

## SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – BY SUBMITTER

Submitter number	Submitter	Contact Details
S119	<b>Ara Poutama, Department of Corrections</b>	Attention: Andrea Millar – Manager, Resource Management and Land Management, Private Bag 1206, Wellington 6140 <a href="mailto:andrea.millar@corrections.govt.nz">andrea.millar@corrections.govt.nz</a>
S120	<b>Armstrong</b> , Johnny Harley	601 Mairangi Street, Hastings 4120
S121	<b>Barnden</b> , Janice	2/724 Maxville Drive, Parkvale, Hastings 4122 <a href="mailto:janice.barnden@gmail.com">janice.barnden@gmail.com</a>
S122	<b>Blackberry</b> , Christine	1209b Ada Street, 2 Ada Court, Parkvale, Hastings 4122 <a href="mailto:christine.blackberry@xtra.co.nz">christine.blackberry@xtra.co.nz</a>
S123	<b>Clifton Bay</b> , Mark Mahoney	380 Clifton Road, Te Awanga <a href="mailto:mark.mahoney2@gmail.com">mark.mahoney2@gmail.com</a>
S124	<b>Corban</b> , Jenny	507c Fitzroy Avenue, Hastings 4122 <a href="mailto:jenny.corban@xtra.co.nz">jenny.corban@xtra.co.nz</a>
S125	<b>Cornes</b> , David	523/569 Lyndhurst Road, Frimley, Hastings 4120 <a href="mailto:david@eastfield.co.nz">david@eastfield.co.nz</a>
S126	<b>Currie</b> , Brendan	1200 Oliphant Road, Hastings, 4120 <a href="mailto:brendan.maree@outlook.com">brendan.maree@outlook.com</a>
S127	<b>Currie</b> , Scott	507 Lyndhurst Road, Frimley, Hastings, 4120 <a href="mailto:scott@currieco.co.nz">scott@currieco.co.nz</a>
S128	<b>Davies</b> , Julie	700 Maxville Drive, Hastings 4122 <a href="mailto:pudandjulie7@gmail.com">pudandjulie7@gmail.com</a>
S129	<b>Fyfe</b> , Boris	1245 Howard Street, Parkvale, Hastings 4122 <a href="mailto:boris@pro-structure.co.nz">boris@pro-structure.co.nz</a>
S130	<b>Harrison</b> , Bridget	521 Fenwick Street, Mayfair, Hastings 4122 <a href="mailto:bridgetharrison521@gmail.com">bridgetharrison521@gmail.com</a>
S131	<b>Hodges</b> , Anthony	322 Frimley Road, Frimley, Hastings 4120 <a href="mailto:akk.hodges@gmail.com">akk.hodges@gmail.com</a>
S132	<b>Hussey</b> , Gail	1212 Louie Street, Parkvale, Hastings 4122 <a href="mailto:ghussey9@gmail.com">ghussey9@gmail.com</a>

S133	<b>Jackson, Janet</b>	708 Charles Street, Raureka, Hastings 4120 <a href="mailto:atomac22@gmail.com">atomac22@gmail.com</a>
S134	<b>McFlynn Surveying and Planning,</b> Angela McFlynn	PO Box 13036, Mahora, Hastings 4155 <a href="mailto:angela@mcflynnsurveying.co.nz">angela@mcflynnsurveying.co.nz</a>
S135	<b>McIntosh, Jillian</b>	1220 Louie Street, Parkvale, Hastings 4122 <a href="mailto:ptosh@xtra.co.nz">ptosh@xtra.co.nz</a>
S136	<b>Moffat, Margaret</b>	179/1228 Ada Street, Parkvale, Hastings 4122 <a href="mailto:margaretmoffat17@gmail.com">margaretmoffat17@gmail.com</a>
S137	<b>Naylor, Kevin Melvin</b>	719 Charles Street, Raureka, Hastings <a href="mailto:kevinmnaylor@yahoo.co.nz">kevinmnaylor@yahoo.co.nz</a>
S138	<b>Rawle, Pamela</b>	705 Charles Street, Raureka, Hastings 4120 <a href="mailto:j.mcnair@xtra.co.nz">j.mcnair@xtra.co.nz</a>
S139	<b>Sankey, Daniel</b>	1210 Kaiapo Road, Hastings 4120 <a href="mailto:djs@greenleafnurseries.co.nz">djs@greenleafnurseries.co.nz</a>
S140	<b>Save Our Fertile Soils, Richard Gaddum</b>	<a href="mailto:harryapple53@gmail.com">harryapple53@gmail.com</a>
S141	<b>Senior, Karla</b>	1019 Caroline Road, Mayfair, Hastings 4122 <a href="mailto:karla@theseniors.co.nz">karla@theseniors.co.nz</a>
S142	<b>Senior, Kevin</b>	208 Ikanui Road, Hastings <a href="mailto:kevin@theseniors.co.nz">kevin@theseniors.co.nz</a>
S143	<b>Smith, Andrew; Smith, Grant; &amp; Taylor, Simon</b>	C/o PO Box 352, Mayfair, Hastings 4156 <a href="mailto:ajs@snz.net.nz">ajs@snz.net.nz</a>
S144	<b>Taylor, Brendon</b>	556 Ikanui Road, Frimley, Hastings 4120 <a href="mailto:brendonjtaylor@outlook.com">brendonjtaylor@outlook.com</a>
S145	<b>Tucker, Peter</b>	4/1228 Ada Street, Parkvale, Hastings 4122 <a href="mailto:peter.r.tucker@gmail.com">peter.r.tucker@gmail.com</a>
S146	<b>TW Property</b>	C/o Stradeqy, PO Box 239, Napier 4140 <a href="mailto:Catherine@stradeqy.co.nz">Catherine@stradeqy.co.nz</a>
S147	<b>van Kampen, Vanessa</b>	611 Windsor Avenue, Parkvale, Hastings 4122 <a href="mailto:vanessavankampen@gmail.com">vanessavankampen@gmail.com</a>
S148	<b>Watson, Linda</b>	1103A Haig Street, Parkvale, Hastings 4122 <a href="mailto:lindawatson79@gmail.com">lindawatson79@gmail.com</a>
S149	<b>Whananaki Trust, David Bloxham</b>	809B Pepper Street, Raureka, Hastings 4120 <a href="mailto:dandvbloxham@gmail.com">dandvbloxham@gmail.com</a>
S150	<b>Wilkinson, Brian</b>	711 Rainbow Avenue, Parkvale, Hastings 4122

		<a href="mailto:b.wilkinson@xtra.co.nz">b.wilkinson@xtra.co.nz</a>
S151	<b>Wilson</b> , Shirley Elizabeth	1254B Louie Street, Parkvale, Hastings 4122
S152	<b>Wright</b> , Graeme	909 Harding Road, Hastings 4120 <a href="mailto:graeme.n.wright@gmail.com">graeme.n.wright@gmail.com</a>

S119 **Ara Poutama, Department of Corrections**  
Resource Management and Land Management,  
Attention: Andrea Millar – Manager, Private Bag 1206, Wellington 6140  
[andrea.millar@corrections.govt.nz](mailto:andrea.millar@corrections.govt.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S119.1	Support with amendment	Definitions		Ara Poutama requests the addition of a definition of “community corrections activity” for consistency with the National Planning Standard definition	<u>Community Corrections Activity</u> : means the use of land and buildings for non-custodial services for safety, welfare, and community purposes, including probation, rehabilitation and reintegration services, assessments, reporting, workshops and programmes, administration, and a meeting point for community works groups.
S119.2	Support with amendment	Definitions		Ara Poutama seeks that a definition of “household” be included in the Hastings District Plan, to clarify that a household is not necessarily limited to a family unit or a flatting arrangement	<u>Household</u> : means a person or group of people who live together as a unit whether or not: (a) any or all of them are members of the same family; or (b) one or more members of the group receives care, support and/or supervision (whether or not that care, support and/or supervision is provided by someone paid to do so).
S119.3	Support with amendment	Definitions		Ara Poutama seeks that the National Planning Standard definition of “residential activity” be implemented via PC5 as the proposed definition is	1. Delete the operative definition of “residential activity” in the HDP. <del>Residential Activity: means the use of land and buildings by people for the</del>

				unnecessarily complicated and inconsistent with the National Planning Standards.	<p><del>purpose of permanent living accommodation, and includes, residential buildings, residential unit buildings, supplementary residential buildings and associated accessory buildings and for Residential Zones it includes seasonal workers accommodation for a maximum of 10 persons per site.</del></p> <p>2. Amend the proposed PC5 definition of “residential activity” as follows: Residential Activity (<del>in the Medium Density Residential Zone</del>): means the use of land and building(s) for people's living accommodation.</p> <p>3. Consequential amendments to give effect to this relief.</p>				
S119.4	Support in part	Objective and policy	Objective RESZ-O2 Policy RESZ-P1	Ara Poutama requests that objective RESZ-O2 is retained, and a minor amendment to policy RESZ-P1 made, so that a variety of household types are provided for in the residential zones	<p>1. Retain proposed objective RESZ-O2 as notified.</p> <p>2. Amend proposed policy RESZ-P1 as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>RESZ-P1</td> <td>Housing Diversity</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Relates to RESZ-O2</td> <td>Provide a range of residential zones that cater for different types of housing densities, typologies, and living arrangements and households.</td> </tr> </table>	RESZ-P1	Housing Diversity	Relates to RESZ-O2	Provide a range of residential zones that cater for different types of housing densities, typologies, and living arrangements and households.
RESZ-P1	Housing Diversity								
Relates to RESZ-O2	Provide a range of residential zones that cater for different types of housing densities, typologies, and living arrangements and households.								
S119.5	Support with amendment	<u>Activity inclusion in Zones:</u>		Ara Poutama requests the amendment of the rules for zones Bridge Pa Suburban Commercial Zone, Central Commercial Zone, Central Residential Commercial Zone, Commercial Service Zone, Suburban Commercial Zone, Havelock North Retail Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Clive Suburban Commercial Zone, Haumoana Te Awanga Suburban	Amend the rules in the following zones to enable <u>community corrections activities</u> to be undertaken as permitted activities for Bridge Pa Suburban Commercial Zone, Central Commercial Zone, Central Residential Commercial Zone, Commercial Service Zone, Suburban Commercial Zone, Havelock North Retail Zone, Mixed Use Zone,				

				Commercial Zone, Waimarama Suburban Commercial Zone to enable “community corrections activities” as a permitted activity.	Clive Suburban Commercial Zone, Haumoana Te Awanga Suburban Commercial Zone, Waimarama Suburban Commercial Zone.
S119.6	Support with amendment	Activity inclusion in Zones:		Ara Poutama requests the amendment of the rules for the Large Format Retail Zone, Light Industrial Zone, Business Zone, Havelock North Industrial Zone, Flaxmere Commercial Zone, Flaxmere Commercial Service Zone and General Industrial Zone to enable “community corrections activities” as a permitted activity.	Amend the rules in the following zones to enable <u>community corrections activities</u> to be undertaken as permitted activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large Format Retail Zone</li> <li>• Light Industrial Zone</li> <li>• Business Zone</li> <li>• Havelock North Industrial Zone</li> <li>• Flaxmere Commercial Zone</li> <li>• Flaxmere Commercial Service Zone</li> <li>• General Industrial Zone</li> </ul>

S120 **Armstrong**, Johnny Harley  
601 Mairangi Street, Hastings 4120

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S120.1	Oppose	Plan Change in its entirety		Opposes any development in Mairangi street	Leave our street quiet and stressless for long-term residents.

S121 **Barnden, Janice**  
2/724 Maxville Drive, Parkvale, Hastings 4122  
[janice.barnden@gmail.com](mailto:janice.barnden@gmail.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S121.1	Oppose	Plan Change in its Entirety		Objects to high-density intensification in Hastings/Havelock North area, particularly the proposed development at 1203 and 1205 Ada Street. Sites cannot accommodate multiple dwellings in a small area with limited off-street parking.	Object to high density intensification in general residential zone.
S121.2	Oppose	Infrastructure		Existing sewage infrastructure struggles to cope in heavy rain and would be severely compromised having to cater for multiple new dwellings	Object to high density intensification in general residential zone.
S121.3	Oppose	Building height		Three storey buildings will not complement the beautiful established community.	Object to high density intensification in general residential zone.
S121.4	Oppose	Density		Unsuitable for families to live in confined living areas with no lawns or play areas on site, creating community within community.	Object to high density intensification in general residential zone.

S122 **Blackberry, Christine**  
1209b Ada Street, 2 Ada Court, Parkvale, Hastings 4122  
[christine.blackberry@xtra.co.nz](mailto:christine.blackberry@xtra.co.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
------------------	---	-------	---	--------------------	--------------------

S122.1	Oppose	Extent of MRZ		Many areas mapped as MDRZ are close to residential areas with older people, character homes, churches and sports parks. This would have negative impacts on those areas that have not been considered or covered in documented plan.	Not specifically stated
S122.2	Oppose	Parking		Impact of parking on the surrounding amenities e.g., Windsor Park when there is a sports event, visitors and tourists when visiting Splash Planet, students and teachers when at school.	Not specifically stated
S122.3	Oppose	Safety/utilities		Who will be responsible for security of current public parks? Many people (including older people) walk the parks. With new housing having no play area, there will be lots more children/teenagers/etc congregating in the parks. Rate payers should not have to pay for rubbish to be cleaned up daily. What happens to the public toilets as a facility for park users not for residents of neighbouring homes?	Not specifically stated
S122.4	Oppose	Safety		Who will be responsible for extra crime in the areas, noise control, and social issues?	Not specifically stated
S122.4	Oppose	Infrastructure		Already current wastewater issues. Who pays when the development is done, and extra drainage is needed in the neighbouring areas?	Not specifically stated
S122.5	Oppose	Other		If current maps/planned areas are the only areas to have medium housing, why is Council accepting Resource Consents for intensive building outside the mapped areas? If this is the case, public notice and hearing must be made, otherwise what is the use of having a mapped out area?	Medium density housing proposals located outside mapped areas should be publicly notified.
S122.6	Oppose	Affected Person's Consent		Disagree with the removal of the need for affected person's consent. All affected parties and neighbours have the right to consent and approve as this	Affected parties (all) and neighbours (all) must have the right to consent and approve.

				affects current living, property, values, security, and homelife.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

S123 **Clifton Bay**, Mark Mahoney  
380 Clifton Road, Te Awanga  
[mark.mahoney2@gmail.com](mailto:mark.mahoney2@gmail.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S123.1	Support with amendment	Zoning	2.6 Medium Density.	Clifton Bay Limited being suitable for Comprehensive Residential Development site.	Rezone 2.7Ha of Land on the site to Medium Density Comprehensive Residential Development
S123.2	Support with amendment	Activity status	11.2 Haumoana – Te Awanga Residential Zone.	To enable CRD as a permitted or controlled activity for Clifton Bay Limited site.	Amend activity status of CRD on this site to a Controlled or Permitted Activity.
S123.3	Support with amendment	Appendices	References in 11.2, Appendix 25A	Update by replacing current reference to enable CRD at Clifton Bay Limited site.	Delete & Replace Te Awanga Lifestyle Overlay Zone, and All references in 11.2, Appendix 25A,
S123.4	Support with amendment	Subdivision	30.1.5, 30.1.6, 30.1.8.2 Subdivision and land development	Updated by replacing current master plan and replacing with new master plan.	Amend Sections 30.1.5, 30.1.6, 30.1.8.2 to allow for the new Master Plan
S123.5	Support with amendment	Subdivision	SLD7A and SLD 14 Subdivision and land development	Update to include Te Awanga Residential zone within the CRD.	Amend SLD7A and SLD 14 to include Te Awanga Residential Zone
S123.6	Support with amendment	Subdivision	SLD16 Subdivision and land development	Update to include reference to new structure plan.	Amend SLD16 to refer to new Appendix 25A Plan as outlined in our submission
S123.7	Support with amendment	Subdivision	Table 30.1.6A 6 – Haumona – Te Awanga 4) Subdivision and	Change density for Clifton Bay Limited site	Amend Table 30.1.6A 6 – Haumona – Te Awanga 4). Te Awanga Lifestyle Overlay 500m <sup>2</sup> .



			land development		
S123.8	Support with amendment	Subdivision	30.1.7S 2. Te Awanga Lifestyle Overlay Subdivision and land development	Amend performance standard 30.1.7S 2 to enable the proposed master plan.	Amend 30.1.7S 2. Te Awanga Lifestyle Overlay to allow for new Master Plan
S123.9	Support with amendment	Subdivision	30.1.8.2 Specific Assessment Criteria S19 Subdivision and land development	As a result of a new master plan the assessment criteria needs to be amended.	Amend 30.1.8.2 Specific Assessment Criteria S19. To allow for new Master Plan.
S123.10	Support with amendment	Medium Density Housing Strategy	2.6.4 MDO1 Medium Density Housing Strategy	Amend objective MD01 to include MRD for Te Awanga.	Amend 2.6.4 MDO1 – To allow for Te Awanga
S123.11	Support with amendment	Urban Strategy	2.4.3 UPD14 Urban Strategy	Add new policy to recognise and enable CRD for Te Awanga.	Amend 2.4.3 UPD14 - To allow for Te Awanga
S123.12	Support with amendment	Appendices	Appendix 25A	Replace master plan to enable CRD for Clifton Bay Limited.	Amend Appendix 25A with new master plan

S124 **Corban, Jenny**  
507c Fitzroy Avenue, Hastings 4122  
[jenny.corban@xtra.co.nz](mailto:jenny.corban@xtra.co.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S124.1	Support with amendment	Heights of buildings	Heights of buildings	I support in principle the aims of the plan i.e., Policy MDP1 and MDP2, and MRZ-01, MRZ-02 and MRZ-03.	I request that only single storied buildings are permitted at the boundary between 507 and 507c Fitzroy Avenue.

				<p>I support MRZ-S1 and seek assurance that this will be the case for any development adjacent to 507c Fitzroy Avenue.</p> <p>As applications will be non- notified, it is crucial that permitted limits on buildings adjacent to the boundary take this factor into account.</p>	
S124.2	Support with amendment	Heights of Buildings	Heights of buildings	<p>I support in principle the aims of the plan i.e., Policy MDP1 and MDP2, and MRZ-01, MRZ-02 and MRZ-03.</p> <p>I support MRZ-S1 and seek assurance that this will be the case for any development adjacent to 507c Fitzroy Avenue.</p> <p>As applications will be non- notified, it is crucial that permitted limits on buildings adjacent to the boundary take this factor into account.</p>	<p>If two storied buildings are permitted, then trees should be removed from the boundary of 507c Fitzroy Ave and Cornwall Park to improve available sunlight to the property</p>
S124.3	Support with amendment	Heights of Buildings	Heights of buildings	<p>I support in principle the aims of the plan i.e., Policy MDP1 and MDP2, and MRZ-01, MRZ-02 and MRZ-03.</p> <p>I support MRZ-S1 and seek assurance that this will be the case for any development adjacent to 507c Fitzroy Avenue.</p> <p>As applications will be non- notified, it is crucial that permitted limits on buildings adjacent to the boundary take this factor into account.</p>	<p>Three storied buildings are not appropriate at 507 Fitzroy Ave and should be specifically excluded in the plan.</p>

S125 **Cornes, David**  
523/569 Lyndhurst Road, Frimley, Hastings 4120  
[david@eastfield.co.nz](mailto:david@eastfield.co.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S125.1	Oppose	Plan change in its entirety	PC5 in Total	I strongly oppose the provisions of Plan Change 5. It is out of character socially and every way with the quiet leafy subdivision that we enjoy in the Lyndhurst Frimley area. It would downgrade Hastings and who would want to move to Hastings if the chances were that one of these high-density housing developments were built on their neighbouring land with no provision for any consultation process.	Discontinue PC5

S126 **Currie, Brendan**  
1200 Oliphant Road, Hastings, 4120  
[brendan.maree@outlook.com](mailto:brendan.maree@outlook.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S126.1	Oppose	Plan change in its entirety	MRZ-R16 Comprehensive Residential Development	I oppose the rule MRZ-R16 where there are proposed developments of more than just subdividing a property into 2 lots (i.e., more than 1 additional dwelling on the same site).  I strongly oppose the idea of	Don't let the people of Hastings (and therefore the younger generations) down by giving developers a free reign of where they can take away the value of surrounding properties and make the areas feel unsafe, even perceptually.  Oppose the rule MRZ-R16 Comprehensive

				<p>developers being able to buy up property or properties in well-established areas and completely change the character of these areas without public consultation.</p> <p>These developments have proven to devalue the area and degrade the quality and feeling of safety in the neighborhood.</p>	Residential Development
--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------

S127 **Currie, Scott**  
 507 Lyndhurst Road, Frimley, Hastings, 4120  
[scott@currieco.co.nz](mailto:scott@currieco.co.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S127.1	Oppose	Plan change in its entirety	Objective MRZ-01 Purpose of Zone	<p>I oppose the proposal of allowing 3 Storey Housing, Smaller Section Size, Duplex and Low Rise Apartments being allowed in existing Neighbourhoods.</p> <p>I believe this will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Devalue existing and neighbouring properties</li> <li>- Destroy the character of these neighbourhoods due to building heights and visual appearance</li> <li>- Have adverse effects on neighbours due to reduced privacy</li> <li>- Create health and general wellbeing issues due to lack of personal open spaces, trees for shade and areas for private relaxation including gardening</li> </ul>	Oppose the proposal of allowing 3 Storey Housing, Smaller Section Size, Duplex and Low Rise Apartments being allowed in existing Neighbourhoods

				and areas for children to play safely in own yards	
--	--	--	--	--	--

S128 **Davies, Julie**  
700 Maxville Drive, Hastings 4122  
[pudandjulie7@gmail.com](mailto:pudandjulie7@gmail.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S128.1	Oppose	Plan change in its entirety	Medium Density Residential Provisions	I clearly object to the Plan Change 5 as we are seeing on going issues with a lot of these concerns in the Medium Density Residential HDC areas. We already have a lot of ongoing problems to be trying to push these changes through will only make for things to get a lot worse.	Request only single storey housing at the most to be built  Whoever is the landlord to any of these developments (should any of it go ahead) has to have a contract for maintaining the lawns, gardens and maintenance of the dwellings

S129 **Fyfe, Boris**  
1245 Howard Street, Parkvale, Hastings 4122  
[boris@pro-structure.co.nz](mailto:boris@pro-structure.co.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S129.1	Oppose	Plan change in its entirety	MRZ-01	Weaving in higher density housing amongst housing, which is already established, especially in the Parkvale area. This is set to undermine the current residential zones manner of life and the communities land size per lot.	Medium Density housing is overruled and not passed to be acceptable. Medium density housing is not allowed in existing urban areas.

				Reduction per Lot size and jamming more houses onto an existing section just makes no sense. Building houses which cater to 2 stories (duplexes) beside existing housing is rude and invasive of privacy.	
S129.2	Oppose	Plan change in its entirety with reference to greenfield areas being used for greater density		I oppose this submission entirely, while the buildings may be attractive' and the urban environment "visually attractive' this is far from what is needed in our communities. Good quality onsite and off-site residential living is hardly accurate at all. These Sections which get subdivided and 3 lots of houses placed on them are tiny. We need to maintain sections sizes and freedom of movement in our residential Zones. For the multitude who want a reasonable size section of 1000m <sup>2</sup> +, there is very little available and to go and make section sizes which are almost at this level smaller is not acceptable by the community. Land away from an already developed community and formed on the outskirts of Hastings / Havelock should be used for medium density housing.	Maintain space in our communities.  Maintain land away from existing communities to build medium density housing.

S130 **Harrison, Bridget**  
521 Fenwick Street, Mayfair, Hastings 4122  
[bridgetharrison521@gmail.com](mailto:bridgetharrison521@gmail.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S130.1	Oppose	Density, the existing residential environment, property values		While the need for more housing cannot be denied it is imperative that current rate payers and homeowners do not have the values to their homes decreased because of increased social and larger housing subdivisions. In Mayfair we have a large increase of infill housing already and have seen properties drop in value and the needs of the Community rise.	That the Council consider current streets and environments and listen to ratepayers and residents.
S130.2	Oppose	Height and typology of buildings		There are no 3 story buildings currently in Fenwick and no two storey buildings on one side of the street. Allowing 2 and 3 story buildings to be built will change the character of the street and block the light to the established homes and the 8 newly built homes on the corner of Fenwick and Karamu Rd. These homes are already close to the fence line which may cause a reduction in the light, air and warmth they are able to receive particularly in the winter. There are limited public parks, shops, and access to public transport is limited to My Way and school buses or taxi and uber. (GRP 3)	That the inclusion of 3 story low rise apartments will be removed from the plan
S130.3	Oppose	Outdoor living space,		It is important for children to be able to play safely in a yard that is well fenced and clear of traffic. Many of the homes now being built particularly in Mayfair, Hood St and Jellicoe St for example, have small yards a small garden shed	Homes need to have ample space for outdoor use and living, play and recreation.

				and not really enough room to play safely.	
S130.4	Oppose	Traffic / parking		These homes are also very close to the road. The increased numbers of homes lead to increased traffic. Many families have more than the one car and streets are becoming full with parked cars. These are at times obstructing the view of the footpaths and roads	

S131 **Hodges, Anthony**  
322 Frimley Road, Frimley, Hastings 4120  
[akk.hodges@gmail.com](mailto:akk.hodges@gmail.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S131.1	N/A	Trees		Protection of native Totara Taonga Tapu at 322 Frimley Road by registering this tree under the Notable Tree Register. The submission provides detailed reasons for seeking the trees protection.	Seeks formal acknowledgement, registration and protection of the Totara tree located at 322 Frimley Road through its addition to the Notable Tree Register in Section 18.1 'Heritage Items and Notable Trees' of the District Plan.
S131.2	Oppose	Plan change in its entirety		Concerns regarding a lack of consultation and inclusion in preparing Proposed Plan Change 5.	That proposed Plan Change 5 not go through in its present form and Council goes back to the community for feedback and further input.



S132 **Hussey, Gail**  
1212 Louie Street, Parkvale, Hastings 4122  
[ghussey9@gmail.com](mailto:ghussey9@gmail.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S132.1	Oppose	Plan change in its entirety		Totally oppose all of plan change 5. This plan change completely changes the feel and outlook of many areas. Cannot build multiple houses on one section with limited car parking, green space not to mention extra stress on existing services, schools. This is not the way to allow more housing. Existing home owners are being railroaded into a change in their neighborhood that they did not buy into. This is not right home right place. The whole plan is wrong.	More sections and areas need to be opened up for development with sections and housing that reflect family living with parking and green space where kids can play. This cannot be done in this current plan. It is a short-sighted quick fix to housing that is not long lasting and will drop value of everyone around them. We need homes that are long lasting and reflect their surroundings.
S132.2	Oppose	Affected persons' consent		Any change either big or small should be notifiable	Any change either big or small should be notifiable

S133 **Jackson, Janet**  
708 Charles Street, Raureka, Hastings 4120  
[atomac22@gmail.com](mailto:atomac22@gmail.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S133.1	Oppose	House types		Oppose multiple (more than 3 units), duplex units, apartment blocks and terraced housing. This multiple housing does not promote happy healthy living.	Not stated

				It is eroding the character of our city and impacting the social fabric of our existing community. Good design is not what we are seeing in the repetitive designs of the many KO developments	
S133.2	Oppose	Density (number of houses on a site)		Families need green space for outdoor living – Hawkes Bay living As an immediate neighbour to 711 Southland Road I am concerned that from 4 residents this site will soon have 44, and maybe 20 dogs!	Site size should be restricted to 300m <sup>2</sup>
S133.3	Oppose	Carparking provision		The government got it wrong with not providing parking for 2 cars per house. We are not Auckland, we are not serviced well enough with public transport here in Hastings to not have cars. Our Hawke's Bay lifestyle is based around vehicle use. We travel to share joint amenities with Napier City. How do occupants charge their EV's if no car parking is provided?	
S133.4	Oppose	Height of buildings		We do not need 3 storey housing in Hastings. As there is no clear distinction of rules around the proposed medium density housing areas where up to 3 storied homes would be allowed, I oppose 3 storied housing in any Residential Zone.	
S133.5	Oppose	Affected person's consent		If any aspect of a proposed development does not FULLY comply with the District Plan, then affected parties and neighbours should have a say.	I disagree with the removal of consent / approval being required.
S133.6	Oppose	Medium Density Design Framework		The rules around medium density development are too broad. I disagree with the recommendations from the recent review of the Medium Density Strategy which included removing barriers to development within the District Plan and providing greater certainty for the development community. The concerns in years	I oppose the use of the Hastings Medium Density Framework as a key assessment tool.

				gone by of backyard development are now but a joke with Developers already getting their way far too often by pushing the District Plan boundaries. Council and Kainga Ora are providing a launching pad for Developers to buy up properties and demolish established housing.	
S133.7	Oppose	Character Homes		Council should be saving these individual historic homes and recognizing the architectural history in our established residential neighbourhoods. A very high % of development in Hastings is currently for KO Housing.	The character residential zones need attention and individual historic homes should be included.
S133.8	Oppose	Infrastructure / services / amenities		Hastings needs to stop this perpetual KO house building and catch up with the infrastructure & services we need. Our hospital is already struggling.	Source more doctors, dentists, provide more transport facilities and schools.

S134 **McFlynn Surveying and Planning**, Angela McFlynn  
 PO Box 13036, Mahora, Hastings 4155  
[angela@mcflynnsurveying.co.nz](mailto:angela@mcflynnsurveying.co.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S134.1	Oppose	Plan Change 5 in its entirety		<p>The proposed plan change is not consistent with the NPS-UD in that it does not remove overly restrictive planning rules – e.g., specifically, the Medium Density Residential Zone prevents infill subdivision and the creation of vacant sites.</p> <p>Public feedback on recent resource consent applications for developments</p>	That the plan change is withdrawn, and a new plan change prepared that is consistent with the NPS-UD, aligns with community aspirations, provides for development at an appropriate density and in particular provides for subdivision and development within the Medium Density Residential Zone that is not limited only to 'comprehensive residential developments' (that is it

				<p>in the General Residential Zone has provided clear evidence that these types of developments do not align with community aspirations for the district. There are strong concerns around the reduced quality of the wider residential environment that would result from the types of high density development that would be enabled.</p> <p>Controlling the overall maximum density of development that can be undertaken (i.e., allowing medium density, rather than high density developments) will also ensure that the District Plan remains consistent with the Regional Policy Statement (i.e., infill medium density development in appropriate locations at 20 - 40 dwellings per hectare).</p>	allows for infill and vacant site subdivision).
S134.2	Oppose	Definitions / Use of terms	Comprehensive Residential Development	The term Comprehensive Residential Development suggests that the development will comprise of more than just a group of houses, and certainly more than two houses, and will include communal facilities and/or open spaces. The type of development anticipated by this plan change would be more accurately described as Multi-unit development.	Replace all occurrences of comprehensive residential development with multi – unit development
S134.3	Support in part	Hastings General Residential Zone objectives and policies	Objective RO1	Determining what makes a 'quality living environment' is highly subjective and should be clearly defined.	Amend Objective RO1 to identify the specific elements that are considered necessary to ensure a quality living environment.
S134.4	Oppose in part	Hastings General Residential Zone objectives and policies	Objective RO2	Determining what makes a 'high quality residential environment' is highly subjective and should be clearly defined.	Amend Objective RO2 to identify the specific elements that are considered necessary to ensure a high quality residential environment.
S134.5	Oppose in part	Hastings General Residential Zone objectives and policies	Policy RP4	Determining what makes a 'high quality residential environment' is highly subjective, and should be clearly defined	Amend Policy RP4 to identify the specific elements that are considered necessary to ensure a high quality residential environment.

S134.6	Support in part	Hastings Character Residential Zone	Rule HC26 Comprehensive Residential Development on land identified in Appendix 27 Figure 2 – RD	Appendix 27 is being removed from the District Plan by this plan change.	Amend to ‘Multi Unit Residential Development that complies with specific performance standard 7.2.6E’ – RD
S134.7	Oppose	Hastings Character Residential Zone	RULE HC32 – Comprehensive Residential Development outside the areas identified in Appendix 27 Figure 2 – NC	Appendix 27 is being removed from the District Plan by this plan change.	Amend to ‘Multi Unit Residential Development that does not comply with specific performance standard 7.2.6E’ – NC
S134.8	Oppose in part	Residential Overview Chapter	Objective – RESZ-O6	The Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy is a Non statutory document that has been prepared by Council with limited public input, and without an opportunity for the public to challenge the strategy, and therefore should not be relied on to make decisions on resource consent applications.	Remove reference to the Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy
S134.9	Support in part	Residential Overview Chapter	Policy – RESZ-P4	This policy encourages infill subdivision and development within the existing urban areas. The policy should also be specific in reference to the appropriate density for such compact development, i.e., low to medium density, to ensure development is undertaken in accordance with the Regional Policy Statement.	Amend this policy to: Provide for compact low and medium density settlement development and the efficient utilisation of land relative to the characteristics of the particular residential environment in order to help safeguard the productive nature of the soils surrounding the residential zones of the district.
S134.10	Oppose in part	Medium Density Residential Zone	Objective MRZ-O2	The Medium Density Residential Zone should be consistent with the description of this zone type as prescribed by the National Planning Standards, i.e., “Areas used predominantly for residential activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, low-	Amend Objective MRZ-O2 as follows: The planned urban built environment of the zone is characterised by; a. A diversity of housing typologies including <u>detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, low-rise apartments, and other compatible activities;</u> <del>townhouses, duplexes, terrace houses and low-rise apartments;</del>

				rise apartments, and other compatible activities" A predominance of 2 – 3 level buildings is not realistic, and is not consistent with the zone description of a Medium Density Residential Zone as prescribed by the National Planning Standards.	<p><del>b. A built form of predominantly two and three storey buildings which are integrated with public and private open space;</del></p> <p>c. Good quality on-site and off-site residential living environments that provide for the health and well-being of people and communities and are consistent with the Hastings Medium Density Design Framework;</p> <p>d. An urban environment that is visually attractive, safe and easy to navigate and convenient to access.</p>
S134.11	Oppose	Medium Density Residential Zone	Policy – Comprehensive Residential Development MRZ-P1	In identifying the Medium Density Residential zone as suitable for comprehensive residential development, and essentially attempting to prohibit any other form of development in these areas, Council must have already confirmed that there is sufficient infrastructure capacity to service this type of development.	Delete this policy
S134.12	Oppose	Medium Density Residential Zone	Policy – Compact Development MRZ - P2	This policy will effectively prohibit development of smaller sites and constrain housing supply, by preventing the efficient use of the zone, and is therefore inconsistent with the NPS-UD. The implementation of this policy will prevent development of the Medium Density Residential Zone in accordance with the zone description prescribed in the national planning standards. Further development in accordance with this policy would not be possible without the displacement of the existing community, which would therefore negatively impact the social wellbeing of these residents in a manner that is inconsistent with the purpose of the RMA.	<p>Amend to: Provide for infill development of one additional dwelling on a site to ensure the efficient use of the zone for more compact housing types where an average density of greater than one dwelling per 350m<sup>2</sup> net site area is achieved.</p> <p>Make consequential amendments to the District Plan to reflect the appropriateness of infill subdivision</p>

S134.13	Oppose in part	Medium Density Residential Zone	Policy – Urban Character MRZ - P3	A predominance of 2 and 3 storey buildings is not realistic and is not consistent with the zone description prescribed by the National Planning Standards for a Medium Density zone. Specific reference should also be made the expected density within the policy (i.e., Medium Density).	Amend to: Achieve the planned <u>Medium Density</u> urban built environment character of <del>two and three storey buildings surrounded by landscaping</del> including by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Limiting height, bulk and form of development;</li> <li>b. Managing the design, appearance and variety of building development;</li> <li>c. Requiring setbacks and landscaped areas that are consistent with an urban character;</li> <li>d. Ensuring developments are consistent with the Hastings Medium Density Design Framework principles and key design elements</li> </ul>
S134.14	Support in part	Medium Density Residential Zone	Policy – High Quality Living Environment MRZ - P4	This policy should also include specific reference to the intended density of development, i.e., Medium Density to avoid the cumulative effects associated with overcrowding through both individual and successive overly intensive developments	Amend Policy MRZ-P4 to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>a. Limiting development to medium density development, comprising of a density of no greater than one dwelling per 250m<sup>2</sup> net site area.</u></li> </ul>
S134.15	Support in part	Medium Density Residential Zone	Policy – High amenity streets and neighbourhoods	This policy should also include specific reference to the intended density of development, i.e., Medium Density to avoid the cumulative effects associated with overcrowding through both individual and successive overly intensive developments.	Amend Policy MRZ-P5 to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>a. Limiting development to medium density development, comprising of a density of no greater than one dwelling per 250m<sup>2</sup> net site area.</u></li> </ul>
S134.16	Oppose	Medium Density Residential Zone	Rule MRZ – R16 Comprehensive Residential Development	The controlled activity status of CRD in this zone as it will not provide Council the ability to refuse to grant consent where the standards are met, but the overall design does not align with the objectives and policies of the Plan in terms of the effects on the amenity of the environment, or appropriateness of the overall intensity of development (particularly if Council do not place an appropriate limit on density through development standards. A restricted discretionary status is more	Amend to Restricted Discretionary for proposals that meet the relevant standards, and non-complying for proposals that do not meet the relevant standards.

				appropriate, with developments that do not meet these standards more appropriately recognised as non-complying.	
S134.17	Oppose	Medium Density Residential Zone	Rule MRZ – R16 Comprehensive Residential Development	Precluding notification is also not appropriate given the density and design of developments can have significant adverse effects on the occupiers of immediately surrounding residential properties.	Remove the statement precluding notification of applications pursuant to these rules
S134.18	Oppose	Medium Density Residential Zone	Rule MRZ-R22 Infill Residential Development	Preventing infill development will constrain housing supply and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD. This could also result in displacement of the existing community as redevelopment is promoted over subdivision of one additional dwelling / lot. This could negatively impact the social wellbeing of these residents in a manner that is inconsistent with the purpose of the RMA.	Amend activity status to Restricted Discretionary and set an appropriate density for infill development such as a minimum net site area of 250m <sup>2</sup> per dwelling.
S134.19	Oppose	Medium Density Residential Zone	Performance Standard MRZ-S1 Height	A maximum height of 11m is excessive for a medium density residential area. The existing height limit of 8m is appropriate and sufficient to provide for a range of building typologies without compromising the neighbourhood amenity for residents who choose to exercise their right to remain in their existing dwellings within this zone. It is inappropriate to attempt to force the existing residents out through overcrowding by new inappropriately designed developments	Revert to the existing, and appropriate, maximum building height of 8m.
S134.20	Oppose	Medium Density Residential Zone	Performance Standard MRZ-S7 Outdoor Living Space	A well-designed multi-unit residential development would allow for reduced private outdoor living spaces in situations where these are compensated for by shared communal open spaces, protecting the quality of the living environment for residents, and assisting in the avoidance of	Amend to: a. A <u>Each</u> residential unit at ground floor must have <del>an private</del> outdoor living space that is at least 30m <sup>2</sup> , with a minimum 4m dimension b. A <u>Each</u> residential unit above ground floor must have <del>an private</del> outdoor



				overcrowding through overly intensive development.	living space of at least 8m <sup>2</sup> , with a minimum 1.8m dimension  c. <u>Where any residential unit is provided with less than 50m<sup>2</sup> private outdoor living space, any shortfall must be provided for within a shared communal outdoor living space.</u>
S134.21	Oppose in part	Stormwater Management Standards in the Medium Density Residential Zone and General Residential zones of Hastings, Flaxmere and Havelock North	MRZ-S12, 7.2.5B, 7.2.6E(13), 8.2.5G, 8.2.6F(13), 9.2.5K, 9.2.6J(13)	The permitted development standards provide for 50% building coverage and require at least 20% landscaped area within a site. It is reasonable to expect the Council's stormwater network has been designed to accommodate stormwater from permitted developments in residential areas. Site specific stormwater management should only be necessary where these standards are not met. The stormwater runoff allowed should also be consistent for all sites regardless of the type of development proposed.	Amend to:  <u>Where standards MRZ-S6 and/or MRZ-S8 are not complied with, the peak stormwater runoff from the site shall not exceed the following standards...</u>
S134.22	Oppose in part	Roading Infrastructure / Vehicle Access Standards in the Medium Density Residential Zone and General Residential Zones	MRZ-S13, 7.2.5N, 7.2.6E(14), 8.2.5M, 8.2.6F(14), 9.2.5M, 9.2.6J(14)	The vehicle access standards are only relevant on residential sites where on-site parking is being provided. This standard should be amended to reflect this, to avoid absurd situations where vehicle access is required to be provided to sites on which no parking is proposed.	Amend to: Where on-site parking is proposed to be provided on a site, activities shall comply with the rules and standards for access outlined in Section 26.1 Transport and Parking of the District Plan.
S134.23	Oppose	Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-S14 – Infrastructure – Water, Wastewater and Stormwater	In identifying the Medium Density Residential zone as suitable for comprehensive residential development, and essentially attempting to prohibit any other form of development in these areas, Council must have already confirmed that there is sufficient infrastructure capacity to service this type of development.	Not stated

S134.24	Support	Medium Density Residential Zone	New Density Standard proposed	In order to ensure that development is undertaken at an appropriate (medium) density, a new standard is required.	Add a new development standard: MRZ-SXX Density The density of development must be no greater than one residential unit per 250m <sup>2</sup> net site area.
S134.25	Oppose	Medium Density Residential Zone	Assessment Criteria MRZ-R16	The listed assessment criteria are overly prescriptive. The National Medium Density Design Guide would provide an appropriate level of guidance, is less prescriptive, and will provide for greater flexibility in building design.	Remove references to the Hastings Medium Density Design Framework, and replace with reference to the checklist of priority design elements within the National Medium Density Design Guide.
S134.26	Oppose	Hastings General Residential Zone	Rule GR-18 Comprehensive Residential Developments complying with specific performance standards 7.2.6E Rule GR-24 Comprehensive Residential Developments that do not meet one or more of the specific performance standards and terms in 7.2.6E	Precluding notification is not appropriate given the density and design of developments can have significant adverse effects on the occupiers of immediately surrounding residential properties. A restricted discretionary status (with the ability for notification) is more appropriate, with developments that do not meet these standards more appropriately recognised as non-complying.	Amend to Restricted Discretionary for proposals that meet the relevant standards, and non-complying for proposals that do not meet the relevant standards.
S134.27	Support in part	Hastings General Residential Zone Specific standards for Comprehensive Residential Development	7.2.6E.1 Site Context	Sites should be located within 400m-600m walking distance of the identified features to ensure the features are readily accessible to future residents, and to ensure consistency with the assessment criteria. Depending on road layouts, features within a 600m radius can be located at a significantly greater walking distance.	Amend to: Comprehensive Residential Developments that propose a density of development greater than 1 residential unit per 350m <sup>2</sup> net site area shall be located on sites in the <u>General Residential Zone or Hastings Character Residential Zone</u> that are within or partially within a 400-600m <u>radius walking distance</u> of
S134.28	Oppose	Hastings General Residential Zone	7.2.6E.2 Height	A maximum height of 11m is excessive for a residential area. The existing height limit of 8m is appropriate and	Revert to the existing, and appropriate, maximum building height of 8m.

		Specific standards for Comprehensive Residential Development		sufficient to provide for a range of building typologies without compromising the neighbourhood amenity for residents on the surrounding general residential zoned properties where a maximum height of 8m applies.	
S134.29	Oppose in part	Hastings General Residential Zone Specific standards for Comprehensive Residential Development	7.2.6E.6 Setbacks	The setback from the road boundary should be consistent with the setback required for single dwellings within the zone to ensure that the overall character and amenity of the residential zone is not compromised by multi-unit developments.	Revert to the front yard setbacks required by Rule 7.2.5F
S134.30	Oppose	Hastings General Residential Zone Specific standards for Comprehensive Residential Development	7.2.6E.7 Building Coverage	Building coverage allowed should be consistent with the building coverage allowed on sites used for single dwellings to ensure that the overall character and amenity of the general residential zone is not compromised by overly intensive multi-unit developments.	Amend to: a. The maximum building coverage must not exceed 45% of the net site area
S134.31	Oppose	Hastings General Residential Zone Specific standards for Comprehensive Residential Development	7.2.6E..8 Outdoor Living Space	A well designed multi-unit residential development would allow for reduced private outdoor living spaces in situations where these are compensated for by shared communal open spaces, protecting the quality of the living environment for residents, and assisting in the avoidance of overcrowding through overly intensive development	Amend to: a. A <u>Each</u> residential unit at ground floor must have <del>an</del> <u>private</u> outdoor living space that is at least 30m <sup>2</sup> , with a minimum 4m dimension b. A <u>Each</u> residential unit above ground floor must have <del>an</del> <u>private</u> outdoor living space of at least 8m <sup>2</sup> , with a minimum 1.8m dimension c. <u>Where any residential unit is provided with less than 50m<sup>2</sup> private outdoor living space, any shortfall must be provided for within a shared communal outdoor living space.</u>
S134.32	Support	Hastings General Residential Zone Specific standards for Comprehensive Residential Development	New standard proposed for density of development	In order to ensure that multi-unit residential development is undertaken at an appropriate (medium) density, a new standard is required.	Add new development standard: Density  The density of development must be no greater than one residential unit per 250m <sup>2</sup> net site area.

S134.33	Oppose	Havelock North General Residential Zone	Rules HNGR14 – Comprehensive Residential Developments comply with the specific performance standards and terms in 8.2.6F and HNGR25 Comprehensive Residential Developments not meeting one or more of the specific performance standards and terms in 8.2.6F	Precluding notification is not appropriate given the density and design of developments can have significant adverse effects on the occupiers of immediately surrounding residential properties. A restricted discretionary status (with the ability for notification) is more appropriate, with developments that do not meet these standards more appropriately recognised as non-complying.	Amend to Restricted Discretionary for proposals that meet the relevant standards, and non-complying for proposals that do not meet the relevant standards.
S134.35	Oppose in part	Havelock North General Residential Zone General Performance Standards	8.2.5A Density standard	The proposed density standard does not provide for the construction of a residential unit on any existing vacant site with an area of between 350m <sup>2</sup> and 700m <sup>2</sup> in the HRCRZ or between 350m <sup>2</sup> and 1000m <sup>2</sup> within the Toop Street or Breadalbane Avenue Special Character Areas.	Amend to allow the construction of a new dwelling on an existing site less than 700m <sup>2</sup> / 1000m <sup>2</sup> as appropriate for the character area as a permitted activity
S134.36	Support in part	Havelock North General Residential Zone Specific performance standards for Comprehensive Residential Development	8.2.6F.1 Site Context	The sites should be located within 400m-600m walking distance of the identified features to ensure the features are readily accessible to future residents, and to ensure consistency with the assessment criteria. Depending on road layouts, features within a 600m radius can be located at a significantly greater walking distance.	Amend to require sites to be within 400m-600m walking distance of all of the identified features.
S134.37	Oppose	Havelock North General Residential Zone	8.2.6F.2 Height	A maximum height of 11m is excessive for a residential area. The existing height limit of 8m is appropriate and sufficient to provide for a range of	Rever to the existing, and appropriate, maximum building height of 8m.

		Specific performance standards for Comprehensive Residential Development		building typologies without compromising the neighbourhood amenity for residents on the surrounding general residential zoned properties where a maximum height of 8m applies	
S134.38	Oppose in part	Havelock North General Residential Zone Specific performance standards for Comprehensive Residential Development	8.2.6F.6 Setbacks	The setback from the road boundary should be consistent with the setback required for single dwellings within this zone (i.e., 3m on local roads and 5m on arterial and collector roads) to ensure that the overall character and amenity of the general residential zone is not compromised by multi-unit developments.	Revert to the front yard setbacks required by standard 8.2.5D
S134.39	Oppose	Havelock North General Residential Zone Specific performance standards for Comprehensive Residential Development	8.2.6F.7 Building Coverage	The building coverage allowed should be consistent with the building coverage allowed on sites used for single dwellings to ensure that the overall character and amenity of the general residential zone is not compromised by overly intensive multi-unit developments.	Amend to: a. The maximum building coverage must not exceed 45% of the net site area
S134.40	Oppose	Havelock North General Residential Zone Specific performance standards for Comprehensive Residential Development	8.2.6F.8 Outdoor Living Space	A well-designed multi-unit residential development would allow for reduced private outdoor living spaces in situations where these are compensated for by shared communal open spaces, protecting the quality of the living environment for residents, and assisting in the avoidance of overcrowding through overly intensive development.	Amend to: a. A <del>an</del> <u>Each</u> residential unit at ground floor must have <del>an</del> <u>private</u> outdoor living space that is at least 30m <sup>2</sup> , with a minimum 4m dimension b. A <u>Each</u> residential unit above ground floor must have <del>an</del> <u>private</u> outdoor living space of at least 8m <sup>2</sup> , with a minimum 1.8m dimension c. <u>Where any residential unit is provided with less than 50m<sup>2</sup> private outdoor living space, any shortfall must be provided for within a shared communal outdoor living space.</u>
S134.41	Support	Havelock North General Residential Zone Specific performance	New provision for density of development	In order to ensure that multi-unit residential development is undertaken at an appropriate (medium) density, a new standard is required.	Add new development standard:  Density

		standards for Comprehensive Residential Development			The density of development must be no greater than one residential unit per 250m <sup>2</sup> net site area.
S134.42	Oppose	Flaxmere Residential Zone	Rule FR24 – Comprehensive Residential Developments complying with the specific standards and terms in 9.2.6J and FR25 Comprehensive Residential Developments not meeting one or more of the specific performance standards and terms in 9.2.6J	Precluding notification is not appropriate given the density and design of developments can have significant adverse effects on the occupiers of immediately surrounding residential properties. A restricted discretionary status (with the ability for notification) is more appropriate, with developments that do not meet these standards more appropriately recognised as non-complying.	Amend to: Restricted Discretionary for proposals that meet the relevant standards, and non-complying for proposals that do not meet the relevant standards.
S134.43	Oppose in part	Flaxmere Residential Zone General Performance standards	9.2.5A Density	The proposed density standard does not provide for the construction of a residential unit on any existing vacant site with an area of between 350m <sup>2</sup> and 500m <sup>2</sup>	Amend to allow the construction of a new dwelling on an existing site less than 500m <sup>2</sup> as a permitted activity.
S134.44	Support in part	Flaxmere Residential Zone Comprehensive Residential Development specific performance standards	9.2.6J.1 Site Context	The sites should be located within 400m-600m walking distance of the identified features to ensure the features are readily accessible to future residents, and to ensure consistency with the assessment criteria. Depending on road layouts, features within a 600m radius can be located at a significantly greater walking distance	Amend to require sites to be within 400m-600m walking distance of all of the identified features.
S134.45	Oppose	Flaxmere Residential Zone Comprehensive Residential Development specific	9.2.6J.2 Height	A maximum height of 11m is excessive for a residential area. The existing height limit of 8m is appropriate and sufficient to provide for a range of building typologies without compromising the neighbourhood	Revert to the existing, and appropriate, maximum building height of 8m.

		performance standards		amenity for residents on the surrounding general residential zoned properties where a maximum height of 8m applies.	
S134.46	Oppose	Flaxmere Residential Zone Comprehensive Residential Development specific performance standards	9.2.6J.6 Setbacks	The setback from the road boundary should be consistent with the setback required for single dwellings within this zone (i.e., 3m on local roads and 5m on arterial and collector roads to ensure that the overall character and amenity of the general residential zone is not compromised by multi-unit developments.	Revert to the front yard setbacks required by Rule 9.2.5E.
S134.47	Oppose	Flaxmere Residential Zone Comprehensive Residential Development specific performance standards	9.2.6J.7 Building Coverage	The building coverage allowed should be consistent with the building coverage allowed on sites used for single dwellings to ensure that the overall character and amenity of the general residential zone is not compromised by overly intensive multi-unit developments	Amend to: f. The maximum building coverage must not exceed 45% of the net site area
S134.48	Oppose	Flaxmere Residential Zone Comprehensive Residential Development specific performance standards	9.2.6J.8 Outdoor Living Space	A well-designed multi-unit residential development would allow for reduced private outdoor living spaces in situations where these are compensated for by shared communal open spaces, protecting the quality of the living environment for residents, and assisting in the avoidance of overcrowding through overly intensive development	Amend to: a. A <u>Each</u> residential unit at ground floor must have <del>an</del> <u>private</u> outdoor living space that is at least 30m <sup>2</sup> , with a minimum 4m dimension b. A <u>Each</u> residential unit above ground floor must have <del>an</del> <u>private</u> outdoor living space of at least 8m <sup>2</sup> , with a minimum 1.8m dimension c. <u>Where any residential unit is provided with less than 50m<sup>2</sup> private outdoor living space, any shortfall must be provided for within a shared communal outdoor living space.</u>
S134.49	Support	Flaxmere Residential Zone Comprehensive Residential Development specific	New standard Density of Development	To ensure that multi-unit residential development is undertaken at an appropriate (medium) density, a new standard is required.	Add new development standard:  Density The density of development must be no greater than one residential unit per 250m <sup>2</sup> net site area.

		performance standards			
S134.50	Support in part	Section 30.1 Subdivision and Development Rules	Rule SLD15 and minimum site size table 30.1.6A	This rule provides for subdivision within the City Living Zone (to be renamed to the Medium Density Residential Zone) as Restricted Discretionary activity. Table 30.1.6A however proposes to remove the minimum lot size for this zone	Amend Rule SLD15 to refer to the Medium Density Residential Zone and retain the specified density within Table 30.1.6A (250m <sup>2</sup> average with a maximum site size of 350m <sup>2</sup> ) to encourage infill developments consistent with the expected density of development for this zone.
S134.51	Not stated	Section 30.1 Subdivision and Land Development Standards	Standard 30.1.7E Property Access	The vehicle access standards are only relevant on residential sites where on-site parking is being provided. This standard should be amended to reflect this, to avoid absurd situations where vehicle access is required to be provided to sites on which no parking is proposed	Amend to: <u>Where on-site parking is proposed to be provided on a site</u> , activities shall comply with the rules and standards for access outlined in Section 26.1 Transport and Parking of the District Plan.

S135 **McIntosh, Jillian**  
1220 Louie Street, Parkvale, Hastings 4122  
[ptosh@xtra.co.nz](mailto:ptosh@xtra.co.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S135.1	Oppose	Height of Buildings		3 storey housing should not be permitted except for apartments in the central city area, or on large pieces of land where recreational areas can be created around the building. 3 and 2 storey creates shading and wind tunnels. 3 storey dwellings are not efficient family homes as stairwells cut down living space.	Greater density but only 1 storey
S136.2	Oppose	Car parking provisions		Parking not required by central government but should be insisted on as it provides safer streets.	Wants parking to be required



S136.3	Oppose	Medium Density Zone		Does not agree with medium density around Windsor and Cornwall parks. Parks should not be overshadowed by 3 storey dwellings.	No medium density housing around parks.
S136.4	Support in part	Relocated dwellings			No infill housing using old, transported houses
S136.5	Oppose	Hastings Character Residential Zone		Should be a character zoning around Windsor Ave (Ada St to Karamu High) as they are an example of great construction for their particular era.	A character zone for the area of Windsor Avenue listed.

S136 **Moffat, Margaret**  
179/1228 Ada Street, Parkvale, Hastings 4122  
[margaretmoffat17@gmail.com](mailto:margaretmoffat17@gmail.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S136.1	Oppose	Plan Change in Entirety	All	Opposes living near medium density community housing	Reject plan change

S137 **Naylor, Kevin Melvin**  
719 Charles Street, Raureka, Hastings  
[kevinmnaylor@yahoo.co.nz](mailto:kevinmnaylor@yahoo.co.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S137.1	Support in part	Bulk and Location, Design Framework		Opposes more than 3 townhouses, apartments and terraced housing joined together	No more than 3 houses joined together

S137.2	Support in part	Density (number of houses on site)		Minimum house site should be 300m <sup>2</sup> or larger to support outdoor space and off street carparking.	Ensure maximum of 3 houses per 1000m <sup>2</sup> site. Minimum site size larger than 300m <sup>2</sup> .
S137.3	Oppose	Affected parties' consent		Opposes the removal of the need for affected persons consent or neighbours approval, as rate payers should be able to have a say in proposed developments.	Ensure affected persons have say in proposed medium density developments
S137.4	Oppose	Medium Density Framework		Oppose the Medium Density Framework as a key assessment tool as this would just give developers more uncontrolled scope	Remove medium density framework as a key assessment tool.

S138 **Rawle, Pamela**  
705 Charles Street, Raureka, Hastings 4120  
[j.mcnair@xtra.co.nz](mailto:j.mcnair@xtra.co.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S138.1	Not stated	Definitions/ Density		Requests clarification as to what is a 'site'. As per existing Southland Rd example all site sizes are below the current minimum of 350m <sup>2</sup> . What is the size, or range of sizes of a 'site' as it will apply in the CRD or a medium density residential zone.	Define what range of site sizes constitute a 'site' as part of the plan change.
S138.2	Support with amendment	Definitions/ Medium density standards and terms		In defining a 'commercial area' for Medium Density Residential Zone what uses have been considered? Does a dairy/food centre sufficiently support the needs of MDR development as a 'commercial area'?	Consider 'commercial area' uses as to whether they can support medium density.
S138.3	Oppose	Bulk and Location, Design Framework		Opposes terraced housing being built in Hastings	Remove ability to build terraced housing

S138.4	Oppose	Height of Buildings		Opposes 3 story housing in Hastings. Only tier 2 authority so do not need to bring tier 1 provisions in.	Retain height limits at current levels.
S138.5	Support in part	Density (number of houses on site)		Maximum of 3 houses should be allowed on 1000m <sup>2</sup> section.	Density no more than 3 dwellings on 1000m <sup>2</sup> section
S138.6	Oppose	Affected Parties' Consent		Opposes the removal for affected parties' consent or neighbours approval. Ratepayers and residents should not have to resort to legal action to learn about medium density developments and be considered	Retain the need for 3 <sup>rd</sup> party rights and affected parties' consent.
S138.7	Oppose	Medium Density Framework		Oppose the medium density design framework as a key assessment tool. The barriers are there to protect the fabric of the established community for a reason. Minimising these barriers benefits the developers at the expense of the general ratepayers.	Remove medium density framework as a key assessment tool.
S138.8	Oppose	Character buildings		Council has allowed the destruction of many historic character homes. We need to protect the remaining notable examples in city	Protect historic character buildings from being removed for future development.
S138.9	Oppose	CRD in General Residential Zone		CRD in General Residential Zone should be deferred until the effects of intensification can be assessed. This may prevent negative consequences from scattergun approach to intensification.	Remove CRD development from the general residential zone as part of PC5 until we can better assess the issue.
S138.10	Oppose	600m radius from commercial areas		Concern the 400 – 600m radius would open most of Hastings up to medium density residential zoning. Given the scale, far more rigorous consultation should have been undertaken.	Remove the ability to do medium density within 600m of commercial zone, park and bus stop.

S139 **Sankey, Daniel**  
1210 Kaiapo Road, Hastings 4120  
[djs@greenleafnursery.co.nz](mailto:djs@greenleafnursery.co.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S139.1	Oppose	Activity status, affected parties' consent		Applications are precluded from being publicly or limited notified. This is a breach of human rights as residents have no say in housing construction in their area.	PC5 should be redrafted with consent from Hastings' citizens following consultation
S139.2	Oppose	Height of Buildings		Building height could detract from character and shade neighbouring properties	PC5 should be redrafted with consent from Hastings' citizens following consultation
S139.3	Oppose	Medium Density Zone		Medium density should be built in designated areas suited to them and not integrated throughout the city. This will have adverse effects on housing standards, causing an exodus of business, increased unemployment and crime.	PC5 should be redrafted with consent from Hastings' citizens following consultation.

S140 **Save our Fertile Soils, Richard Gaddum**  
[harryapple53@gmail.com](mailto:harryapple53@gmail.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S140.1	Not Stated	NPS-HPL	Not Stated	NPS-HPL doesn't go far enough to protect Highly Productive Land.	Moving forward, the Council needs to focus on new residential and industrial communities within existing town and city boundaries and on unproductive land.

S141 **Senior, Karla**  
1019 Caroline Road, Mayfair, Hastings 4122  
[karla@theseniors.co.nz](mailto:karla@theseniors.co.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S141.1	Oppose	Height - 3 Storey Housing	Not Stated	Opposes allowing 3 storey housing in Hastings residential areas. Concerned it would destroy neighbourhood character and amenity. Suggests reclaiming commercial land for 3 storey housing instead.	Not stated.

S142 **Senior, Kevin**  
208 Ikanui Road, Hastings  
[kevin@theseniors.co.nz](mailto:kevin@theseniors.co.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S142.1	Oppose	All PC5	N/A	PC 5 will very detrimentally affect the city that many of us have called home for a number of decades. I am a former 21yr resident of Flaxmere and seen the 'perpetual downward spiral' of Flaxmere and do not want Hastings to follow that path.	I request that the changes proposed in Plan Change 5 of the District Plan are withdrawn.
S142.2	Oppose	Affected party consent	Not stated	PC5 is not what Hastings needs and removing neighbours approval is opposed.	Devote efforts to protecting ratepayer rights instead of pushing for changes set on by people that do not live in our area.

S143 **Smith, Andrew; Smith, Grant; & Taylor, Simon**  
C/o PO Box 352, Mayfair, Hastings 4156  
[ajs@snz.net.nz](mailto:ajs@snz.net.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S143.1	Oppose	General Approach to PC5	Hastings and Havelock North's General Residential Zones	Opposes provisions allowing Comprehensive Residential Development in Hastings and Havelock North's General Residential Zones without public notification, concern for a negative impact on aesthetics, design and safety due to potentially poorly maintained low-cost housing.  Allowing CRD in most zones is opposed. The proposed approach to provide for CRD in PC5 will not result in careful consideration of locations and opens up CRD to most zones.	Seeks a greater degree of District Plan control of the locations for CRD housing in Hastings and Havelock North so it is provided in suitable locations only.
S143.2	Oppose	General Approach to PC5	Hastings and Havelock North's General Residential Zones	Oppose provisions which are enabling of Comprehensive Residential Development (CRD) in the General Residential Zones of Hastings and Havelock North <u>without</u> public or limited notification and no consideration of the potential adverse effects on neighbouring landowners.	Seeks that affected parties be notified of CRD resource consent applications.
S143.3	Oppose	Chapter 7.2 Hastings Residential Env	Policy GRP3	Policy GRP3 will not give effect to Objective GRO2 – which is to provide suitable intensification in appropriate locations. Amend policy.	Amend Policy GRP3 as follows:  POLICY GRP3 - Provide for comprehensive residential development on sites that are located within walking distance (400m- <del>600m</del> ) of public parks and commercial centres and are located on public transport routes. Explanation ( <i>Abridged</i> ) Comprehensive residential development is an appropriate way to

					provide new housing in <b>suitable locations</b> in Hastings... can also be appropriate in the General Residential Zone...
S143.2	Oppose	Chapter 7.2 Hastings Residential Env	Rule GR18	Seek activity status be more rigorous (Discretionary) and allow for consideration of affected persons consent.	Amend Rule GR18 as follows:  Replace Restricted Discretionary Non-Notified with <b>Discretionary</b>
S143.4	Oppose	Chapter 7.2 Hastings Residential Env	Rule GR24	Opposed to providing CRD not meeting performance standards as Restricted Discretionary activity and seek it to be non-complying activity. Add new rule.	Add new Rule GR24 as follows:  <b><u>Rule GRXX</u></b> <b><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></b>  <b><u>Activity Status: Non-Complying</u></b>  <u>Or</u> if the above new rule is not accepted it is requested that the activity status of Rule GR18 be amended to Discretionary; and or Rule GR24 be amended to non-complying.
S143.4	Oppose	Chapter 7.2 Hastings Residential Env	Specific Performance standard 7.2.6E	Seeks that this standard be amended because it is not measurable and specific.	Amend 7.2.6E as follows:  7.2.6E COMPREHENSIVE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  1. SITE CONTEXT Comprehensive Residential Developments that propose a density of development greater than 1 residential unit per 350m <sup>2</sup> net site area shall be located on sites in the General Residential Zone that are within or partially within a <del>400-600m</del> <b>400m</b> radius of: a. A <b>An existing or proposed</b> public transport bus-stop; and b. An existing public park <b>that is zoned Open Space and listed in Appendix 63 as a Sport &amp; Recreation.</b>

					<p><b><u>Community, or Public Gardens Reserve or proposed open-space reserve, or a proposed onsite communal playground or open space area;</u></b> and</p> <p>c. A commercial zone <b><u>that comprises of three or more different retail or service shops...</u></b></p>
S143.5	Oppose	Chapter 8.2 Hav Nth Res Env	Policy HNRP10	<p>Policy HNRP10 will not give effect to objective HNRO6 which is it ensure that intensification in Havelock North is designed to create high quality living environment for residents and neighbours.</p> <p>Amend Policy.</p>	<p>Amend policy HNRP10 as follows:</p> <p>POLICY HNRP10 Provide for comprehensive <b><u>residential</u></b> development on sites that are located within walking distance (400m-600m) of public parks <del>or</del> <b>and</b> commercial centres and are located on public transport routes.</p> <p>Explanation Comprehensive residential development (medium density housing) has been identified as an appropriate way of providing for new housing development in existing urban areas <b><u>in suitable locations... (Abridged)</u></b></p> <p>While comprehensive residential development is envisaged in <b><u>appropriate locations</u></b> in the General Residential Zone, it would not be encouraged in the Character Residential Zone... <i>Abridged</i></p>
S143.6	Oppose	Chapter 8.2 Hav Nth Res Env	Rule HNGR14	<p>Seek activity status be more rigorous (Discretionary) and allow for consideration of affected persons consent.</p>	<p>Amend Rule HNGR14: Replace Restricted Discretionary with <b><u>Discretionary</u></b></p>
S143.7	Oppose	Chapter 8.2 Hav Nth Res Env	Rule HNGR26	<p>Opposed to providing for CRD not meeting one or more standards as restricted discretionary activity.</p>	<p>Amend Rule HNGR26: Comprehensive residential Development not meeting one or more of the specific performance standards and terms in 8.2.6F<b>(2)-(15)</b>. And</p>



					Replace Restricted Discretionary with <b><u>Discretionary</u></b>
S143.8	Oppose	Chapter 8.2 Hav Nth Res Env	Rules	Wants a new Rule added for CRD that don't meet one or more of the specific performance standards and terms in 8.26F(1) (Site Context) as a Non Complying activity	Add new Rule HNGRxx: <b>Comprehensive Residential Developments that do not meet one or more of the specific performance standards and terms in 8.26F(1) (Site Context) - Non Complying</b>
S143.9	Oppose	Chapter 8.2 Hav Nth Res Env	Specific Performance Standard 8.2.6F CRD	Seeks that this standard be amended because it is not measurable and specific.	Amend 8.2.6F as follows:  8.2.6F COMPREHENSIVE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  1. SITE CONTEXT Comprehensive Residential Developments that propose a density of development greater than 1 : 350m <sup>2</sup> net site area shall be located on sites in the General Residential Zone that are within or partially within a <del>400-600m</del> <b>400m</b> radius of: a. <del>A An existing or proposed</del> public transport bus-stop; and b. An existing public park <b>that is zoned <u>Open Space and listed in Appendix 63 as a Sport &amp; Recreation, Community, or Public Gardens Reserve or proposed open space reserve, or a proposed onsite communal playground or open space area;</u></b> and c. A commercial zone <b>that comprises <u>of three or more different retail or service shops...</u></b>
S143.10		General	General	Seeks that in addition to any other amendments sought by this submission, any other amendments to the District Plan are requested to address concerns raised.	Seeks that in addition to any other amendments sought by this submission, any other amendments to the District Plan are requested to address concerns raised.

S144 **Taylor, Brendon**  
556 Ikanui Road, Frimley, Hastings 4120  
[brendonjtaylor@outlook.com](mailto:brendonjtaylor@outlook.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S144.1	Oppose	Wording including specific reference to Maori	Urban Strategy Intro 2.4.1	Offence taken to statement contained in the introduction: “an increase in the number of young Maori as a percentage of the population”. PC5 relates to a housing need which has nothing to do with ethnicity.	Delete statement from Plan Change 5.
S144.2	Oppose	Proposed 3 storey height limit	Height controls	Opposes 3 storey buildings – raises issues of privacy, earthquake risk, leaky homes	Not stated
S144.3	Oppose	Non residential use of limited residential land	MRZ and GRZ – Rules / Activity Table	Allowing non residential uses (Police Remand Facility at 811 Omahu Road) in residentially zoned areas is not an efficient use of residential zone, especially when Council is encouraging intensification.	HDC should refuse any submission to rezone land from general residential to this non residential activity.
S144.4	Oppose	Rule MRZ-R20 Places of Assembly	Minimum Setback Distance	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.	Not stated
S144.5	Oppose	Removal of affected party consent	N/A	Concerned that PC5 will allow developments without affected party consent when neighbours may be adversely affected by a development. An attack on democracy.	Retain need for affected party approval.

S145 **Tucker, Peter**  
4/1228 Ada Street, Parkvale, Hastings 4122  
[peter.r.tucker@gmail.com](mailto:peter.r.tucker@gmail.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S145.1	Oppose	Three storey dwellings	MRZ-R16	Three storey dwellings are incompatible with the surrounding development and do not conform with the original intent of Council rules.	Not stated
S145.2	Oppose	On site carparking		Insufficient on site carparking will lead to an increased shortage of kerbside parking and safety issues with Ada St designated as a critical access route to Havelock North	Not stated
S145.3	Oppose	Effects on infrastructure		Number of dwellings will impact on existing sewage overload and the site will be unable to absorb additional stormwater loading resulting in further stormwater onto the street	Not stated
S145.4	Oppose	Effect on residential character		The proposed development in Ada St will be completely out of character (type/style) with the existing properties.	Not stated

S146 **TW Property** (Catherine Raeburn)  
C/o Stradegy, PO Box 239, Napier 4140  
[Catherine@stradegy.co.nz](mailto:Catherine@stradegy.co.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S146.1	Support with Amendment	Increase opportunities for		There is limited development opportunity in the identified Medium	Publish publicly accessible maps to provide transparency as to where the

		medium density housing		<p>Density Zones (former City Living Zones). Providing greater zoned opportunities for medium density housing will allow the market to respond to the demand sectors and ensure that the development economics can stack up.</p> <p>Inadequate supply will increase acquisition costs and could lead to developers avoiding the higher cost land in the Medium Density Residential zone.</p> <p>It is unclear if the extent of the general residential zones that would meet all three locational criteria to enable a non-notified application. 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.</p>	<p>opportunities for non-notified medium density development are provided for.</p> <p>The medium density residential zone should be extended having regard to accessibility to a greater range of amenities including schools.</p>
S146.2	Support with amendment	Reduce uncertainty in the resource consent process	<p>Standards 7.2.6E(1) 8.2.6F(1) and 9.2.6J(1)</p> <p>MRZ-S14 7.2.6E(15) 8.2.6F(15) and 9.2.6J(15)</p>	<p>Sufficient certainty is required at the early stage to reduce risk around their investment decisions. The current discretionary status for comprehensive residential development in the general residential zone further adds to this uncertainty with assessment against a number of potentially subjective criteria. Reducing uncertainty and improving the process for comprehensive residential development will ensure developers don't opt for the easier infill/vacant lot subdivision.</p> <p>In principle support is given to the following aspect of PC5;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The move towards restricted discretionary status in the general residential zone.</li> <li>Default non-notification for CRDS in certain circumstances</li> </ul>	<p>Delete 400-600m locational standard and rely on 600m only. Supply a non-statutory map showing the areas that meet the 600m criteria.</p> <p>Delete the infrastructure certification standards MRZ-S14 7.2.6E(15) 8.2.6F(15) and 9.2.6J(15) and publish non-statutory maps indicating areas of significant infrastructure capacity constraint.</p> <p>Provide opportunities for pre-application meetings to understand/resolve infrastructure issues Should the certification be retained, introduce a clear process and timeframes and ensure the team is</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The introduction of concise material development standards</li> </ul> <p>The infrastructure certification standard introduces an additional level of uncertainty and relies on a resourced asset management team to provide timely responses.</p> <p>There is current variability in resource consent conditions for comprehensive residential developments.</p>	<p>resourced. Provide discounts if agreed timeframes are not met.</p> <p>Design assessment criteria from the Medium Density Design Framework should be retained as non-statutory guidance only, to avoid subjectivity and uncertainty.</p> <p>Tensions between urban design drivers and engineering requirements such as the width of jointly owned access lots should be resolved and clearly set out in the criteria.</p> <p>Make common resource consent conditions for comprehensive residential development, permitted standards, and/or through other methods.</p>
S146.3	Oppose	Fence Heights	7.2.5L	Lower fence heights proposed by PC5 may be desirable from a safety and security perspective, but higher fences may be appropriate to provide privacy, screening and for acoustic control to provide greater levels of amenity.	Allow up to 1.8m solid fences on collector or arterial roads.
S146.4	Support with amendment	Minimum Lots sizes	SLD7A and 30.1.6A	Supports the removal of minimum lot sizes for subdivision of an approved (or concurrent) comprehensive residential development. Minimum lots sizes should apply to vacant lot subdivision only. Subdivision of approved or concurrent CRD should not require revisiting internal non-compliances with development standards, provided that subdivision boundaries are consistent with nominal boundaries.	Wording of SLD7A should include; <i>There is no requirement to revisit internal non-compliances with development standards, for the subdivision of approved or concurrent CRD provided that subdivision boundaries are consistent with nominal boundaries.</i>
S146.5	Support	Maximum height	MRZ-S1, 7.2.6E(2), 8.2.6F(2) and 9.2.6J(2)	Supports the maximum height of 11m+1m for pitched roof forms as this will facilitate medium density development.	Retain

S146.6	Supports with amendment	Height to boundary standard	MRZ-S3, 7.2.6E(4), 8.2.6F(4) and 9.2.6J(5)	Generally, supports retaining the height in relation to boundary standards, but consider a more lenient standard for the front of sites to encourage two storey development to face the street.	Provide a more lenient height to boundary standard for the street frontage.
S146.7	Opposed	Garage and Accessory Buildings standard	MRS-S4(b), 7.2.6E(5), 8.2.6F(5) and 9.2.6J(5)	The garage and accessory building standards are opposed as it will significantly restrict the ability to provide two level terraced houses facing the street. Design assessment criteria can address the relationship of dwellings to the street.	Delete standards relating to garage and accessory buildings.
S146.8	Oppose	Front yard setback	MRZ-S5, 7.2.2E(6), 8.2.6F(6), and 9.2.6J(6)	A 3 metre front yard setback may be overly onerous and remove flexibility for optimal site layouts.	Reduce front yard setback to 2 m, alternatively, retain 3m but allow up to 30% of the road frontage to infringe this to a maximum of 1m.
S146.9	Support with amendment	Building Coverage standard	MRZ-S6, 7.2.6E(7), 8.2.6F(7) and 9.2.6J(7)	Supports building coverage of 50% of net site area with amended wording.	Ensure wording of the standard applies to net site area of nominal boundaries at the CRD land use consent stage.
S146.10	Oppose	Outdoor Living standards	MRZ-S7, 7.2.6E(8), 8.2.6F(8) and 9.2.6J(8)	Requiring 30m <sup>2</sup> of outdoor living space with a minimum 4m dimension may significantly affect flexibility of site layout to optimise onsite amenity and allocate space to other functional areas.	Amend the standard to make it consistent with the Medium Density Residential Standards i.e., 20m <sup>2</sup> with a 3m minimum dimension for ground floor and 8m <sup>2</sup> , and 1.8m dimension for above ground floor units. Alternatively, if 30m <sup>2</sup> is to be retained then the minimum dimension should be reduced to 2m while retaining requirement for a 4m diameter circle.
S146.11	Support with amendment	Landscaping standards	MRZ-S8, 7.2.6E(9), 8.2.6F(9), and 9.2.6J(9)	Supports the minimum 20% landscaped area requirement with amended wording.	Wording of the standard should ensure 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 consent.
S146.12	Support with amendment	Windows and Connections to Street	MRZ-S9, 7.2.6E(10), 8.2.6F(10), and 9.2.6J(10)	Supports the standard for windows and connections to the street, as it relates to front boundaries, however it also applies to internal accessways which creates additional and unnecessary complexity for internal building	Delete that part of the standard that applies to internal accessways.

				configuration particularly for affordable options.	
S146.13	Support	Outlook space standards	MRZ-S10, 7.2.6E(11), 8.2.6F(11), and 9.2.6J(11)	Supports the proposed outlook space requirements as they provide clarity on the expectations for privacy and amenity between units.	Retain
S146.14	Oppose	Variety in building Design	MRZ-S11, 7.2.6E(12), 8.2.6F(12), and 9.2.6J(12)	The standard for variety in building design and visual appearance is not supported as the wording is open to interpretation and is not appropriate as a standard. Standard typologies are likely to be used to deliver affordable medium density development and these can be visually absorbed into the development site and not impact on streetscape.	Delete the standards relating to variety in building design and visual appearance.

S147 **van Kampen, Vanessa**  
611 Windsor Avenue, Parkvale, Hastings 4122  
[vanessavankampen@gmail.com](mailto:vanessavankampen@gmail.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S147.1	Oppose	Medium density housing around Windsor Park		Medium density housing around Windsor Park will bring a decline to this city asset. It needs to be protected and kept as a high-quality facility for tourism and the community.	Retain general resident zoning around Windsor Park.  Consider making 611 Windsor Ave and the adjoining property character residential.
S147.2	Oppose	Notification of applications		3 storey developments should be notified applications to protect existing property owners in established areas. New areas should	Require notification of 3 storey development
S147.3	Oppose	Maximum Height Controls		3 storey development around the park will destroy the amenity for the community.	Remove 3 storey maximum height around the park.

S148 **Watson, Linda**  
1103A Haig Street, Parkvale, Hastings 4122  
[lindawatson79@gmail.com](mailto:lindawatson79@gmail.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S148.1	Oppose	Purpose of the Medium Density Zone	MRZ-O1	The purpose of the zone does not take into account the wellbeing of existing residents. It degrades the health and safety and economic wellbeing of existing residents	Not stated
S148.2	Oppose	Density of development	MRZ-R16 Matters of Control	The greater the density the greater the impact on wellbeing for all. It would be best redirect medium density to large scale open land areas to create suburbs suited to high density need.	Maximum density of 4 houses per site
S148.3	Oppose	Individuality of design	b.2.2	'Individuality' is confusing and is not aesthetically calming.	Single colour housing to blend into the environment.
S148.4	Oppose	Building height	c.2.3	The maximum height proposed removes privacy and removes sunlight which affects wellbeing.	Allow only single storey dwellings
S148.5	Oppose	Privacy	f.2.6	Orientation of windows to backyards will set up conflict	
S148.6	Oppose	Stormwater runoff	J.2.10	Increases the flood risk to my property with potential for insurance difficulties.	
S148.7	Oppose	Building materials	k.2.11	Intensification will increase the trapping of heat and lead to the need to increase cooling leading to increased costs and adding to global warming	
S148.8	Oppose	Building form	MRZ-R10 (3)	You are lowering the standard of building in the area, thus devaluing my property.	
S148.10	Oppose	Infrastructure Servicing	MRZ-R10(4)	Sewage problems are a problem in the area.	
S148.11	Oppose	Notification		There should be an appeal structure to hold the landowner to account.	Medium density development should be notified.



S149 **Whananaki Trust**, David Bloxham  
809B Pepper Street, Raureka, Hastings 4120  
[dandvbloxham@gmail.com](mailto:dandvbloxham@gmail.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S149.1	Oppose	Notification		Neighbours of a medium density development will have no right to challenge the location, design or density of a development that would have adverse effects on their properties.	Keep the proposed high density housing developments in the areas of Hastings that are of the same type currently.

S150 **Wilkinson**, Brian  
711 Rainbow Avenue, Parkvale, Hastings 4122  
[b.wilkinson@xtra.co.nz](mailto:b.wilkinson@xtra.co.nz)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S150.1	Oppose	Plan Change in its entirety	All	While understanding the need for more residential dwellings, the current form will make Hastings an undesirable place to live.	That the proposed plan change is rejected in its current form, with a new proposal drafted with MRZ closer to the city centre so is walking distance from public amenities.
S150.2	Oppose	Objectives	MRZ-O1	Proposed zones are fragmented and inconsistent with the desired outcomes of a MRZ zone, with many areas seeming to be considered only because they are close to public parks. Some areas are a considerable distance from public amenities – any MRZ should be within a walkable distance from centre of town (less than 750m). A single area would provide clear direction for	The plan change be amended so the MRZ is an area no more than 750m from the city centre.

				infrastructure development, providing certainty for developers to know what they can build in the area.	
S150.3	Oppose	Affected Persons Consent		Oppose non-notification of developments to neighbouring properties as owners have a right to know what is going to be built beside them. There should be the option to object if there are likely to be detrimental effects on one's property.	Plan Change 5 be amended so that neighbours are notified of any developments that will be more than one storey.
S150.4	Oppose	Building Height		Oppose maximum building height of 12m. Buildings should be no more than two stories. If a developer wishes to build an apartment complex, they should be built closer to the CBD and a minimum of 200m from any General Residential zone property.	Plan change be amended so that any building more than 2 stories cannot be built within 200m of a property in the General Residential Zone.

S151 **Wilson, Shirley Elizabeth**  
1254B Louie Street, Parkvale, Hastings 4122

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S151.1	Support in part	Density		Supports the plan change but doesn't want areas to be too dense with people / housing. The number of sections / houses proposed for the Ada Street development was too many. There would be no room on the sections for parking cars or for rubbish bins and it is a busy traffic area already with the school close by. There are other more suitable locations for housing within the Hastings suburbs.	Smaller sections are ok as long as they are managed well to maintain a tidy appearance - enough room for car parking and rubbish bin storage.

S152 **Wright, Graeme**  
909 Harding Road, Hastings 4120  
[graeme.n.wright@gmail.com](mailto:graeme.n.wright@gmail.com)

Submission Point	Support / Oppose / Support in Part / Support with Amendment	Topic	Plan Change Ref/District Plan Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested
S152.1	Oppose	Plan Change in its Entirety	All	Oppose Plan Change 5 in entirety until honest and open discussions and robust consultation has been had with community, including proper planning for infrastructure.	Seek the Plan Change 5 is not accepted and status quo retained until proper planning and consultation has taken place.