for medium density housing without significantly detracting from the character of the existing street and affecting the privacy of the neighbours.

Also opposed is providing for Comprehensive Residential Development not meeting one or more of the specific performance standards as a Restricted Discretionary Activity in the Hastings General Residential Zone under Rule GR24 and in the Havelock North General Residential Zone under Rule HNGR26. Although a restricted discretionary activity status allows for the consideration of affected persons, discretion is restricted to specified matters. Further to this, a development that did not comply with only one part of the Comprehensive Residential Development specific performance standard would have the same activity status as a development that breached multiple parts of the standard. Where such a development is not located in proximity to public parks, public transport and commercial centres, it is not appropriately located and therefore should be assessed as a discretionary or non-complying activity.

Comprehensive Residential Development Specific Performance Standards:

The Specific Performance Standards for Comprehensive Residential Development that would apply to the General

Residential Zones in both Hastings and Havelock North, being 7.2.6E and 8.2.6F respectively, do not provide sufficient certainty and appropriate control from a locational perspective.

The site context standard being 7.2.6E(1) and 8.2.6F(1) is not measurable and specific as it applies to sites that “are within or partially within a 400–600m radius of... “ public transport, parks, and commercial zones. Does this mean that the rule does not apply to sites within a 0–399m radius of these amenities? Presumably it applies to all sites within a 600m radius, which is too far away for the residents to benefit from close access to such amenities. The standard needs to be specific and result in appropriate locations for Comprehensive Residential Development.

Clause (b) is similarly uncertain, in stating “existing public park or proposed open space reserve, or a proposed on-site communal playground or open space area.” There is no definition of public park in the District Plan. It is not clear if the standard is inclusive of all Council reserves regardless of size and purpose, for example drainage reserves or walkway linkages. What constitutes a ‘proposed’ open space reserve, proposed by whom and how big does it need to be? The same question applies to what constitutes an on-site communal playground or open space area, can this standard be met with the provision of a children’s slide and swing set or a 50m² communal green space in the centre of the development?

Clause (c) refers to a “Commercial Zone”. The District Plan does have a definition of Commercial Zone, and this includes the ‘Hastings Suburban Commercial Zone’. In many cases within the Hastings urban area the extent of a suburban commercial zoning is a single standalone diary with no surrounding shops or services. This is not consistent with the intent of Policy GRP3 which refers to Comprehensive Residential Development being within walking distance of “commercial centres.” A single diary is not a commercial centre.

On this basis the Plan Change 5 (“PC5”) rules and standards would enable a Comprehensive Residential Development in terms of meeting the site context locational standards, provided it was within 600m of a drainage reserve (or included as part of the development a communal swing and slide set), a diary with a suburban commercial zoning, and a bus stop. Such an outcome would not give effect to objective GRO2 in “providing for suitable intensification of housing in appropriate locations.” On the contrary, the PC5 provisions will result in low-cost medium density housing in inappropriate locations without access to urban services or green space and little green space available on site for children and families to safely enjoy.

Other anomalous outcomes that will result from PC5 is that a compliant single dwelling on a site in Hastings is restricted to complying with the General Residential Zone height limits (8m), height in relation to boundary (2.75m and recession plane indicator determining the angle into the site), front yard setbacks (5m to collector and arterial roads), and building coverage (45%) requirements. If however two or more dwellings were to be located on the same site they would not have to meet these same requirements and under the Comprehensive Residential Development specific performance standard would be able to be built to a height of 12m with a pitched or gabled roof, height in relation to boundary of 3m and either a 45o or 55o angle into the site, a 3m front boundary setback regardless of the status of the road, and a maximum building coverage of 50%. This is not logical that two or more dwellings on a property are subject to less restrictive District Plan standards, albeit subject to restricted

discretionary activity non-notified resource consent, than if only one dwelling was to be established on the same property.

6. I seek the See attached PDF document.
following
submission
from
Hastings
District
Council:
(Give
precise
details)

Please feel
free to
attach an
addition
document if
necessary.



[a_smith_g_smith_s_taylor_submission_pc5_hastings_district_plan.pdf](#) 348.70 KB • PDF

Submission to Plan Change 5 to the Hastings District Plan

Submitter Name: **Andrew Smith, Grant Smith and Simon Taylor (joint submission)**

Postal Address: C/- PO Box 352, Hastings 4156

E-mail address: ajs@snz.net.nz (Andrew Smith)

Phone number: 021 220 7307 (Andrew Smith)

We wish to be heard in support of our submission.

If others make a similar submission we would be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at the Hearing.

We could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

Our submission does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

We have not previously made a submission on Plan Change 5.

3. My submission relates to the following proposed elements of plan change 5:

- The types or range of houses that can be built
- The number of houses that can be built on a site
- The 3 storey height limit for houses
- The removal of the need for affected parties' consents or neighbour's approval
- Other – the above concerns are specific to these matters to be applied within General Residential Zones.

4. The specific chapter and provisions of the proposed plan change my submission relates to are:

(Please reference the specific section or part of the planning provision(s), such as Objective MRZ-O1 or Rule MRZ-R16)

Chapter 7.2 Hastings Residential Environment

Policy GRP3

Rules GR18 and GR24

Specific Performance Standard 7.2.6E

Chapter 8.2 Havelock North Residential Environment

Policy HNRP10

Rules HNGR14 and HNGR26

Specific Performance Standard 8.2.6F

5. My submission is that:

(State in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)

General Comments

We oppose those provisions which are enabling of Comprehensive Residential Development in the General Residential Zones of Hastings and Havelock North without public or limited notification and no consideration of the potential adverse effects on neighbouring landowners.

As drafted Comprehensive Residential Development would be enabled over much of the General Residential Zones of Hastings and Havelock North, changing the character of those residential environments and adversely affecting those residents who take pride in the appearance of their properties and streets. Recent examples of Comprehensive Residential Development in Hastings are all lower cost housing developments, which are unlikely to be well maintained and tidily kept, and will therefore detract from the residential neighborhoods that other residents have invested time and resources in.

Concentrations of low-cost housing may lead to increased crime in existing residential neighbourhoods and may force a trend towards gated communities for people wanting to protect themselves and their properties as has occurred in other countries.

While in the metropolitan centres there is demand for apartment, town house, and generally higher intensity housing from a variety of demographic and socio-economic groups, this does not appear to be the case in Hastings District with the opportunity for Comprehensive Residential Development only being taken up for the provision of social housing. Where social housing is being provided at high residential densities there is a need for careful consideration of location and design so as not to lead to future social problems. The General Residential Zone provisions in Plan Change 5 as drafted will not result in careful consideration of location as it opens up most of the zone to these types of housing options and offers no protection of the character that existing residents enjoy.

Where a Comprehensive Residential Development is sited next door to an existing residential property the existing residents enjoyment of their section will be compromised by reduced privacy, potential shading and loss of solar access from the less restrictive height and recession plane standards, light spill from upper floors, and noise from the concentration of new residents over the boundary.

From a social and community perspective, meeting the needs for social housing and low cost housing is not appropriately achieved by the high intensity housing as proposed. Most of the social housing needs involve potentially large families with a wide spread of age ranges. Those families need space to relax, recreate, establish a garden and play safely just like any other New Zealand family. The social and community needs are not served by attempting to squeeze as many people as possible into high intensity housing. There is no correlation between the demographics in need and the proposed high intensity housing provisions.

Comprehensive Residential Development Policies

We seek changes to policies GRP3 and HNRP10 as they are too enabling of Comprehensive Residential Development in the General Residential Zones of Hastings and Havelock North respectively. As it is drafted GRP3 will not give effect to objective GRO2 and provide for suitable intensification of housing in appropriate locations in Hastings. Similarly, as drafted policy HNRP10 will not give effect to objective HNRO6 in ensuring that the intensification of housing in Havelock North is designed to create a high-quality living environment for residents and neighbours.

Comprehensive Residential Development Rules

Providing for Comprehensive Residential Development without the need for the consideration of the effects on neighbours as a Restricted Discretionary Non-Notified activity in the Hastings General Residential Zone under Rule GR18 and in the Havelock North General Residential Zone under Rule HNGR14, is strongly opposed. Such an approach does not allow for any consideration of different circumstances where for example due to the size and shape of a site and the nature of the street it can't be developed for medium density housing without significantly detracting from the character of the existing street and affecting the privacy of the neighbours.

Also opposed is providing for Comprehensive Residential Development not meeting one or more of the specific performance standards as a Restricted Discretionary Activity in the Hastings General Residential Zone under Rule GR24 and in the Havelock North General Residential Zone under Rule HNGR26. Although a restricted discretionary activity status allows for the consideration of affected persons, discretion is restricted to specified matters. Further to this, a development that did not comply with only one part of the Comprehensive Residential Development specific performance standard would have the same activity status as a development that breached multiple parts of the standard. Where such a development is not located in proximity to public parks, public transport and commercial centres, it is not appropriately located and therefore should be assessed as a discretionary or non-complying activity.

Comprehensive Residential Development Specific Performance Standards

The Specific Performance Standards for Comprehensive Residential Development that would apply to the General Residential Zones in both Hastings and Havelock North, being 7.2.6E and 8.2.6F respectively, do not provide sufficient certainty and appropriate control from a locational perspective.

The site context standard being 7.2.6E(1) and 8.2.6F(1) is not measurable and specific as it applies to sites that *"are within or partially within a 400-600m radius of..."* public transport, parks, and commercial zones. Does this mean that the rule does not apply to sites within a 0-399m radius of these amenities? Presumably it applies to all sites within a 600m radius, which is too far away for the residents to benefit from close access to such amenities. The standard needs to be specific and result in appropriate locations for Comprehensive Residential Development.

Clause (b) is similarly uncertain, in stating *"existing public park or proposed open space reserve, or a proposed on-site communal playground or open space area."* There is no definition of public park in the District Plan. It is not clear if the standard is inclusive of all Council reserves regardless of size and purpose, for example drainage reserves or walkway linkages. What constitutes a 'proposed' open space reserve, proposed by whom and how big does it need to be? The same question applies to what constitutes an on-site communal playground or open space area, can this standard be met with the

provision of a children's slide and swing set or a 50m² communal green space in the centre of the development?

Clause (c) refers to a "Commercial Zone". The District Plan does have a definition of Commercial Zone, and this includes the 'Hastings Suburban Commercial Zone'. In many cases within the Hastings urban area the extent of a suburban commercial zoning is a single standalone diary with no surrounding shops or services. This is not consistent with the intent of Policy GRP3 which refers to Comprehensive Residential Development being within walking distance of "commercial centres." A single diary is not a commercial centre.

On this basis the Plan Change 5 ("PC5") rules and standards would enable a Comprehensive Residential Development in terms of meeting the site context locational standards, provided it was within 600m of a drainage reserve (or included as part of the development a communal swing and slide set), a diary with a suburban commercial zoning, and a bus stop. Such an outcome would not give effect to objective GRO2 in "*providing for suitable intensification of housing in appropriate locations.*" On the contrary, the PC5 provisions will result in low-cost medium density housing in inappropriate locations without access to urban services or green space and little green space available on site for children and families to safely enjoy.

Other anomalous outcomes that will result from PC5 is that a compliant single dwelling on a site in Hastings is restricted to complying with the General Residential Zone height limits (8m), height in relation to boundary (2.75m and recession plane indicator determining the angle into the site), front yard setbacks (5m to collector and arterial roads), and building coverage (45%) requirements. If however two or more dwellings were to be located on the same site they would not have to meet these same requirements and under the Comprehensive Residential Development specific performance standard would be able to be built to a height of 12m with a pitched or gabled roof, height in relation to boundary of 3m and either a 45° or 55° angle into the site, a 3m front boundary setback regardless of the status of the road, and a maximum building coverage of 50%. This is not logical that two or more dwellings on a property are subject to less restrictive District Plan standards, albeit subject to restricted discretionary activity non-notified resource consent, than if only one dwelling was to be established on the same property.

6. I seek the following submission from Hastings District Council: (Give precise details)

The district plan provisions that we are seeking changes to are quoted below with the amendments that we are requesting shown in **bold underlined font** for additions and ~~strike through font~~ for deletions.

Hastings General Residential Zone

Policy GRP3

POLICY GRP3 Provide for comprehensive residential development on sites that are located within walking distance (**400m-600m**) of public parks and commercial centres and are located on public transport routes.

Explanation

Comprehensive residential development is an appropriate way to provide for new housing in **suitable locations in** Hastings and can lead to better amenity outcomes than traditional infill development. It has been specifically provided for within the Medium Density Residential Zone; however provided that comprehensive residential developments are in close proximity to amenities such as shopping areas, public transport routes and public parks, such development can also be appropriate in the General Residential Zone.

Comprehensive Residential Development will be assessed in terms of the key design elements of the Hastings Medium Density Design Framework and whether there is sufficient infrastructure available to service the development. Of particular concern is provision for a quality living environment and a positive contribution to the public streetscape and neighbourhood in general.

Rule GR18

Rule	Land Use Activities	Activity Status
GR18	Comprehensive Residential Developments complying with specific performance standard 7.2.6E.	RD-NN <u>RD</u>

Rule GR24

Rule	Land Use Activities	Activity Status
GR24	Comprehensive Residential Developments that do not meet one or more of the specific performance standards and terms in Section 7.2.6E <u>(2) – (15).</u>	RD <u>D</u>

Rule GRxx (add new rule)

<u>Rule</u>	<u>Land Use Activities</u>	<u>Activity Status</u>
<u>GRxx</u>	<u>Comprehensive Residential Developments that do not meet one or more of the specific performance standards and terms in Section 7.2.6E(1) (Site Context).</u>	<u>NC</u>

Or, if the above new rule is not accepted it is requested that the activity status of Rule GR18 be amended to Discretionary Activity; and Rule GR24 be amended to Non-Complying Activity.

Specific Performance Standard 7.2.6E

7.2.6E COMPREHENSIVE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

1. SITE CONTEXT

Comprehensive Residential Developments that propose a density of development greater than 1

residential unit per 350m² net site area shall be located on sites in the General Residential Zone that are within or partially within a ~~400-600m~~ **400m** radius of:

- a. A ~~An existing or proposed~~ public transport bus-stop; and
 - b. ~~An~~ existing public park **that is zoned Open Space and listed in Appendix 63 as a Sport & Recreation, Community, or Public Gardens Reserve** ~~or proposed open space reserve, or a proposed on-site communal playground or open space area;~~ and
 - c. A commercial zone **that comprises of three or more different retail or service shops.**
- ...

Havelock North General Residential Zone

Policy HNRP10

POLICY HNRP10 Provide for comprehensive **residential** development on sites that are located within walking distance (~~400m-600m~~) of public parks ~~or~~ **and** commercial centres and are located on public transport routes.

Explanation

Comprehensive residential development (medium density housing) has been identified as an appropriate way of providing for new housing development in existing urban areas **in suitable locations**. This type of housing is provided for specifically in the Medium Density Residential Zone in Havelock North; however it may also be appropriate in the General Residential Zone in certain locations, typically in close proximity to the Village Centre where amenities are a short walking distance and parks and reserves are close by.

Vacant greenfield land within new development areas provides a unique opportunity to develop land for compact house types without the constraints that exist within an existing residential area. This type of development also serves to provide for a variety of housing choice within these new residential areas. Appropriate locations for comprehensive residential development within new development areas are described and/or shown within the respective structure plans for each particular area. While comprehensive residential development is envisaged in **appropriate locations** in the General Residential Zone, it would not be encouraged in the Character Residential Zone. Comprehensive Residential Development will be assessed in terms of the key design elements of the Hastings Medium Density Design Framework and whether there is sufficient infrastructure available to service the development. Of particular concern is provision for a quality living environment and a positive contribution to the streetscape and neighbourhood in general.

Rule HNGR14

Rule	Land Use Activities	Activity Status
------	---------------------	-----------------

HNGR14	Comprehensive Residential Development complying with specific performance standards and terms in 8.2.6F.	RD-NN <u>RD</u>
--------	--	-------------------------------

Rule HNGR26

Rule	Land Use Activities	Activity Status
HNGR26	Comprehensive Residential Development not meeting one or more of the specific performance standards and terms in 8.2.6F(2) – (15).	RD <u>D</u>

Rule HNGRxx (add new rule)

<u>Rule</u>	<u>Land Use Activities</u>	<u>Activity Status</u>
<u>HNGRxx</u>	<u>Comprehensive Residential Development not meeting one or more of the specific performance standards and terms in 8.2.6F(1) (Site Context).</u>	<u>NC</u>

Or, if the above new rule is not accepted it is requested that the activity status of Rule HNGR14 be amended to Discretionary Activity; and Rule HNGR26 be amended to Non-Complying Activity.

Specific Performance Standard 8.2.6F

8.2.6F COMPREHENSIVE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

1. SITE CONTEXT

- a. Comprehensive Residential Developments that propose a density of development greater than 1: 350m² net site area shall be located on sites in the General Residential Zone that are within or partially within a **400m** ~~400-600m~~ radius of:
 - i. ~~A~~ ~~An existing or proposed~~ public transport bus-stop; and
 - ii. ~~An~~ existing public park that is zoned Open Space and listed in Appendix 63 as a Sport & Recreation, Community, or Public Gardens Reserve ~~or proposed open space reserve or a proposed on-site communal playground or open space area;~~ and
 - iii. A commercial zone that comprises of three or more different retail or service shops.

...

General Relief Sought

In addition to the above specific amendments requested to the provisions of Plan Change 5, any other amendments to the District Plan are requested that would have the effect of addressing the concerns raised in this submission.

Tania Sansom-Anderson

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, 10 August 2023 9:12 PM
To: Policy Team
Subject: HDC - Plan Change 5 Submission Further Opportunity [#14]

Name * Brendon Taylor

Postal address * 
 556 Ikanui Road Frimley
 Hastings 4120
 New Zealand

Email address * brendonjtaylor@outlook.com

Phone number * 021 532437

Do you want to be heard in support of your submission? No

(Hearings will take place later, and we will contact you to arrange a time only if you wish to be heard. Please give us your contact details in the top section.) *

If others make a similar submission, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing? * No

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? * No, I could not

1. Have you already made a submission on Plan Change 5 (PC5)? No (Go to question 3)

3. My submission relates to the following proposed elements of plan change 5: (Tick all that apply).

- The types or range of houses that can be built – townhouses, duplexes, terraced housing and low rise apartments
- The number of houses that can be built on a site
- The 3 storey height limit for houses
- The removal of the need for affected parties' consents or neighbor's approval
- The use of the Hastings Medium Density Design Framework as a key assessment tool

- Other, please specify

- Please see attached document.

4. The specific chapter and provisions of the proposed plan change my submission relates to are:

(Please reference the specific section or part of the planning provision(s), such as Objective MRZ-O1 or Rule MRZ-R16)

Please see attached document.

5. My submission is that:

(State in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)

Please see attached document.

6. I seek the following submission from Hastings District Council:
(Give precise details)

Please see attached document.

Please feel free to attach an additional document if necessary.



[hdc_submission_plan_change_5_brendon_taylor_10.08.2023.docx](#)

25.59 KB • DOCX

Given the gravity of the proposed changes in Plan Change 5 Right Homes/Right Place regarding Medium Density Housing and the affect this could have on all Hastings residents, I am mystified why the Hastings District Council did not personally write to all urban ratepayers outlining the consultation process to be held in October/November 2022 and the consequences this Plan Change could have on them. I have only found about this by default after submissions re-opened after information was missing from some documents. I guess the HDC could argue that this was publicly notified, but I doubt that most of Hastings residents would understand the implications this could have for them and future Hastings residents. Would the HDC consider doing this and extending the submission?

I take offence to the wording “an increase in the number of young Maori as a percentage of the population” as stated by HPUDS in Introduction 2.4.1. of 2.4 Urban Strategy. The Plan Change 5 Right Homes/Right Place relates to the housing of the residents of Hastings and has nothing to do with ethnicity or race. This needs to be deleted from Plan Change 5 literature immediately please.

Having lived in Hastings for nearly 60 years, and knowing that history repeats itself by definition, it is folly and madness to consider building 3 storey high residential homes. We only have to go back a few years to remember the 2 storey “Housing Corporation” residential flats in Mahora, Camberley and Raureka that were an absolute eyesore and have thankfully all been demolished now. Plan Change 5 should not allow 3 storey high buildings for residential. They invade privacy, are an earthquake risk given that Hastings is situated on a fault line and also lend themselves to leaky home conditions having very little protection from the eaves onto the external walls.

Of utmost concern is the purchase by the Police using taxpayers' money of an exorbitantly priced 2-hectare block of development residential land situated at 811 Omaha Road, Hastings with the intent to build a state-of-the-art Remand Centre facility. Here we are making a submission regarding a Plan Change encouraging intensification of urban activity, while we have a government department buying up residential land for use other than residential. This should definitely not be allowed to go ahead, and I question why this was approved for purchase in the first place. The HDC should categorically refuse any submission to rezone this land from general residential and should not be bullied into it.

MRZ-R20 Places of Assembly refers to the minimum setback distances of buildings from boundaries being 5 metres. This should be discretionary and if consent from neighbours is obtained, this distance should be able to be reduced. The Plan Change must allow for alterations if consent is granted.

Of major concern in this Plan Change is the removal of the need for affected parties' consents or neighbour's approval if something is untoward or may adversely affect somebody. We live in a democratic country where freedom of rights is generally upheld, and this proposal is a stark attack on what we uphold in New Zealand. There have recently been situations in Hastings where unscrupulous developers have tried to force adverse propositions past unsuspecting neighbourhoods. This will only escalate if the need for consent or approval is removed, and this factor must be allowed to remain.

Tania Sansom-Anderson

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, 6 August 2023 3:04 PM
To: Policy Team
Subject: HDC - Plan Change 5 Submission Further Opportunity [#9]

Name * Peter Tucker


Company Private
name (if applicable)

Postal address * 
4/1228 Ada Street, Parkvale, Hastings, New Zealand
Hastings, Hawke's Bay 4122
New Zealand

Email address * peter.r.tucker@gmail.com

Phone number * +64274418878

Contact name, address, email address and phone number for service of person making the submission* Peter Tucker

Postal address 
4/1228 Ada Street, Parkvale, Hastings, New Zealand
Hastings, Hawke's Bay 4122
New Zealand

Email peter.r.tucker@gmail.com

Phone number +64274418878

Do you want to be heard in support of your submission? (Hearings will take place later, and we will contact you to arrange a time only if you wish to be heard. Please give us your contact details in the top section.) *

If others make a similar submission, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing? *

Could you gain an advantage

in trade
competition
through this
submission?

*

Are you
directly
affected by
an effect of
the subject
matter of
the
submission
that:
(If trade
competition
applies,
select one
of these.)

- (a) Adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

1. Have you No (Go to question 3)
already
made a
submission
on Plan
Change 5
(PC5)?

4. The MRZ-R16
specific
chapter and
provisions
of the
proposed
plan change
my
submission
relates to
are:
(Please

reference
the specific
section or
part of the
planning
provision(s),
such as
Objective
MRZ-O1 or
Rule MRZ-
R16)

5. My submission is that:

(State in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)

My concern is that any social type housing to be built in Ada Street does not conform in many instances with the original intent of the Councils By-Laws and that some of those may be over-ridden to achieve this development. There are other instances when even some of those are incompatible to surrounding currently there. Specifically three storied dwellings.

The number of dwellings on this limited size will impact considerably on sewerage overload in the area where currently in excessive weather conditions it is currently does not cope with excessive overflow into the street. Stormwater will further add to this due to the additional coverage of the site compared to what is currently there where the site will not be able to absorb sufficient, compared to currently, so will put further water onto the street. Vehicle movements in and out will increase which will become a concern for elderly persons walking by, mainly from the Summerset Retirement Village further along the street.

The number of vehicles is very concerning as the number of parking places per dwelling could become a concern especially if insufficient are supplied so vehicles will spill out onto Ada Street. This area has two churches in very close proximity, one of which is used thru-out the week for compromised persons, so is already short of parking in this area at many times. It is well known that in many instances social type housing has a tendency to have more than one vehicle per property and often some of those are immobile which could be parked up indefinitely on the street. Currently Ada Street is designated as a critical additional access route to Havelock North. Will they have garaging or storage sheds per property? I suspect not.

The number of persons living in the proposed complex could well exceed best practice for health and safety reasons and possible regulations. The proposed dwelling will be completely out of keeping with immediately surrounding properties all but one or two are single storey dwellings. The proposed development will be completely out of type/style to the already existing property in this area.

It seems to me that this development would have many aspects not complying to council regulations as currently

written and that the council will rule to over-ride these in the desire to see greater infill housing in this area where currently this is not the case, and pressure applied by a development.

For the above reasons and more I strongly oppose this development.

Job Ref: 23109

11 August 2023

Hastings District Council
 Private Bag 9002
 HASTINGS 4156

Submission by email via: policyteam@hdc.govt.nz

TW Property – Submission on Proposed District Plan Change 5 ‘Right Homes; Right Place’ to the Operative District Plan under Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

This is a submission by TW Property on Proposed District Plan Change 5 – Right homes, Right place (“**PC5**”) to the Operative Hastings District Plan (“**District Plan**”) from Hastings District Council (“**the Council**” or “**HDC**”):

TW Property does not consider it can gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to:

- PC5 to the District Plan in its entirety.
- Submissions points on specific provisions of the proposal are as outlined in the body of this submission.

The TW Property submission is:

1. TW Property is one of Hawke's Bay's leading and respected Property Development, Subdivision, and Consultancy Companies. TW Property works with residential, commercial and industrial clients to assist in delivering development projects. This includes managing property acquisition; planning, engineering, and design; physical construction; sales, marketing and leasing.
2. TW Property has undertaken numerous medium density housing projects within Hawkes Bay and the wider North Island and is therefore well informed on the challenges and opportunities for delivering medium density housing within the provincial property market.
3. TW Property considers that the economic realities of delivering medium density housing in Hastings should be understood by HDC and the decision makers on PC5 to ensure that the provisions will assist in achieving the desired outcomes for the city. In particular, TW Property has an interest in how PC5:



- a. Gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD)
 - b. Minimises barriers that constrain the ability to deliver medium density housing in the Hastings property market; and
 - c. Provides for the provision of services and infrastructure to support the provision of housing.
4. TW Property generally supports the direction of PC5; in particular, the intention to enable a facilitative consent pathway for medium density housing through revised provisions for "comprehensive residential developments".
5. However, TW Property considers that the provisions of PC5 do not go far enough to better enable the supply of medium density housing in an effective and affordable manner able to respond to demand.
6. The TW Property submission seeks amendments to PC5 to address the following key themes:
 - a. Increase opportunities for medium density housing across a broader area
 - b. Reduce uncertainty for applicants and the community
 - c. Ensure workable standards.

Submission theme 1: Increase opportunities for medium density housing

7. We understand that Hastings currently has a housing shortage. Medium density housing can provide additional supply as well as greater choice in housing typologies and price points to the market. It also reduces demand for ongoing expansion of Hastings' urban areas onto the surrounding productive land. Providing greater zoned opportunities for medium density housing will allow the market to respond and deliver housing in appropriate locations and demand sectors, where the realities of development economics can stack up. The more land available for medium density housing, the more likely it is that this typology can be delivered at a scale that meets demand - or need.
8. The approach taken in PC5 to restrict the new Medium Density Residential Zone ("MDRZ") to existing city living zoned or identified Comprehensive Residential Development ("CRD") sites, means that it will apply to areas that have already been available for this typology under the Operative District Plan, yet the market has not substantially delivered on this opportunity. This could be due to existing owner/occupied properties wanting to retain their existing property, or for other reasons such as development feasibility. Based on TW Property's investigations to date, there is limited opportunity for development in the City Living Zone. Extending this zone more broadly would provide more opportunities for developers to provide medium density housing in highly accessible areas.
9. We also note that from a market perspective, if there is an inadequate supply of the 'easier' MDRZ zoned land in relation to demand (housing need), land values will be increased to the extent that the Policy approach seeking to deliver density in these locations may end up being compromised due to high acquisition costs. This increased development cost is likely to constrain supply. This may also result in a locational / spatial outcome skew, if developers decide to avoid the higher cost land in the MDRZ, in favour of slightly harder to consent, but cheaper, (and therefore more economically viable) residential zoned sites.



10. It is not clear in the section 32 analysis the extent of the General Residential zones (i.e. Hastings, Havelock North and Flaxmere) that would meet all three location criteria to enable a non-notified CRD. We note that if the spatial extent of land meeting the three criteria for a non-notified CRD is actually small, then PC5 could have perverse outcomes by making it more difficult to obtain CRD consents elsewhere in the city than under the current planning framework, as it provides a differential process depending on location. This capability relates back to the supply matters referenced in 7 – 9 above. Without a clear understanding of the 'supply' land areas enabled by the criteria an assessment of whether the provisions will achieve the intent cannot be made.

Relief sought:

11. Mapping: At a minimum, TW Property seeks that HDC undertake GIS analysis and publishes publicly accessible maps to provide transparency as to where the opportunities for non-notified medium density development is provided for (i.e. as enabled by 7.2.6E(1), 8.2.6F(1) and 9.2.6J(1)). Without this mapping being available (e.g. as part of HDC's s32 analysis) it is not clear whether this will sufficiently achieve the policy direction. We submit that this information is necessary to enable a robust, informed s32 analysis.
12. Rezone land to MDRZ: Alternatively, and as a preference, the medium density residential zone should be extended to a wider spatial extent having regard to accessibility to a wider range of amenities, including schools. This will allow proactive planning for infrastructure, including public bus routes and three waters services, while providing greater opportunity for developers to provide medium density housing options to the market.

Submission theme 2: Reduce uncertainty

13. Increasing the certainty of gaining planning approvals is key to enable developers to actually deliver medium density housing "on the ground". Reducing risk (including time and cost risk) to projects will encourage developers to move from traditional infill and/or greenfield subdivisions to deliver duplex and terraced housing typologies in the Hawkes' Bay context across all market/occupancy sectors. Sufficient certainty is required at the early due diligence stage to make property acquisition and investment decisions.
14. The current process for comprehensive residential developments in the general residential zones of the Hastings District Plan requires a full discretionary activity status with the potential for limited or full notification, and assessment against a number of potentially subjective criteria. Even where best efforts are made by developers to achieve a design-led approach to delivering quality medium density housing, there is still significant uncertainty in the current planning framework around urban design peer reviews, planner assessment of the inevitable infringements to development controls designed for a lower density of built form, and the potential impact of affected parties and notification on the time, cost and ultimate success of the resource consent process. Uncertainty in the resource consent process adds time and cost to developers which inevitably needs to be passed on property purchasers. Improving certainty to the process will assist in the delivery of more affordable housing in Hastings. Further, improving the process for CRDs is essential to ensure property owners and/or developers don't opt for the "easier" option of infill/vacant lot subdivision in the General Residential zone, which



will preclude delivery on medium density housing not just in the short term but for the life of those new detached dwellings.

15. TW Property accepts that medium density residential development will likely require resource consent applications, particularly for larger scale development, as not all potential matters may be adequately addressed through permitted activity standards. The flexibility of a resource consent process can also enable developments to better respond to site specific characteristics than compliance with a plethora of onerous standards. However, the resource consent process should provide as much certainty and clarity for all involved, including developers and also existing neighbouring property owners and communities.

Relief sought:

16. TW Property supports the following approach of PC5 in principle:
 - a. The move towards restricted (rather than full) discretionary activity status for CRDS in the General Residential zones
 - b. Default non-notification for CRDS in certain circumstances, and
 - c. The introduction of concise 'material' development standards (as opposed to *interpretive* standards) that better enable medium density housing, which also reduce the number of overall infringements while providing consistent bottom lines for onsite and neighborhood amenity.
17. The following relief is sought to better achieve the policy direction of PC5:
 - a. Locational criteria (Standards 7.2.6E(1), 8.2.6F(1) and 9.2.6J(1)): The "400m-600m" standard for a non-notified CRD is vague and provides no certainty. Should HDC wish to retain this approach, it should delete "400m" and rely on "600m" only. As above, a non-statutory map available showing the areas that meet the criteria would increase transparency both to the market, and to established communities.
 - b. Infrastructure certification (Standards MRZ-S14, 7.2.6E(15), 8.2.6F(15), and 9.2.6J(15)): The requirement to obtain certification from the assets department regarding infrastructure capacity prior to lodging a compliant CRD application introduces an additional level of uncertainty, including time and cost uncertainty. As this new "certification" process sits outside of the RMA process, there is no requirement for HDC's asset management team to respond in a timely manner. Unless the asset management team is well resourced, this could add significant time and cost uncertainty to projects, before even applying for resource consent. Slow response times may also impact the land acquisition process given that this is likely to be a key part of due diligence for property developers. We suggest requesting deletion of this requirement and instead:
 - i. Encourage HDC to publish non-statutory maps indicating areas of significant infrastructure capacity constraint to provide guidance to the market, and a regular schedule for mapping updates in response to network upgrades, as well as future scheduled and budgeted upgrades,
 - ii. Encourage HDC to advocate for pre-application meetings to understand and/or resolve infrastructure issues to inform land acquisition, and prior to lodgement,



- iii. Should the certification requirement be retained, introduce a clear process and timeframes, and ensure the team is adequately resourced to respond to developers in a timely manner. Clarity should also be given on the cost associated with this process; templates; and consequences for council if agreed timeframes are not met (e.g. discounts on application fees) to incentivise timely processing of certification requests.
 - iv. We also suggest that PC5 provides the opportunity for engineering approval to be granted at the resource consent stage, to reduce the number of approvals required to facilitate medium density housing. The current process under PC5 would require first an infrastructure certification, then resource consent, then engineering approval, as well as subdivision s224(c) approval where subdivision is also proposed.
- c. Design assessment criteria (MRZ-R16, 7.2.8F, 8.2.9, 9.2.8I): The design guidelines (renamed the Hastings Medium Density Design Framework), although a useful tool in assisting developers, planners and architects on potential measures to achieve quality design outcomes, would introduce an additional layer of subjectivity and uncertainty if introduced into the statutory assessment process. TW Property submits that these should be retained as a non-statutory guidance document only, with resource consents to be assessed against concise 'material' development criteria in the District Plan.
- d. Clarity of outcomes: TW Property have experienced tension in previous consent processes between CPTED/urban design drivers, and engineering requirements, such as for the width of jointly owned access lots. These tensions should be resolved and clearly set out in the criteria and/or Code of Practice.
- e. Resource consent conditions: There is currently variability in resource consent conditions for comprehensive residential developments in Hastings. Plan Change 5 could introduce consistency through making common resource consent conditions permitted standards, and/or through "other methods". This will reduce uncertainty in planning for delivery of medium density housing.

Submission theme 3: Ensure workable standards

18. As noted above, it is appropriate for PC5 to introduce standards specific to medium density housing (or CRDs, should HDC wish to retain this activity as a separate planning mechanism). However, it is important that the standards appropriately facilitate medium density housing while achieving quality onsite amenity and maintain an appropriate and transparent standard of amenity for adjacent residents. A useful comparison is with central government's national medium density residential standards (**MDRS**), that apply to all Tier 1 urban areas (i.e. Auckland, Hamilton, Tauranga, Wellington and Christchurch). Although they do not directly apply in Hastings, they provide a useful baseline as to what types of controls are anticipated to be appropriate to deliver medium density housing. These have been considered when determining the submission points outlined below.



Relief sought:

19. TW Property seeks the following relief to ensure the standards support developers in delivering medium density housing while also achieving good onsite and neighbourhood amenity outcomes:
- a) Front fences (Standards MRZ-S2, 7.2.6E(3), 8.2.6F(3), and 9.2.6J(3)): The existing front fence rules (e.g. 7.2.5L) allow up to 1.8m solid fences on collector and arterial roads, in recognition of the privacy and acoustic function fences have for houses along busy roads. This allowance is removed for CRDs through PC5, with a requirement for a maximum front fence height of 1.2m, or 1.5m if visually permeable. We suggest further consideration be given to this potential conflict in amenity expectations, particularly given CRDs are likely to be developed on key connection routes. Further, the front fence standards for CRDs also applies to internal accessway (including Jointly Owned Access Lots). Although this may be desirable from a safety and security perspective, depending on site layout, higher fences may be appropriate (at least in part) to provide privacy for outdoor living areas and/or screen waste storage areas or for acoustic control to ensure amenity for residents. To ensure optimal site layout, this matter may be more appropriately addressed through criteria than application of the front fence standard.
 - b) Subdivision (Rule SLD7A and Standard 30.1.6A): TW Property supports the removal of minimum lot sizes for subdivision of an approved (or concurrent) CRD. Minimum lot sizes should apply to vacant lot subdivision only. Subdivision of approved or concurrent CRDs should not require revisiting internal non-compliances with development standards, providing that subdivision boundaries are consistent with nominal boundaries that we request be shown on the land use consent plans. Assessing technical infringements where there is no material impact on the approved design or effects on the environment (including onsite and neighbouring property amenity), adds cost and time to subdivision consenting processes without adding any value in terms of outcomes. We request confirmation that the wording of SLD7A provides for this.
 - c) Height (Standards MRZ-S1, 7.2.6E(2), 8.2.6F(2), and 9.2.6J(2)): TW Property supports the maximum height of 11m + 1m for pitched roof forms as this will facilitate medium density housing and enable variety of roof pitches.
 - d) Height in relation to boundary (Standards MRZ-S3, 7.2.6E(4), 8.2.6F(4), and 9.2.6J(4)): TW Property generally supports retaining the proposed height in relation to boundary standard of 3m + 45° for all boundaries facing the southern half of a compass and 55° for all boundaries facing the northern half of the compass. This is a key control for maintaining amenity for adjacent residents, it assists in supporting a non-notified status for medium density housing in established residential areas, and is appropriate for the Hastings context. However, we consider that HDC may wish to consider a more lenient standard for the front of sites to encourage and enable two storey duplex units to face the street without infringing the standard.
 - e) Garage and Accessory building (Standards MRS-S4(b), 7.2.6E(5), 8.2.6F(5) and 9.2.6J(5)): TW Property does not support this standard as notified as it has the potential to significantly restrict the ability to provide two level terraced houses facing the street, which may limit the viability



of achieving this form. Design assessment criteria can address the relationship of dwellings to the street without requiring this restrictive control.

- f) Setbacks (Standards MRZ-S5, 7.2.6E(6), 8.2.6F(6), and 9.2.6J(6)): TW Property considers that a 3m front yard setback may be overly onerous and remove flexibility for optimal site layouts. We therefore request this be reduced to a 2m front yard. Together with other design standards and criteria, this will still enable an appropriate streetscape amenity while improving flexibility in terms of site orientation and layout. Alternatively, retain a 3m front yard but allow up to 30% of the road frontage to infringe this to a maximum of 1m, to provide for architectural variation along the street frontage while retaining the overall openness of suburban streetscapes.
- g) Building coverage (Standards MRZ-S6, 7.2.6E(7), 8.2.6F(7), and 9.2.6J(7)): TW Property supports the proposed building coverage of 50% of net site area; however, we request that the wording of the standard ensures that the building coverage requirement applies to net site area of nominal boundaries at the CRD land use consent stage to avoid reassessing building coverage in subdivision consents, as this adds additional complexity, time and cost.
- h) Outdoor living space (Standards MRZ-S7, 7.2.6E(8), 8.2.6F(8), and 9.2.6J(8)): TW Property requests that the outdoor living space standard be amended to be consistent with the Medium Density Residential Standards legislation i.e. 20sqm, 3m minimum dimension for ground floor and 8sqm, 1.8m minimum dimension for above ground floor units. In the Medium Density Residential Zone, and sites meeting the locational requirements for non-notified CRDs in the General Residential zone, there is greater access to parks and other social facilities, therefore the requirement for onsite outdoor living areas to provide for a quality living environment is reduced. We also note that this control complements the landscaping control. The key difference between these controls is that the outdoor living area control is specifically about useable area and onsite amenity, whereas the landscaping control provides more broadly for the built character of an area. Requiring 30sqm of minimum 4m dimension may significantly affect flexibility of site layout to optimize onsite amenity, and allocate space to other functional areas such as bin and shed storage, and washing lines, that do not necessitate a 4m minimum dimension. Alternatively, should HDC wish to require a larger area or usable outdoor space (i.e. 30sqm rather than 20sqm) then the minimum dimension should be reduced to 2m, while retaining requirement for a 4m diameter circle, to allow flexibility in site design.
- i) Landscaped area (Standards MRZ-S8, 7.2.6E(9), 8.2.6F(9), and 9.2.6J(9)): TW Property supports the minimum 20% landscaped area requirement. However, we request that the wording of the standard ensures that the landscaped area requirement applies to net site area of nominal boundaries at the CRD land use consent stage to avoid reassessing building coverage in subdivision consents, as this adds additional complexity, time and cost. This may be intended by the use of the term “exclusive use area” however this term does not seem to be defined.
- j) Windows and connections to street/road (Standard MRZ-S9, 7.2.6E(10), 8.2.6F(10), and 9.2.6J(10)): TW Property supports this standard as notified as it relates to front boundaries, as it provides greater clarity on the expectations for the relationship of new units to the street. However, the standard also applies to internal accessways (including Jointly Owned Access Lots). Although this may be desirable from a safety and security perspective, depending on site layout, having substantial window outlook over the legal access may compromise the amenity (privacy and acoustic amenity) for residents within the development). We note that



this requirement combined with north facing outdoor living space areas creates a requirement for multiple outlook areas creating additional unnecessary complexity for internal building configuration, particularly for affordable housing options.

- k) Outlook space (Standards MRZ-S10, 7.2.6E(11), 8.2.6F(11), and 9.2.6J(11)): TW Property supports the proposed outlook space requirements. They provide greater clarity on the expectations for privacy and amenity between units, which will assist in site design, without being unnecessarily onerous.
- l) Variety in building design and visual appearance (Standards MRZ-S11, 7.2.6E(12), 8.2.6F(12), and 9.2.6J(12)): TW Property requests deletion of this standard. The wording is open to interpretation and is therefore not appropriate as a standard; this matter is more appropriately addressed through criteria having regard to context. Retirement villages Further, to deliver affordable medium density housing at scale, standard typologies are likely to be used. This can assist in providing an integrated aesthetic to a development, and in most instances, this will be visually absorbed within a development site and therefore not impact on streetscape or neighbourhood character and amenity. We note that the MDRS allows up to three units as a permitted activity with no such control or design assessment. The risk of whole streets having replicated typologies along the street is low.

20. The changes sought are made to:

- a. Ensure that the proposed provisions appropriately enable the development of medium density housing in Hastings while providing for the amenity of existing and future residents; and
- b. Provide clarity for all plan users.

21. TW Property wishes to be heard in support of its submission.

If others make a similar submission, TW Property is happy to consider presenting a joint case at a hearing.

Yours Sincerely

Isaac Aitken

Isaac Aitken – Senior Development Manager

TW Property


M 0272009105

E Isaac.aitken@twproperty.co.nz

Tania Sansom-Anderson

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 19 July 2023 9:17 AM
To: Policy Team
Subject: HDC - Plan Change 5 Submission Further Opportunity [#1]


Name *	Vanessa van Kampen
--------	--------------------

Postal address *	 611 Windsor Avenue Parkvale Hastings, Hawkes Bay 4122 New Zealand
------------------	--

Email address *	vanessavankampen@gmail.com
-----------------	--

Phone number *	+64275063111
----------------	--------------

Contact name, address, email address and phone number for service of person making the submission*	Vanessa van Kampen
--	--------------------

Postal address *	 611 Windsor Avenue Parkvale Hastings, Hawkes Bay 4122 New Zealand
------------------	--

Email	vanessavankampen@gmail.com
-------	--

Phone number	+64275063111
--------------	--------------

Do you Yes

want to be
heard in
support of
your
submission?

(Hearings
will take
place later,
and we will
contact you
to arrange a
time only if
you wish to
be heard.

Please give
us your
contact
details in
the top
section.) *

If others Yes

make a
similar
submission,
would you
be prepared
to consider
presenting
a joint case
with them
at the
hearing? *

Could you No, I could not

gain an
advantage
in trade
competition

through this
submission?

*

Are you
directly
affected by
an effect of
the subject
matter of
the
submission
that:
(If trade
competition
applies,
select one
of these.)

- (a) Adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

1. Have you
already
made a
submission
on Plan
Change 5
(PC5)?

No (Go to question 3)

3. My
submission
relates to
the
following
proposed
elements of
plan change
5: (Tick all
that apply).

- The types or range of houses that can be built – townhouses, duplexe, terraced housing and low rise apartments
- The number of houses that can be built on a site
- The 3 storey height limit for houses
- The removal of the need for affected parties' consents or neighbor's approval

4. The
specific
chapter and

Projection: NZTM

Datum: D_NZGD_2000 Medium residential plan change for Windsor Avenue

provisions
of the
proposed
plan change
my
submission
relates to
are:
(Please
reference
the specific
section or
part of the
planning
provision(s),
such as
Objective
MRZ-O1 or
Rule MRZ-
R16)

5. My submission is that:

(State in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)

I oppose medium density housing anywhere around Windsor Park, that was gifted to the Council by the Beatson family must be protected and kept as a high quality facility for tourism and the local community. Medium residential development will no doubt bring a decline to this city asset. The stucco style housing and villas in this area will long be standing after new, high/medium density developments are needing a rebuild, and the original housing is part of the history and character of this area, and much of Hastings.

I request that Council consider some areas to become Hastings Character residential, that being my property at 611 and my neighbours villa which were the original homestead for this pocket of land along with the smaller villa which was the 'sister' property to the original villa. These properties, and some others along the road will be destroyed, along with a history of the area, should intensified building be allowed.

I request that the areas noted, other than traditional villas and art deco homes, as medium residency become general residential, again to protect the area. This will keep Hastings in the improved state that it has become and give those of us who do not wish to relocate to Havelock North, an opportunity to live in an area of Hastings that

sits with our values and that many can aspire to.

I request that 3–storied developments remain a notified development to protect our citizens who have purchased and developed properties in a chosen area so that they can continue to enjoy the fruits of their sacrifices and commitment in working towards living in an area that they can enjoy living in an established community with older, high quality homes that give privacy (they are not over–shadowed by multi storied properties) and that enjoy sunshine. All of the latter is paramount to a dry and warm home for all, and is proven to assist with quality mental health. The other rationale for this request is that there is no reason why new areas cannot be established with multi–storied properties that allow people to choose a high–rise option with no property as a preference, what you are proposing is poor quality planning and is imposing on existing property owners a problem that does not belong with them.

Splash Planet brings tourism to Hastings and the greater area. The Cricket/football fields are enjoyed by the wider community. Post Covid families are still visiting the park to feed the ducks and to enjoy a quiet time in this gentle area. High rise buildings will destroy this and must not be allowed to be built.

6. I seek the following submission from Hastings District Council: (Give precise details) I ask that any development or change to Windsor Park within the perimeters of Windsor Ave/Grove Road/Sylvan Road/Albert Street/Terrace Road be notified in advance to any residents. Whilst this may not be an immediate plan, I've lost confidence in Council re planning and consideration of existing residents and believe anything could happen going forward.

Tania Sansom-Anderson

From:

Sent:

To:

Subject:

Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>

Sunday, 30 July 2023 6:13 PM


Policy Team

HDC - Plan Change 5 Submission Further Opportunity [#3]

Name *

Linda Watson

Postal address *



1103A Haig Street Parkvale
Hastings, Hawkes Bay 4122
New Zealand

Email address *

lindawatson79@gmail.com

Phone number *

027 388 5432

Do you want to be heard in support of your submission?
(Hearings will take place later, and we will contact you to arrange a time only if you wish to be heard.
Please give us your contact details in the top section.) *

Yes

If others Yes

make a
similar
submission,
would you
be prepared
to consider
presenting
a joint case
with them
at the
hearing? *

Could you No, I could not

gain an
advantage
in trade
competition
through
this
submission?
*

Are you • (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
directly
affected by
an effect of
the subject
matter of
the
submission
that:
(If trade
competition
applies,
select one
of these.)

1. Have you Yes

already
made a

submission
on Plan
Change 5
(PC5)?

2. If you have already made a submission on PC5, do you want to: Withdraw your original submission and make a new submission (you can do this by filling out this form);

3. My submission relates to the following proposed elements of plan change 5: (Tick all that apply).

- The types or range of houses that can be built – townhouses, duplexe, terraced housing and low rise apartments
- The number of houses that can be built on a site
- The 3 storey height limit for houses
- The removal of the need for affected parties' consents or neighbor's approval
- The use of the Hastings Medium Density Design Framework as a key assessment tool

4. The specific chapter and provisions of the proposed plan change my submission relates to are:
(Please reference the specific section or part of the planning provision(s), such as Objective MRZ-O1 or Rule MRZ-R16)

MRZ-O1 – Purpose of the Zone. The zone plan 5 does take cognisance of the wellbeing of the existing residents. It considers the health and wellbeing of the future population but degrades the existing residents health and safety as well as their economic wellbeing eg. 3 storey buildings looking into backyards removing privacy. Intensification has a major impact on overall mental wellbeing.

MRZ-R16 – Comprehensive Residential Development

(a) House types etc – the greater the density eg greater than 2 bedroom x the number of dwellings the greater the negative impact on wellbeing for all entities.

(b) Individuality – multiple colours of housing etc are not fluid and aesthetically not calming, thus are intrusive to the mind. This is psychologically unappealing. Even body corporations have rules to maintain high standards, 'individuality' is really confusing and would look like Soweto. Should this element of Plan 5 take place, you are

taking away my individual privileges as a rate paying citizen.

(c) Building height, sunlight etc – removing my privacy by allowing others to look into my backyard is a violation of my rights and lacks consideration for my wellbeing. Removing sunlight is a high negative which is shameful.

(f) 2.6 – Private and Safe Environments – should you orientate windows to my backyard, you are setting up a depressed society and setting up conflict.

(j) 2.10 – Storm Water runoff – intensification is significant – if you intensify you run the risk of increasing the flood risk to my property which ultimately could see my house as uninsurable.

(K) 2.11 – building materials, with intensification you are increasing the trapping of heat which requires me to increase cooling activities, which increases my costs and increases global warming.

3. Building form etc – Should you build one of these unappealing social housing developments you are lowering the standard of building in my area and thus devaluing my property.

4. Infrastructure Servicing – we already are having sewage problems.

5. My submission is that:


(State in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)

I clearly oppose Plan Change 5 for multiple reasons, this plan is ill conceived and poorly considered for the wellbeing of the current Hastings District residents. You are devaluing our property significantly and significantly impacting our mental wellbeing with the proposal to build multiple storey high density developments. You would be best to redirect these development to large scale open land areas to create suburbs suited to high density needs. I am a resident saving for my retirement and should you build these developments close to me, you are literally creating poverty for my retirement. I am happy to have 1 or 2 single storey development but never more. These must never intrude into my privacy, be it visual or auditory. Based on sociodemographics, people buy in areas suited or matching to their values. I am concerned that you are dictating to my values, plus impacting my mental wellbeing. You are also decreasing the value in a top suburb such as Parkvale. You will create 'white flight'. This is very concerning and not the NZ that I know!

6. I seek the following submission from Hastings District Council: (Give precise details) I would like the HDC to only allow single storey dwelling with a minimum density of a maximum of 4 houses in single colour blending into the environment. If you are the land owner, you must ensure responsibility for the upkeep of all the grounds and maintenance on a yearly basis e.g painted bi-yearly, lands mowed fortnightly, gardens maintained fortnightly. There should be an appeal structure to hold the land owner to account whether this is local or central government.

Tania Sansom-Anderson

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, 10 August 2023 7:12 PM
To: Policy Team
Subject: HDC - Plan Change 5 Submission Further Opportunity [#13]

Name *	David Bloxham
Company name (if applicable)	Whananaki Trust
Postal address *	 809B Pepper St Raureka Hastings 4120 New Zealand
Email address *	dandvbloxham@gmail.com
Phone number *	0212282494
Do you want to be heard in support of your submission? (Hearings will take place later, and we will contact you to arrange a time only if you wish to be heard. Please give us your contact details in the top section.) *	No
If others make a similar submission, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing? *	No
Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? *	No, I could not
1. Have you already made a submission on Plan Change 5 (PC5)?	No (Go to question 3)
3. My submission relates to the following proposed elements of plan change 5: (Tick all that apply).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The types or range of houses that can be built – townhouses, duplexe, terraced housing and low rise apartments • The number of houses that can be built on a site • The 3 storey height limit for houses • The removal of the need for affected parties' consents or neighbor's approval

- The use of the Hastings Medium Density Design Framework as a key assessment tool

4. The specific chapter and provisions of the proposed plan change my submission relates to are:
(Please reference the specific section or part of the planning provision(s), such as Objective MRZ-O1 or Rule MRZ-R16)

I am concerned that the neighbours to a proposed housing development site will have no right to challenge the location ,design (up to 3 story)and the density of the housing in proximity their properties ,that would have adverse effects on their properties such as shading, light spill, privacy and noise. A Retirement village in proximity.

5. My submission is that:
(State in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)

My submission is based on the real concern that the HDC is establishing the right to issue a consent for a residential property development with out consultation with neighbour of that property or affected parties.

6. I seek the following submission from Hastings District Council:
(Give precise details)

To keep the proposed high density housing developments in the areas of Hastings that of the same type currently.

Tania Sansom-Anderson

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Friday, 11 August 2023 9:43 AM
To: Policy Team
Subject: HDC - Plan Change 5 Submission Further Opportunity [#18]

Name * Brian Wilkinson

Postal address * 
711 Rainbow Ave Parkvale
Hastings 4122
New Zealand

Email address * b.wilkinson@xtra.co.nz

Phone number * 06 8765670

Contact name, address, email address and phone number for service of person making the submission* Brian Wilkinson

Postal address 
711 Rainbow Ave Parkvale
Hastings 4122
New Zealand

Email b.wilkinson@xtra.co.nz

Phone number 06 8765670

Do you No
want to be
heard in
support of
your
submission?
(Hearings
will take
place later,
and we will
contact you
to arrange a
time only if
you wish to
be heard.
Please give
us your
contact
details in
the top
section.) *

If others No
make a
similar
submission,
would you
be prepared
to consider
presenting
a joint case
with them
at the
hearing? *

Could you No, I could not
gain an
advantage
in trade
competition

through this
submission?

*

1. Have you No (Go to question 3)
already
made a
submission
on Plan
Change 5
(PC5)?

3. My
submission
relates to
the
following
proposed
elements of
plan change
5: (Tick all
that apply).

- The types or range of houses that can be built – townhouses, duplexe, terraced housing and low rise apartments
- The number of houses that can be built on a site
- The 3 storey height limit for houses
- The removal of the need for affected parties' consents or neighbor's approval
- The use of the Hastings Medium Density Design Framework as a key assessment tool

4. The MRZ-O1, MRZ-R16, MRZ-S1
specific
chapter and
provisions
of the
proposed
plan change
my
submission
relates to
are:
(Please
reference
the specific
section or
part of the
planning
provision(s),

such as

Objective

MRZ-O1 or

Rule MRZ-

R16)

5. My submission is that:

(State in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)

I understand the need to increase the number of residential dwellings in the Hastings area but I do not believe that the proposed plan change will deliver the desired outcome in its current form. If it goes ahead, it will make Hastings an undesirable place to live.

Overall, I oppose the plan change, but my main objections are below.

MRZ-O1

I opposed the current Medium Density Residential Zones proposed for Hastings in the plan change. The zones are fragmented and are inconsistent with the desired outcomes of a MRZ zone. Several of the areas appear to have been considered only because they are close to public parks. However, these parks are regularly used for sporting activities and are not available for public use 100% of the time. Some areas are also a considerable distance away from public amenities such as supermarkets, medical facilities, and retail stores. Public transport is limited with a bus service only available between 6am – 6pm on weekdays, even fewer times on weekends. Any MRZ should be within a walkable distance from the centre of town, no more than 750 meters. This would reduce the need for vehicle ownership and reduce traffic congestion.

Creating a single area like this this would provide clear direction for infrastructure development and provide certainty for developers knowing what they build in these areas would be consistent with neighbouring properties. It would also mean property owners outside this area would not have to live in fear of developments suddenly appearing around them.

The plan change should be amended so the MRZ is an area no more than 750 meters from the city centre.

MRZ-R16

I oppose the non-notification of developments to neighbouring properties especially with buildings of two or three

stories. Neighbouring property owners have a right to know what is going to be built beside them, especially when the MRZ is adjacent to the General Residential Zone properties. They should be able to object if there is going to be detrimental effects on their property.

The plan change should be amended so that neighbours are notified of any developments that will be more than one story.

MRZ-S1

I oppose buildings the maximum height of 12 meters. There is no need for buildings this height in the Hastings residential zone. Buildings should be no more than two stories. If a developer wishes to build an apartment complex, then these should be built closer to the CBD and a minimum of 200 meters from any General Residential Zone property.

The plan change should be amended so that any building more than two stories cannot be built within 200m of a property in the General Residential Zone.

6. I seek the following submission from Hastings District Council: (Give precise details) That the proposed plan change is rejected in its current form. A new proposal should be drafted with a MRZ closer to the centre of the city so it is within walking distance to public amenities.

SUBMISSION FORM 5

Submission on Hastings District Plan

Further Opportunity for Submissions to Proposed Plan Change 5

'Right Homes, Right Place – Proposed Medium Density Residential Zone'.

Submissions can be:

Posted to:

Plan Change 5 Environmental
Policy Manager
Hastings District Council Private Bag 9002
Hastings 4156

Delivered to:

Civic Administration
Building
Hastings District Council
Lyndon Road East Hastings

Electronically:

Via www.myvoicemychoice.co.nz Or
Email: policyteam@hdc.govt.nz

Please be aware when providing personal information that submissions will be reproduced and included in Council public documents. Your submission and any supporting documents will be published on Council's website. If you wish for your contact details to remain private, please let us know. Please print and do not use pencil. You can attach more pages if necessary. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your submission.

Full Name (required)

Shirley Elizabeth WILSON

Company Name (if applicable)

Postal Address (Required)

1254 B Louie Street Per-Kvale.

Email Address (required)

Phone Number (required)

06 8786193

Contact Name, Address,
Email Address and Phone
Number for Service of Person
Making the Submission*

* (This is the person and address to which
all communication from Council about the
submission will be sent. You do not need to
fill this in if the details are the same as the
above.)

Do you want to be heard in support of your submission?

☒ Yes

☐ No

(Hearings will take place later, and we will contact you to arrange a time only if you wish to be heard. Please give us your contact details in the top section.)

If others make a similar submission, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing?

☒ Yes

☐ No

I could / could not* gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (*select one)

I am / am not ** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that –

- (a) Adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

(** If trade competition applies, select one of these.)

Please feel free to use additional sheet if necessary.

1. Have you already made a submission on Plan Change 5 (PC5)? ☐ Yes ☐ No (Go to question 3)
2. If you have already made a submission on PC5, do you want to:
- ☐ Keep your original submission as it is (i.e.: unaltered);
 - ☐ Add to or amend your original submission (you can do this by filling out this form);
 - ☐ Withdraw your original submission and make a new submission (you can do this by filling out this form);
 - ☐ Withdraw your original submission completely.

3. **MY SUBMISSION RELATES TO THE FOLLOWING PROPOSED ELEMENTS OF PLAN CHANGE 5:**

(Tick all that apply).

- ☒ The types or range of houses that can be built – townhouses, duplexes (two houses attached), terraced housing (3 or more houses joined together) and low rise (up to 3 stories) apartments
- ☐ The number of houses that can be built on a site
- ☐ The 3 storey height limit for houses
- ☐ The removal of the need for affected parties' consents or neighbor's approval
- ☒ The use of the Hastings Medium Density Design Framework as a key assessment tool
- ☐ Other, please specify _____

4. **THE SPECIFIC CHAPTER AND PROVISIONS OF THE PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE MY SUBMISSION**

RELATES TO ARE: *(Please reference the specific section or part of the planning provision(s), such as Objective MRZ-O1 or Rule MRZ-R16)*

5. **MY SUBMISSION IS THAT:** *(State in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)*

6. **I SEEK THE FOLLOWING DECISION FROM HASTINGS DISTRICT COUNCIL:** *(Give precise details.)*

Your signature or that of the person authorised to sign on behalf of the person making this submission:



Signature: S.E. Wilson

Date: 6th August 2023

REMINDER: Submissions must reach Council by **5pm Friday 11th August 2023**

Tania Sansom-Anderson

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 2 August 2023 8:34 PM
To: Policy Team
Subject: HDC - Plan Change 5 Submission Further Opportunity [#6]

Name *	Graeme Wright
Postal address *	 909 Harding Road Hastings 4120 New Zealand
Email address *	graeme.n.wright@gmail.com
Phone number *	0274747178
Contact name, address, email address and phone number for service of person making the submission*	Graeme Wright
Postal address	 909 Harding Road Hastings 4120 New Zealand
Email	graeme.n.wright@gmail.com
Phone number	0274747178
Do you want to be heard in support of your submission? (Hearings will take place later, and we will contact you to arrange a time only if you wish to be heard. Please give us your contact details in the top section.) *	No
If others make a similar submission, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing? *	No
Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? *	No, I could not

<p>Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that: (If trade competition applies, select one of these.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
---	---

<p>1. Have you already made a submission on Plan Change 5 (PC5)?</p>	<p>No (Go to question 3)</p>
---	------------------------------

<p>3. My submission relates to the following proposed elements of plan change 5: (Tick all that apply).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The types or range of houses that can be built – townhouses, duplexe, terraced housing and low rise apartments • The number of houses that can be built on a site • The 3 storey height limit for houses • The removal of the need for affected parties' consents or neighbor's approval • The use of the Hastings Medium Density Design Framework as a key assessment tool • Other, please specify
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<p>The lack of community consultation</p>
---	---

<p>4. The specific chapter and provisions of the proposed plan change my submission relates to are: (Please reference the specific section or part of the planning provision(s), such as Objective MRZ-O1 or Rule MRZ-R16)</p>	<p>MRZ-O1 MRZ-O2 MRZ-P2</p>
---	-------------------------------------

<p>5. My submission is that: (State in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)</p>	<p>I OPPOSE to Plan Change 5 in total UNTIL such time as there is honest and open discussion with the community and a long, robust consultation. And until, as per your Planning Committee's submission, proper planning for infrastructure has been completed.</p>
---	---

<p>6. I seek the following submission from Hastings District Council: (Give precise details)</p>	<p>I seek the Plan Change 5 in total is NOT ACCEPTED and the status quo is kept until proper planning and consultation has taken place.</p>
---	---