

HUTT CITY COUNCIL
KOMITI 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 8 August 2024 commencing at 2:00 pm

PRESENT:

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:

A Geddes, Director Environment and Sustainability
 J Kingsbury, Director Economy and Development
 T Johnston, Head of Planning
 N Geard, Policy Planning Manager
 S Davis, Senior Policy Planner
 P McDonald, Senior Policy Planner
 L Chi, Principal, Quality Assurance (part meeting)
 J Randall, Democracy Advisor
 H Clegg, Minute Taker

PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. 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 tikina 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

There was no public comment.

4. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS

Deputy Mayor Lewis declared a conflict of interest in Item 7: Update on the Historic Heritage Chapter for the District Plan Review and took no part in discussion or voting on the matter.

5. SUBMISSION ON MAKING IT EASIER TO BUILD GRANNY FLATS DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

Report No. DPRC2024/4/189 by the Head of Planning

In response to questions from members, The Principal, Quality Assurance, advised that the risk of building a granny flat without building consent lay with the building owner. She further advised that if Council had been aware of a building where an issue subsequently became evident, Council could be liable. The Head of Planning highlighted that the submission requested clarity on this issue.

In response to questions from members, the Head of Planning advised residential buildings were required to be connected to Council services. He explained that if alternative water, power or toilet services were proposed, a resource consent would be required to assess their suitability.

RESOLVED: (Cr Dyer/Cr Morgan)

Minute No. DPRC 24401

"That the Committee approves the submission as set out in the officer's report on behalf of Hutt City Council, noting that the key submission points are summarised as follows:

The intentions of the policy to provide for smaller homes and increase affordable housing choices are supported in principle. However:

- a. The health and safety of building occupants and their neighbours cannot be compromised.*
- b. Councils such as Hutt City Council that have given effect to the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) and already permit minor residential units should be excluded from any national direction that is specific to this issue.*
- c. The policy should only apply to residential and rural zones. Applying the policy to other zones could conflict with other land use priorities and result in an under-utilization of land contrary to the NPS-UD.*
- d. All district-wide matters should apply to minor residential units, such as hazards, historical and cultural values, earthworks etc.*
- e. A National Policy Statement is preferred to a National Environment Standard (NES) as it provides for a more comprehensive and coherent approach to enabling and managing minor residential units.*
- f. If an NPS is used it must enable changes to be made to district plans without needing a RMA Schedule 1 process.*
- g. There needs to be an additional standard, or an equivalent mechanism in place, that requires a check on the infrastructure capacity to serve the new development.*
- h. The final approach that government determines must include clear compliance responsibilities*

- and powers.*
- i. *Granny flats must contribute to the cost of infrastructure and there must be a clear mechanism for councils to collect development contributions for granny flats / minor residential units."*

6. UPDATE ON LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL ZONE FOR THE PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN

Report No. DPRC2024/4/186 by the Principal Policy Planner

The Policy Planning Manager elaborated on the report.

In response to questions from members, the Policy Planning Manager confirmed that the relevant submitters to the Draft District Plan had not been recontacted regarding the Slope Stability Overlay proposal. He advised zone changes following submissions had not been finalised.

In response to questions from members, the Policy Planning Manager and the Head of Planning agreed to create a communications plan for property owners where zoning provisions had changed due to the introduction of a Slope Stability Overlay or other material changes, as well as for those who had previously submitted on the Large Lot Residential Zone.

In response to a question from a member, the Policy Planning Manager confirmed it would be possible for Council's ePlan to identify the relevant Operative and Proposed District Plan requirements for properties. He noted there was potential for the two sets of requirements to be confusing.

Cr Mitchell said Council's online e-Plan viewer was a useful tool for residents to identify natural hazards for individual properties. He asked that information about the tool be included in the officers' communications plan.

Cr Dyer suggested that Council's e-Plan could be a newsworthy item on its own to communicate to residents.

RESOLVED: (Cr Dyer/Cr Edwards)

Minute No. DPRC 24402

"That the Committee receives and notes the report."

7. **UPDATE ON THE HISTORIC HERITAGE CHAPTER FOR THE DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW**

Report No. DPRC2024/4/197 by the Policy Planning Manager

Deputy Mayor Lewis declared a conflict of interest and took no part in discussion or voting on the matter.

Andrew Banks, Senior Planner, Boffa Miskell was in attendance for the item.

The Policy Planning Manager advised pages 28-33 contained in the agenda were an earlier draft of the report and could be discarded. He explained that the actual Appendix to the report was pages 34-35 contained in the agenda: *Criteria for identifying places, sites, and areas with significant historic heritage values.*

In response to questions from members, Andrew Banks advised that all councils were guided by the Regional Policy Statement which tended to unify their approaches to heritage chapters under the Resource Management Act. He clarified that a District Plan could not include a rule stating all buildings must be maintained. Nor could it distinguish between demolition by neglect and demolition due to a natural disaster. He suggested that councils could reduce the risk of demolition by neglect by making it easier for building owners to make changes that would make the building's use more sustainable, such as double glazing or solar panels.

RESOLVED: (Cr Dyer/Cr Mitchell)

Minute No. DPRC 24403

"That the Committee:

(1) receives and notes the report; and

(2) directs officers to complete the Historic Heritage chapters for the proposed District Plan."

8. **UPDATE ON OVERLAYS IN TRANSPORT CHAPTER OF DISTRICT PLAN**

Report No. DPRC2024/4/188 by the Intermediate Resource Consents Planner

The Senior Policy Planner advised of an update to paragraph 20 in the report. He said Natusch, Liverton, Westhill, Waitohu and Mackenzie Roads were all included in the Highly Constrained Roads Overlay. He explained that the Specified High Trip Generator Exemption Overlay (Overlay) would support higher density around rail stations and some larger local centres. He highlighted that the extent of the Overlay was still being finalised.

In response to questions from members, the Senior Policy Planner clarified that the Overlay provided exemptions to thresholds. He said the large scale residential development threshold to trigger a High Trip Generator Assessment had been lowered from 60 to 20 residential units. He said if large scale residential developments were located within a proposed Overlay area, and provided fewer than 10 on-site carparks, no

traffic assessment would be necessary for the resource consents. He confirmed that large scale residential developments outside of the proposed Overlay areas would require a traffic assessment. He advised the District Plan could not specify that on-site carparking be provided.

In response to questions from members, the Policy Planning Manager advised the proposed Overlay was not designed to address the need for alternative on-street parking solutions for large scale residential developments that had little or no on-site carparking. He added the proposed Overlay areas were designed to encourage residential development in preferred areas close to train stations, and the use of alternative modes of transport, including active transport.

The Head of Planning advised that a briefing would be scheduled for members, where more maps and details would be provided. He confirmed that all large scale residential developments would be required to pay Development Contributions, and a portion of these contributions would go towards road improvements.

Cr Edwards expressed concern that solutions to parking issues lay outside the District Plan. He emphasised the importance of the public understanding that on-street parking was not a right for those living in large scale residential developments without on-site carparking.

Cr Mitchell expressed concern that street parking congestion could be an unintended consequence of the incentives provided for large scale residential developments with fewer than 10 on-site carparks.

RESOLVED: (Cr Dyer/Cr Shaw)

Minute No. DPRC 24404

"That the Committee receives and notes the report."

9. INFORMATION ITEM

a) District Plan Review Committee Forward Programme 2024

Memorandum dated 24 July 2024 by the Democracy Advisor

RESOLVED: (Cr Dyer/Cr Briggs)

Minute No. DPRC 24405

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

10. QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

11. **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	<i>so that we be cleansed and be free,</i>
ara 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 2.47 pm.

Cr B Dyer
CHAIR

CONFIRMED as a true and correct record
Dated this 1st day of October 2024