

HUTT CITY COUNCILKOMITI AROTAKE MAHERE Ā-ROHE | DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held in the Council Chambers, 2nd Floor, 30 Laings Road

Lower Hutt on

Thursday 4 July 2024 commencing at 2:00 pmPRESENT:

Cr B Dyer (Chair)	Mayor C Barry
Cr J Briggs	Cr S Edwards (Deputy Chair)
Deputy Mayor T Lewis	Cr A Mitchell
Cr K Morgan	Cr N Shaw
R Te One	

APOLOGIES:

There were no apologies.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Cr C Parkin
 A Geddes, Director Environment and Sustainability
 J Kingsbury, Director Economy and Development
 L Desrosiers, Head of Urban Development
 T Johnston, Head of Planning
 N Geard, Policy Planning Manager
 S Davis, Senior Policy Planner
 J Randall, Democracy Advisor
 H Clegg, Minute Taker

PUBLIC BUSINESS1. OPENING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA TŪTURU: TĒNEI AU

Tēnei au	This
Tēnei au te hōkai nei o taku tapuwae Ko	This is the journey of sacred footsteps
te hōkai nuku ko te hōkai rangi Ko te	Journeyed about the earth journeyed about the
hōkai a tō tupuna a Tāne-nui-a- rangi	heavens
Ka pikitia ai ki ngā rangi tūhāhā ki te	The journey of the ancestral god Tānenuiarangi
Tihi-o-Manono	Who ascended into the heavens to Te Tihi-o-
Ka rokohina atu rā ko Io-Matua-Kore anake	Manono
Ka tīkina mai ngā kete o te wānanga Ko	Where he found Io, the parentless source
te kete-tuauri	From there he retrieved the baskets of knowledge
Ko te kete-tuatea Ko te	Te kete-tuauri
kete-aronui	Te kete-tuatea
Ka tiritiria ka poupoua	Te kete-aronui
Ka puta mai iho ko te ira tāngata Ki te	These were distributed and implanted about the
wheiao ki te ao mārama	earth
Tihei-mauri ora!	From which came human life
	Growing from dim light to full light
	There was life.

2. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Comments are recorded under the item to which they relate.

4. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS

Richard Te One declared a conflict of interest in Item 5: District Plan Zoning – 30 Benmore Crescent, Manor Park, and took no part in discussion or voting on the matter.

5. DISTRICT PLAN ZONING - 30 BENMORE CRESCENT, MANOR PARK

Report No. DPRC2024/3/165 by the Senior Policy Planner

Speaking under public comment, **Shellene Eksteen, a member of the Manor Park Community Association**, expressed concern about recent earthworks on the 30 Benmore Crescent site, stating that they had been approved without public input. She was worried about the potential impact of a proposed recycling station on the site and emphasised the importance of consulting with Manor Park residents.

Speaking under public comment, **Vee Sivorarath, a member of the Manor Park Community Association**, mentioned that Benmore Crescent used to have a variety of plants, trees, native birds, and lizards before the earthworks took place. He pointed out that the stream in the area was a listed 'Water Body of Regional Significance' under the Regional Plan. He expressed disappointment that the area was now a bare wasteland and was concerned that industrial zoning would allow activities producing offensive noise, dust, and odour.

In response to questions from members, Vee Sivorarath explained that previous land uses had not significantly affected the natural environment. He also mentioned that the Benmore stream currently had very little wildlife and occasionally runs dry, confirming that these changes occurred in the last 18 months due to earthworks.

Speaking under public comment, **Shayne Hawtin, a member of the Manor Park Community Association**, expressed concerns expressed concerns about a proposed waste transfer station, stating that it would be unsuitable for the area. He suggested that there were better locations further away from residential areas and with easier access to a state highway. He also mentioned that the community prefers a Mixed Use zone and urged Council to consider all options before deciding on the zoning.

In response to questions from members, Shayne Hawtin stated that having intrusive industrial activities near residential areas with a significant increase in traffic was offensive. He was concerned that the industrial zoning would pave the way for a waste transfer station. He pointed out that this zoning could lead to over 500 trucks entering Manor Park. He suggested the site would be better utilised for small businesses, green spaces, and residential areas.

Speaking under public comment, **John Harrison, a member of the Manor Park Community Association**, expressed his opposition to the proposed site rezoning. He said that the application and Council officers had made incorrect traffic assumptions. He

pointed out that the NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi had projected an additional 2,500 vehicle movements per day in Benmore Crescent, which he believed would lead to traffic queues blocking the roundabout. He requested that Council thoroughly analyse all data and consider the community's perspective.

In response to questions from members, John Harrison recommended that the site be used for light commercial purposes, market gardens, mixed-use development, or storage facilities. He noted that trucks making a left turn from Benmore Crescent onto the state highway on-ramp to head south would have to cross the centre line, posing a risk to other road users.

Speaking under public comment, **Dr Anne Alkema, representing Manor Park Golf Club**, asked that the proposed rezoning be delayed until Council had finished its current work on a Spatial Plan and Development Strategy. She expressed concerns about the lack of community consultation regarding the approved earthworks and the application for a transfer station. Dr Alkema believed that the industrial zoning would undermine the environmental efforts of the golf club.

Speaking under public comment via audio-visual link, **Ben Farrell, an Environmental Planner representing the Manor Park Community Association**, expressed concern that the application to change access points and road designations did not allow public engagement. He pointed out that Plan Change 1 to the Regional Plan excluded the site from the planned urban land category. He raised concerns about the apparent pre-determined position by Council. He stressed the importance of including proposed District Plans in assessing any resource consent application under section 104 of the Resource Management Act (RMA). He highlighted the significance of giving weight to a District Plan once advertised. He asked for a pause in the proposed rezoning for further investigation, research, and a thorough public engagement process.

In response to members' questions, Ben Farrell emphasised the site's ideal location close to transport networks for a Mixed-Use zone. He suggested further investigation and non-statutory engagement with objectors. He asked for the Spatial Plan and Future Development Strategy to be completed before deciding on land uses for the city.

Speaking under public comment, **Tony Werry** expressed concern regarding the potential for increased traffic and large truck volumes on Benmore Crescent and the Haywards Interchange roundabout. He mentioned that the traffic associated with industrial zoning was not anticipated when the Haywards roundabout was designed. He suggested that a storage facility would be a more appropriate land use because it would not generate such high traffic volumes.

Richard Te One declared a conflict of interest and took no part in the discussion or voting on the matter.

The Senior Policy Planner elaborated on the report. He explained that the Industrial Land Study was ongoing, and the Proposed District Plan would be open for public review in early 2025. He also mentioned that decisions on matters like Benmore Crescent would be regularly presented to the Committee leading up to December 2024. He discussed the importance of considering proposed District Plans when evaluating resource consent applications under section 104 of the RMA.

In response to questions from members, the Head of Planning provided the following advice:

- two resource consent applications for the site, both of which were put on hold at the applicants' request due to uncertainties about access.
- if the assessment of the current applications resumed, a decision on the notification level would be made.
- any delay in deciding on the site could potentially set back the proposed District Plan timeline.
- officers would seek legal advice on the impact of removing the site from the Proposed District Plan process while resource consent processes were ongoing.
- it was not considered good practice to postpone a District Plan Change while waiting for the outcome of a resource consent process.

In response to questions from members, the Senior Policy Planner provided the following advice:

- the decision on the site zoning could be delayed until later in 2024.
- the site was separated from the residential area by a double railway track and an access road. traffic impacts would be assessed under the resource consent application, and high trip-generating activities would trigger a traffic management assessment.
- if the site's status quo was retained, the general zone rules should be sufficient for evaluations.
- stormwater management requirements had arisen due to the unique location of the stream on the site.
- all options proposed in the report risked being appealed and overturned.

The Policy Planning Manager confirmed a green waste operation would be a non-complying activity under the Operative District Plan.

The meeting adjourned at 3.48pm and resumed at 3.57pm.

The members discussed that no decisions have been made regarding the site. They would assess the evidence and consider the community's views to determine what would be best for the city. They noted that the landowners would also submit their evidence and views. They also noted that the Committee's decision would not impact the Waste Management Limited resource application. They emphasised that there would be additional opportunities for people to submit their views through the District Plan.

MOTION: (Cr Edwards/Cr Dyer)

“Recommends option 4 General Rural or Rural Lifestyle zones.”

Members expressed support for the motion.

In response to a question from a member, the Head of Planning stated that officers needed guidance on whether the Committee was recommending General Rural or Rural Lifestyle zones.

The meeting, by agreement of the majority of members present, amended the motion with the agreement of the mover and seconder.

RESOLVED: (Cr Edwards/Cr Dyer)

Minute No. DPRC 24301

“That the Committee:

- (1) *notes the content of this report; and*
- (2) *directs officers to prepare a General Rural Zone chapter for the proposed District Plan as it relates to 30 Benmore Crescent, Manor Park, in accordance with recommended option 4 contained in the report, by:*
 - (a) *applying the General Rural Zone to 30 Benmore Crescent, Manor Park;*
 - (b) *considering any site-specific provisions for 30 Benmore Crescent, Manor Park; and*
 - (c) *applying General Industrial zone-wide changes outlined in the report in response to feedback on the draft District Plan.”*

6. **SPATIAL PLAN**

Report No. DPRC2024/3/166 by the Head of Urban Development

The Head of Urban Development elaborated on the report.

In response to questions from members, the Head of Urban Development confirmed that the 'Action' for Waterloo Station would also be included in Strategic Move 2: Building up the Central and Northern Valley Floor as a strategic transport interchange. She mentioned that specific climate change solutions were not incorporated in the Spatial Plan. She explained that the Spatial Plan's role was to highlight the need for a strategic decision to address the challenge of climate change.

RESOLVED: (Cr Dyer/Cr Morgan)

Minute No. DPRC 24302

“That the Committee:

- (1) *approves the general direction of the Spatial Plan;*
- (2) *instructs officers to prepare a Draft Spatial Plan for community engagement on the basis of the Preliminary Spatial Plan in Appendix 1 to the report, subject to text refinements and content from Mana Whenua and maps being added;*
- (3) *instructs officers to seek Committee approval for the Draft Spatial Plan prior to community engagement;*
- (4) *approves the approach to community engagement attached as Appendix 2 to the report, which has the engagement on the Draft Spatial Plan and the Proposed District Plan starting at the same time;*
- (5) *notes the risks associated with the approach to community engagement; and*
- (6) *approves changing the name of the document from “Spatial Plan” to “Sustainable Growth Strategy 2025-2055” to mitigate the community engagement risks identified.”*

7. **UPDATE ON THREE WATERS AND NATURAL HAZARDS AND COASTAL HAZARDS CHAPTERS FOR THE PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN.**

Report No. DPRC2024/3/167 by the Head of Planning

James Beban, Director of Urban Edge Planning, was in attendance for the item.

In response to questions from members, James Beban mentioned that Wellington Water Limited (WWL) did not have local evidence showing that greywater tanks significantly reduced stormwater demand and management. He confirmed that Plan Change 1 had implemented Waitua recommendations. He agreed that greywater data might have been used to develop Plan Change 1 to the Regional Natural Resources Plan. He also agreed to request data from WWL on the impact of greywater systems on the three waters. He explained that Plan Change 1 had been notified, and the hearing of submissions was expected to take place toward the end of 2024. He confirmed no directives in Plan Change 1 for District Plan upgrades within a natural resources plan.

In response to questions from members, James Beban confirmed that the digital water meters installed in new housing could be adjusted if Council decided to switch to a different metering system. He explained that in areas with significant infrastructure and high-risk coastal hazards, certain activities were categorized as "Restricted Discretionary," allowing for minimising risks instead of complete avoidance. He highlighted that the Seaview Industrial Area was an important regional industrial hub, emphasising the necessity of allowing some development in that zone.

RESOLVED: (Cr Dyer/Cr Mitchell)

Minute No. DPRC 24303

"That the Committee:

- (1) notes the content of this report;*
- (2) directs officers to explore further evidence on water tanks; and*
- (3) directs officers to complete the Three Waters and Natural and Coastal Hazards chapters for the Proposed District Plan."*

8. **INFORMATION ITEM**

District Plan Review Committee Forward Programme 2024

Memorandum dated 30 May 2024 by the Democracy Advisor and the Head of Planning

RESOLVED: (Cr Dyer/Cr Mitchell)

Minute No. DPRC 24304

"That the Committee receives and notes the Forward Programme for the District Plan Review Committee for the remainder of 2024."

9. **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

10. **CLOSING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA WHAKAMUTUNGA**

Unuhia!	<i>Release us from the supreme sacredness of our tasks</i>
Unuhia!	<i>To be clear and free</i>
Unuhia i te uru-tapu-nui	<i>in heart, body and soul in our continuing journey</i>
Kia wātea, kia māmā	<i>Oh Rongo, raise these words up high</i>
Te ngākau, te tinana, te wairua i te ara	<i>so that we be cleansed and be free,</i>
takatū	<i>Yes indeed, we are free!</i>
Koia rā e Rongo whakairihia ake ki	<i>Good and peaceful</i>
runga	
Kia wātea, kia wātea!	
Ae rā, kua wātea!	
Hau, pai mārire.	

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 4.41 pm.

Cr Dyer
CHAIR

CONFIRMED as a true and correct record
Dated this 25th day of July 2024