

**Before the Hearings Panels
At Greater Wellington Regional Council**

Under Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region

Hearing Topic Hearing Stream 4 – Urban Development

**Statement of evidence of Torrey James McDonnell on behalf of Hutt City
Council (Planning)**

Date: 15 September 2023

INTRODUCTION:

- 1 My full name is Torrey James McDonnell. I am employed as a Principal Planner by Incite Wellington.
- 2 I have prepared this statement of evidence on behalf of Hutt City Council (“HCC”) to provide planning evidence in relation to its submission to Greater Wellington Regional Council’s (“the Council”) Proposed Change 1 (“Change 1”) to the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region (“RPS”).
- 3 Specifically, this statement of evidence relates to the matters in Hearing Stream 4, Urban Development.
- 4 I am authorised to provide this evidence on behalf of HCC. While I am employed by HCC, I am giving this evidence as a planning expert, and the views I express in this evidence are my own.

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 5 I hold the qualifications of Bachelor of Science (Majoring in Geography) and a Master of Planning both from Otago University.
- 6 I currently work for Incite Resource and Environmental Consultants, based in the Wellington office. I provide expert advice on a variety of resource management matters, including national policy development, growth/spatial planning, district and regional plan policy development, and district and regional consenting. This includes providing policy advice to HCC to inform their current District Plan Review programme.
- 7 I am familiar with Change 1 having worked on Porirua City Council’s (“PCC”) submission, including giving evidence on behalf of PCC in Hearing Stream 3 on natural hazards. I worked for PCC as a Principal Policy Planner from 2017 to 2023. I was involved in the preparation of the 2020 Porirua Proposed District Plan (“PDP”), the 2022 Variation 1 to the PDP,

and the 2022 Plan Change 19 to the Operative District Plan. Variation 1 and Plan Change 19 are part of an Intensification Planning Instrument.

8 Prior to PCC, my work experience included working as a Senior Analyst for the Ministry for the Environment developing national direction under the RMA; and working as a planner for the Transit New Zealand Otago/Southland regional office where my main duties included both consenting and policy input.

9 I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.

Code of conduct

10 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023. I have complied with that Code when preparing my written statement of evidence and I agree to comply with it when I give any oral evidence.

11 My qualifications as an expert are set out above. I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my expressed opinions.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

12 My statement of evidence addresses the following matters arising from HCC's submission on Change 1:

- Chapter 3.9 introduction;
- Objectives 22 and 22B;
- Policies, 30, 31, 32, 55, 56, 57, 58, 67, UD.1, UD.2, UD.3; and
- Definitions.

- 13 In preparing my evidence, I have reviewed the following:
- 13.1 The Section 32 Evaluation of provisions for Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region (Section 32 Evaluation Report); and
 - 13.2 Section 42A Hearing Report Hearing Stream 4 – Urban Development (Section 42A Report).
- 14 I note that no other planning or technical evidence has been provided by the Council other than the Section 42A report.

Response to Section 42A Report

Chapter 3.9 introduction - Hutt City Council [S115.024]

- 15 HCC sought the following relief:
- Reduce the length of the introduction and ensure it provides sufficient guidance for RPS users about the objectives and policies relating to regional form, design and function.*
- 16 The reporting officer recommends amendments to “remove duplicating text and provide more deliberate strategic direction” and “provide a clearer and less repetitive overview for Chapter 3.9”.
- 17 I consider that the changes proposed by the reporting officer do not reduce the length of the introduction as sought, rather they lengthen it. It still contains significant duplication of regulatory content. For example, this revised text in Appendix A simply summarises what is included in the regulatory provisions:

The chapter and associated provisions include:

- a) An over-arching objective for regional form across the whole region (Objective 22). This sets out the outcomes to be achieved in urban, peri-urban and rural areas and how these areas are connected to each other.
- b) A policy articulating what contributing to well-functioning urban areas means in the Wellington Region (Policy UD.5).
- c) Policies providing direction to development to seek a strategic approach to meeting housing and business demand:
 - 1. Firstly urban development within existing urban areas through intensification in and adjacent to centres with a range of commercial activities, and along existing or planned public transport corridors (Policy 31),
 - 2. Then other intensification within existing urban areas (Policy 31),
 - 3. Then urban development in areas identified for future urban development through appropriate growth strategies or district plans (Policy 55),
 - 4. Then other urban development where it adds significantly to development capacity (Policy UD.3), in places connected to existing urban areas,
 - 5. Then residential development in the region's rural areas (Policy 56).
- d) Support for objectives in other parts of the Regional Policy Statement to ensure an integrated approach is taken to development, particularly in relation to freshwater, climate change, indigenous biodiversity, mana whenua / tangata whenua values, and regionally significant infrastructure.
- e) Provisions to enable the expression of Māori cultural and traditional norms in use and development (Policy UD.2) and the occupation, use and development of ancestral land by mana whenua / tangata whenua (Policy UD.1).

- 18 An introduction holds no statutory weight. In my view, an introduction should be as concise as possible, and provide a brief context and signposting to assist plan users. The longer an introduction is, the less likely a plan user is to read it, it also unnecessarily lengthens the plan which may cause plan users to miss important information.
- 19 Further, the RPS already contains tables that show the line-of-sight from objectives through to methods and assist in navigation.
- 20 I consider the introduction should be substantially amended and shortened.

Objective 22 – Hutt City Council [S115.025]

- 21 HCC sought for this objective to be retained as notified. The reporting officer recommends substantial changes in paragraph 276, and therefore recommends accepting HCC's submission in part.
- 22 I do not agree with the substantial changes recommended. I consider that several of the additions are unnecessary, and duplicate other objectives in the RPS relating to climate change, natural hazards fresh water, and infrastructure.
- 23 In my view this repetition would be analogous to repeating the matters listed in sections 6 and 7 of the RMA in each subsequent section throughout the RMA. This is not necessary as the RMA must be read as a whole.
- 24 For example, clause (c) requires Te Mana o Te Wai be given effect to, this directly duplicates Objective 12 in Chapter 3.4. The RPS should be read as a whole, and in my view it is not appropriate to repeat terms throughout the RPS, it adds unnecessary length and complexity.
- 25 I consider that having repetitive RPS objectives and policies will add time and complexity to resource consenting processes. Section 104(1)(b) requires that a proposed or operative RPS must be had regard to when considering a resource consent application. Having to include these policies in a resource consent application, and provide analysis against each of them will considerably lengthen preparation and processing times. The analysis itself will need to be duplicated against each of these policies, as well as the higher order direction that must also be included in a resource consent application.
- 26 For the same reasons, I do not agree that the associated new Policy UD.5 provided by the reporting officer is necessary or appropriate. All Policy UD.5 does is further replicate other objectives and provisions in the RPS which would need to be applied anyway. I consider that Policy 1 of the NPS-UD sufficiently sets out what a well-functioning urban environment is for the purposes of the RPS.

- 27 The reporting officer has recommended some new terms be added to the objective which I consider lack sufficient definition or clarity to be implemented in plans. For example, the term “environmentally responsive” has been added to the chapeau, I am not sure what this term means in this context, as such I do not support its inclusion.
- 28 The concept of “affordable housing” is recommended to be introduced to clause (a). Further, it is phrased as an outcome that must be achieved in urban and rural areas. This is stronger direction than the NPS-UD which requires that planning decisions “improve housing affordability” (Objective 2). While you will not find many people that disagree with the need for affordable housing in urban areas, however it cannot be delivered through our regional planning system alone. At best, RMA plans can enable a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, but they cannot compel the building of houses. While there are theoretically planning approaches such as inclusionary zoning that could require a proportion of the houses that are built to be affordable, they are largely unprecedented in Aotearoa and they would require central government direction to be effective and not result in housing market distortions.
- 29 For the above reasons, I consider that the notified version of this Objective is more appropriate than the Section 42A version.

Objective 22B – Hutt City Council [S115.026]

- 30 The reporting officer recommends accepting HCC’s submission point and deleting Objective 22B. I agree with the reporting officer for the reasons outlined in HCC’s submission:

This objective is unclear, particularly in relation to what it means to be "strategically planned". As the objective primarily supports non-regulatory methods and consideration policies, the objective seems unnecessary.

Policy 30 – Hutt City Council [S115.051]

31 The reporting officer recommends rejecting HCC’s amendments to Policy 30. The officer gives the following reasons in paragraph 756:

I consider that accepting the relief by HCC to list all centres apart from Wellington City Centre as ‘other regionally significant centres’ would not be appropriate. This approach would be contrary to the approach applied to categorizing centres within Policy 30, which I consider does reflect differences in the size, scale, and role of regionally significant and locally significant centres.

32 The officer has provided some further recommended amendments to Policy 30 in paragraph 766. This does not include listing Petone as being regionally significant as sought by HCC, while Johnsonville and Kilbirnie are recommended to be elevated in the hierarchy to “regionally significant”.

33 I have reviewed recent variations and plan changes that seek to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020 (“NPS-UD”) and the National Planning Standards. The centres listed in the RPS have the following zonings (noting some are still subject to decisions):

Table 1: Review of centres zoning across region

Section 42A recommended hierarchy	Section 42A recommended area name	District plan zoning	Relevant plan change/review
Regionally significant central business district	Wellington City	City Centre Zone	PDP
Other regionally significant centres	Upper Hutt	City Centre Zone	IPI
	Lower Hutt	City Centre Zone	PC56 (operative)
	Porirua city centre	Metropolitan Centre Zone	Variation 1 to PDP

	Paraparaumu	Metropolitan Centre Zone	PC2 (operative)
	Masterton town centre	Town Centre Zone	Draft District Plan
	Johnsonville	Metropolitan Centre Zone	PDP
	Kilbirnie	Metropolitan Centre Zone	PDP
Locally significant centres	Petone	Metropolitan Centre Zone	PC56 (operative)
	Otaki Main Road	Town Centre Zone	PC2 (operative)
	Otaki Township	Town Centre Zone	PC2 (operative)
	Waikanae	Town Centre Zone	PC2 (operative)
	Raumati Town	Town Centre Zone	PC2 (operative)
	Featherston	Town Centre Zone	Draft District Plan
	Greytown	Town Centre Zone	Draft District Plan
	Carterton	Town Centre Zone	Draft District Plan
	Martinborough	Town Centre Zone	Draft District Plan

34 As shown in table 1 above, Petone is an outlier in terms of being the only centre identified as being locally significant by the reporting officer with a metropolitan centre zoning. The rest all have Town Centre Zoning. The description of a Town Centre Zone in the National Planning Standards is (Table 13):

Areas used predominantly for:

- *in smaller urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities.*
- *in larger urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs.*

35 The description of Metropolitan Centre Zone is:

Areas used predominantly for a broad range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities. The zone is a focal point for sub-regional urban catchments.

36 Petone provides a commercial offering for a wider catchment than just the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. It provides for a sub-regional urban catchment and is therefore a Metropolitan Centre Zone. This has been tested and confirmed through the Schedule 1 process for Plan Change 56.

37 In my view, Petone has a regional significance that is at least equivalent to the centres on the regionally significant centres list as amended by the reporting officer, and exceeding that of Johnsonville and Kilbirnie. Petone is more of a regional destination than these two centres, it is a popular destination for shopping and entertainment and it contains a reasonable amount of office space. As such it attracts workers and visitors from around the region. It has a central location in the region being close to State Highway 2 and the Main Trunk Railway Line, which makes it easily accessible from most parts of the region.

38 In summary, my view is that Petone is not locally significant but regionally significant, and should be elevated as such in this hierarchy. I have provided a tracked change version of Policy 30 in Appendix A. This includes several other recommended changes including:

- Changes to the chapeau to include 'objectives' as these are required to direct provisions such as policies and rules;
- Replacement of "land use activities" with the broader term "appropriate subdivision, use and development";
- Removal of terminology that could confuse the reader that a specific zoning must be applied e.g. Central Porirua's zoning is proposed to be Metropolitan Centre Zone rather than a City Centre Zone;
- Removal of the term "central business district" from Policy30(1) as it is a bit old fashioned, and it does not reflect the large variety of

activities that take place in a major urban centre such as civic and residential activities.

Policy 31 – Hutt City Council [S115.052]

- 39 The reporting officer recommends rejecting HCC's submission which was delete Policy 31 as proposed. HCC gave the following reasons:

Policy 31 is an unnecessary inclusion that has the potential to cause confusion. The NPS-UD clearly specifies how Local Authority District Plans are to be amended to give effect to the NPS and Policy 31 just inserts another layer of bureaucracy in the process without really adding any value.

- 40 The reporting officer does not agree that the amended Policy 31 repeats national direction without adding value. The reporting officer states:

In my view it is the role of the RPS to implement the NPS-UD by providing context for its implementation within the Wellington Region, to address the regionally significant issues identified in the regional form, design and function chapter. I do not see an issue with the NPS-UD intensification direction being reflected at a high level to fulfil this function. Policy 31 also gives direction to the Wairarapa councils to enable intensification in and around centres and transport corridors, and/or where there is demand. I consider this additional direction to Wairarapa councils is useful and aligned with the broader response to the regionally significant issues and seeking a compact, well-designed regional form.

- 41 The reporting officer agrees with HCC that the operative Policy 31 is now inconsistent with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD (paragraph 394). The reporting officer has recommended a range of further changes in paragraph 411 in response to submissions.

- 42 I agree with the reporting officer that the role of an RPS is to articulate what national direction means at a regional level. Policy 3 of the NPS-UD requires that regional policy statements enable intensification. Ideally this would outline a specific regional approach, however it is worth noting that territorial authorities in the region have already largely given effect to the NPS-UD and MDRS. In the case of HCC and KCDC, the provisions are now operative in their respective district plans. Therefore, with the exception of providing additional policy direction to Wairarapa Councils (which I have no particular view on), it is unclear what value this policy can add to regional planning set out either as notified Change 1 or as recommended in the Section 42A Report.
- 43 In my view, any changes to Policy 31 should do the minimum to align the RPS with the NPS-UD, and to only provide further direction on particular regional issues where needed.
- 44 These higher-level comments about the merits of Policy 31 aside, there are some specific issues with the drafting that I consider should be addressed. Similar to my assessment set out above in relation to officer recommended amendments to Objective 22, I consider that several of the recommended additions to the chapeau of the policy are unnecessary in that they lack sufficient definition or clarity to be implemented, or otherwise duplicate other policies in the RPS. In my view, the final drafting of the policy should be reviewed and stripped back to remove these terms.

Policy 32 & 33 – Hutt City Council [S115.053, S115.054]

- 45 HCC sought to retain these policies as notified. The reporting officer recommends accepting HCC's submissions on these policies in part. The officer recommends further amendments to both policies in Appendix 1, namely adding terms such as "climate-resilient", "accessible", "environmentally responsive" to the chapeau of both policies. As well as adding "well-functioning rural areas" to the chapeau of policy 32.

46 While I could not find evaluation in section 4.7.2 or 4.8.2 to support or explain these recommended changes, I agree with the officer's recommendation to add the terms "accessible" and "well-functioning rural areas", these terms are consistent with other proposed amendments in Change 1. Further, it is most likely that new industrial land will be identified and located in rural areas, and it makes sense that they contribute to these areas being well-functioning.

47 However, I am not sure what "environmentally responsive" means in this context, and I note that "climate-resilient" now has a recommended definition, but the term is repeated unnecessarily throughout Change 1 to the RPS. As such I do not support the inclusion of these terms in these policies.

Policy 55 – Hutt City Council [S115.075]

48 The reporting officer recommends accepting HCC's submission in part, which was to retain the policy as notified. The officer recommends substantial further amendments to the policy in Appendix 1.

49 Similar to my assessment set out in relation to officer recommended amendments to Objective 22, I consider that several of the recommended additions to this policy are unnecessary in that they lack sufficient definition or clarity to be implemented, or otherwise duplicate other policies in the RPS. In my view, the final drafting of the policy should be reviewed and stripped back to remove duplication.

Policy 56 – Hutt City Council [S115.076]

50 The reporting officer recommends rejecting HCC's submission which was: "Amend Policy 56 insofar as it applies to resource consents, so that it only applies to regional resource consents."

51 I do not consider that the policy should only apply to regional consents as requested by HCC. These matters encompass land use matters

relevant to s31 territorial authority functions, and I consider guidance is useful as there is little national direction available on some of these rural issues. However, I do agree that Policy 56 should not apply to district consents once it has been given effect to in a district plan.

52 My understanding is that ‘consideration’ policies are applied in order to guide resource consenting processes in the absence of both district and regional plan rules (as well as notices or requirement, plan changes etc. Rather, I consider that the application of this policy should “fall away” in when it has been implemented in the district plan (or at the regional level when it is implemented by the regional plan). Once appropriate plan provisions are in place, I see no reason that ‘consideration’ policies should continue to apply to resource consents. This is because there is risk that a ‘consideration’ policy could duplicate or conflict with district and regional plans. These plans will have been developed based on the specific resource management issues, evidence base, and community engagement undertaken for particular areas.

53 I consider that having repetitive RPS provisions will add time and complexity to the resource consenting process. Section 104(1)(b) requires that a proposed or operative RPS must be had regard to when considering a resource consent application. Having to include these policies in a resource consent application, and provide analysis against each of them will considerably lengthen preparation and processing time. The analysis itself will need to be duplicated against each of these policies, as well as the higher order direction that must also be included in a resource consent application.

Policy 57, 58, 67, UD.2 – Hutt City Council [S115.077, S115.078, S115.079, S115.090]

54 The reporting officer recommends rejecting HCC’s submission to amend these policies so that they do not apply to resource consents.

55 I agree with the reasoning set out in HCC’s submission:

While we support direction on this issue to inform decisions on district plans, this type of analysis should be complete at plan-making stage and it is redundant and infeasible to reconsider the issue from scratch for each resource consent.

- 56 I consider that these policies would better be articulated as a transitional policies that fall away once relevant regulatory policies are given effect to, as outlined in this statement of evidence above in relation to policy 56.

Policy UD.1 – Hutt City Council [S115.055]

- 57 The reporting officer recommends accepting HCC's submission in part. HCC requested that the policy be amend "to clarify which situations the policy applies to". HCC provides the following reasoning for the relief sought:

While we support the general intent of this policy it is unclear which situations the policy is intended to apply to. At minimum the policy should set out whether it applies only to Māori freehold land, or whether any general land in Maori ownership is included, and which mana whenua groups should be covered.

- 58 I consider that mana whenua are best placed to advise the Panel on this matter. In my experience drafting a Māori Purpose Zone and a Papakāinga Chapter for the Proposed Porirua District Plan, Ngāti Toa Rangatira had a very clear view on how best to provide for the relationship of their people with their ancestral land. Papakāinga provisions in the Proposed Porirua District Plan enable this activity on land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, or where it can be demonstrated that there is an ancestral connection to the land.

Policy UD.3 – Hutt City Council [S115.080]

59 The reporting officer recommends accepting HCC's submission in part. HCC sought specific wording changes to UD.3 as outlined in its submission.

60 The reporting officer has recommended removal of cross-referencing back to Objective 22 and Policy 55, I support this removal of duplication (and consider as a general principle it should be applied more broadly in the final drafting of Change 1 as noted earlier in this statement).

61 I disagree with the recommended additional clauses (e) and (f) recommended by the Section 42A Report author. I consider that these are not consistent with the intent of the relevant clauses in the NPS-UD. In particular, I consider that the recommended clause (e) presupposes the final outcome of a plan change, rather than the consideration of whether it will be treated as adding significantly to development capacity. Whether the plan change is the 'most appropriate' would be considered through section 32 evaluation in relation to giving effect to the objectives.

62 I also consider that the policy can be drafted to better implement the NPS-UD and be more concise and directive. I have recommended tracked changes to Policy UD.3 in Appendix A of this Statement.

Definition - Medium density residential development - Hutt City Council [S115.0123]

63 The reporting officer recommends accepting HCC's submission in part, which was to amend the definition as follows:

Medium density ~~residential~~ development

Means areas used predominately for ~~residential~~ urban activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, low-rise apartments, and other compatible activities with a ~~minimum~~ an anticipated building height of at least 3 stories.

64 I agree with the changes proposed by the reporting officer to broaden out the activity from being solely about residential activities.

65 I consider that the full relief sought by HCC should be adopted. The reporting officer has recommended removal of the reference to “minimum building height of 3 stories” for the reasons they outlined in paragraph 693. However, I consider the I consider the qualifiers “anticipated” and “at least” suggested by HCC address the fact that sometimes the height standard might be less than 3 stories in these areas where qualifying matters apply.

66 I also support the change sought by HCC to amend the definition as follows: “~~commercial, residential and mixed use~~ urban activities”. I support the use of the term “urban”, as it encompasses not only the activities listed, but the broader activities that take place in these areas such as recreation and community facilities, education facilities etc.

Definition – Regionally significant centres - Hutt City Council [S115.0125]

67 The reporting officer recommends accepting HCC’s submission, which was to retain the definition as notified. I support this recommendation.

Definition – Urban areas - Hutt City Council [S115.0126]

68 The reporting officer recommends accepting HCC’s submission, which was to retain the definition as notified. I support this recommendation.

Definition – Complex development opportunities - Hutt City Council [S115.0119]

69 The reporting officer recommends accepting HCC’s submission, which was to delete the definition. I support this recommendation for the reasons outlined in HCC’s submission:

It is inappropriate for a definition to outsource the meaning of a definition to a third party, in this case the Wellington

Regional Leadership Committee, particularly regarding decisions to be made by that third party in future.

Definition – High density development - Hutt City Council [S115.0121]

- 70 The reporting officer recommends accepting HCC’s submission in part, and has recommended changes to the definition in Appendix 1 of the Section 42A Report.
- 71 I support these amendments, in particular the inclusion of the term “at least 6 stories” as this aligns with the NPS-UD.
- 72 The only change sought by HCC that the reporting officer did not support was: “~~commercial, residential and mixed use~~ urban activities”. I support the use of the term “urban”, as it encompasses not only the activities listed, but the broader activities that take place in these areas such as recreation and community facilities, education facilities etc.
- 73 I consider that the full relief sought by HCC should be adopted for this definition.

Date: 15/09/2023



.....

Appendix A: Recommended amendments

Submission Point Ref.	Provision	Relief Sought by HCC (green text where relevant)	Section 42A report Recommendation		Recommended Amendments to Section 42A Version (blue text)
			Response	Recommended Changes (red text)	
S115.051	Policy 30	<p>Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally significant centres - district plans</p> <p>District plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods that enable and manage a range of land use activities that maintain and enhance the viability and vibrancy of:</p> <p>1. The regionally significant central business district main centre of the region, the central business area of Wellington City;</p> <p>2. Other regionally significant centres:</p> <p>(i) Lower Hutt;</p> <p>(ii) <u>Petone;</u></p> <p>[[iii] and other centres outside the City of Lower Hutt as appropriate]</p> <p>3. the locally significant centres of: [list of centres]</p>	Reject	<p>Policy 30: Maintaining and enhancing the viability and vibrancy of regionally and locally significant centres – district plans</p> <p>District plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods that enable and manage a range of land use activities that maintain and enhance the viability and vibrancy of regional central business district in the Wellington city and the:</p> <p><u>1. the regionally significant central business district of Wellington City;</u></p> <p><u>2. other regionally significant centres:</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. Upper Hutt city centre;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">ii. Lower Hutt city centre;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">iii. Porirua city centre;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">iv. Paraparaumu town centre;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">v. Masterton town centre; and the</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>vi. Johnsonville; and</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>vii. Kilbirnie.</u></p> <p><u>3. the locally significant centres of Suburban centres in:</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. Petone;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">ii. Kilbirnie; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">iii. Johnsonville.;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>ii. Ōtaki Main Road;</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>iii. Ōtaki Township;</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>iv. Raumati Town;</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>v. Waikanae;</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>vi. Featherston;</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>vii. Greytown;</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>viii. Carterton; and</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>ix. Martinborough.</u></p> <p><u>4. Other local and neighbourhood centres that provide for the daily and weekly needs of their residential catchments.</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. Sub regional centres of:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i. Upper Hutt city centre;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ii. Lower Hutt city centre;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">iii. Porirua city centre;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">iv. Paraparaumu town centre;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">v. Masterton town centre; and the</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. Suburban centres in:</p>	<p><u>Policy 30: District plans shall include objectives, policies, rules and/or other methods that enable and manage appropriate subdivision, use and development that maintains and enhances the viability and vibrancy of:</u></p> <p><u>1. Central Wellington as the main centre of the Region; and</u></p> <p><u>2. other regionally significant centres of:</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>a. Upper Hutt</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>b. Lower Hutt</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>c. Central Porirua</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>d. Paraparaumu</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>e. Masterton</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>f. Kilbirnie</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>g. Johnsonville</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>h. Petone</u></p> <p><u>3. The locally significant centres of:</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>d. Ōtaki Main Road</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>e. Ōtaki Township</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>f. Waikanae</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>g. Featherston</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>h. Greytown</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>i. Carterton</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>j. Martinborough</u></p> <p><u>4. Other local and neighbourhood centres that provide for the daily and weekly needs of their residential catchments.</u></p>

Submission Point Ref.	Provision	Relief Sought by HCC (green text where relevant)	Section 42A report Recommendation		Recommended Amendments to Section 42A Version (blue text)
			Response	Recommended Changes (red text)	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Petone; ii. Kilbirnie; and iii. Johnsonville; 	
S115.080	Policy UD.3	<p>Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to developments that provide for significant development capacity – consideration</p> <p>When considering a change of a district plan for a development in accordance with clause (d) of Policy 55, particular regard shall be given to whether the following criteria is met:</p> <p>(a) the location, design and layout of the proposal:</p> <p>(i) contributes to establishing or maintaining the characteristics and qualities of a well-functioning urban environment identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22,</p> <p>(ii) is well-connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors</p> <p>(iii) <u>where it provides</u> for housing <u>the proposal</u> will apply a relevant residential zone or other urban zone that provides for high density development or medium density <u>residential</u> development,</p> <p>(b) the proposal makes a significant contribution to meeting a need identified in the latest Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment, or a shortage <u>otherwise</u> identified <u>in monitoring</u> for:</p> <p>(i) a variety of housing that meets <u>the a</u> regional, district, or local shortages of housing in relation to the a particular type, size, or format, or (ii) business space or land of a particular size or locational type, or</p> <p>(iii) community, cultural, health, or educational facilities, <u>and</u> or</p> <p>(iv) the proposal contributes to housing affordability through a general increase in supply or through providing non-market housing, and</p> <p>(c) when considering the significance of the proposal's contribution to a matter in (b), this means that the proposal's contribution:</p> <p>(i) is of high yield relative to either the forecast demand or the identified shortfall,</p> <p>(ii) will be realised in a timely (i.e., rapid) manner, and</p> <p>(iii) is likely to be taken up, <u>and</u></p> <p><u>(iv) will facilitate a net increase in district wide up take in the short to medium term,</u></p> <p>(d) required development infrastructure can be provided effectively and efficiently for the proposal, <u>taking into account</u></p>	Accept in part	<p>Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to <u>plan changes developments</u> that <u>provide for significant development capacity – consideration</u></p> <p><u>For local authorities with jurisdiction over part, or all, of an urban environment, When considering whether a change of a district plan for a urban development in accordance with clause (d) of Policy 55, particular regard shall be given to whether adds significantly to development capacity, the following criteria is must be met:</u></p> <p><u>(i) contributes to establishing or maintaining the characteristics and qualities of a well-functioning urban environment identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22,</u></p> <p><u>(ii) is well-connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors,</u></p> <p><u>(a) (b) the proposal makes a significant contribution to meeting a need identified in the latest Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment, or a shortage identified in through monitoring or otherwise for:</u></p> <p><u>(i) a variety of housing that meets the regional, district, or local shortages of housing in relation to the particular type, size, or format, or</u></p> <p><u>(ii) business space or land of a particular size or locational type, or</u></p> <p><u>(iii) community, cultural, health, or educational facilities; and</u></p> <p><u>(b) (iii) where it provides for housing, the proposal will:</u></p> <p><u>(i) will apply a relevant residential zone or other urban zone that provides for high density development or medium density residential development, and</u></p> <p><u>(ii) (iv) the proposal contributes to housing affordability through a general increase in housing choice and supply or through providing non-market housing; and</u></p> <p><u>(c) when considering the significance of the proposal's contribution to a matter in (ba), this means that the proposal's contribution:</u></p> <p><u>(i) is of high yield relative to either the forecast demand or the identified shortfall,</u></p> <p><u>(ii) will be realised in a timely (i.e., rapid) manner and earlier than any urban development anticipated by the district plan, and</u></p> <p><u>(iii) responds to demonstrated demand for the short-medium term in that particular location is likely to be taken up; and</u></p> <p><u>(iv) will facilitate a net increase in district wide up take in the short to medium term,</u></p> <p><u>(d) (d) the required development infrastructure can be provided effectively and efficiently for the proposal, and without material impact on the capacity provided by existing or committed development infrastructure planned development infrastructure provision to, or reduction in development infrastructure capacity available for, other feasible, likely to be realised developments, in the short-medium term, and</u></p>	<p>Policy UD.3: Responsive planning to <u>plan changes developments</u> that <u>provide for significant development capacity – consideration</u></p> <p><u>For local authorities with jurisdiction over part, or all, of an urban environment, When considering whether a change of a district plan for a urban development in accordance with clause (d) of Policy 55, particular regard shall be given to whether adds significantly to development capacity, the following criteria is must be met:</u></p> <p><u>When determining whether a plan change will be treated by a local authority as adding significantly to development capacity that is not otherwise enabled in a plan or is not in sequence with planned land release, the following criteria are to be applied:</u></p> <p><u>(i) contributes to establishing or maintaining the characteristics and qualities of a well-functioning urban environment identified in Policy 55(a)(ii) and Objective 22,</u></p> <p><u>(ii) is well-connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors,</u></p> <p><u>(a) (b) the proposal plan change makes a significant contribution to providing significant development capacity meeting a need identified in the latest Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment, or a shortage otherwise identified for:</u></p> <p><u>(i) a variety of housing that meets the a regional, district, or local shortages of housing in relation to the particular type, size, or format, or</u></p> <p><u>(ii) business space or land of a particular size or locational type, or</u></p> <p><u>(iii) community, cultural, health, or educational facilities; and</u></p> <p><u>(b) (iii) where it provides for housing, the proposal plan change will:</u></p> <p><u>(i) will apply a relevant residential zone or other urban zone that provides for high density development or medium density residential development, and</u></p> <p><u>(ii) (iv) the proposal contributes to increasing housing affordability through a general increase in housing choice and supply or through providing non-market housing; and</u></p> <p><u>(c) when considering the significance of the proposal's contribution to a matter in (ba), this means that the proposal's contribution:</u></p> <p><u>(i) is of high yield relative to either the forecast demand or the identified shortfall,</u></p> <p><u>(ii) will is likely to be realised in a timely (i.e., rapid) manner and earlier than any urban development anticipated by the district plan, and</u></p> <p><u>(iii) responds to demonstrated demand for the short-medium term in that particular location is likely to be taken up; and</u></p> <p><u>(iv) will facilitate a net increase in district wide up take in the short to medium term,</u></p>

Submission Point Ref.	Provision	Relief Sought by HCC (green text where relevant)	Section 42A report Recommendation		Recommended Amendments to Section 42A Version (blue text)
			Response	Recommended Changes (red text)	
		<p><u>that the capacity provided by existing or committed infrastructure may already be needed for and without material impact on planned development infrastructure provision to, or reduction in development infrastructure capacity available for,</u> other feasible, likely to be realised developments, in the short-medium term.</p> <p>...</p> <p>(See also our requested relief on definitions used in this policy)</p>		<p><u>(e) the proposal justifies the need for additional urban-zoned land as the most appropriate option to meet housing and business demand, including consideration of existing development capacity enabled within the urban area, and</u></p> <p><u>(f) the proposal can demonstrate it will mitigate any potential adverse effects on the ability of existing urban areas and rural areas to be well functioning, including by minimising potential land use conflicts and impacts on the feasibility, affordability, or deliverability of urban development anticipated by the district plan.</u></p>	<p><u>(d) (e)the required development infrastructure can be provided in an integrated, efficient and comprehensive manner effectively and efficiently for the proposal, and without material impact on the capacity provided by existing or committed development infrastructure. planned development infrastructure provision to, or reduction in development infrastructure capacity available for, other feasible, likely to be realised developments, in the short-medium term, and</u></p> <p><u>(e) the proposal justifies the need for additional urban-zoned land as the most appropriate option to meet housing and business demand, including consideration of existing development capacity enabled within the urban area, and</u></p> <p><u>(f) the proposal can demonstrate it will mitigate any potential adverse effects on the ability of existing urban areas and rural areas to be well functioning, including by minimising potential land use conflicts and impacts on the feasibility, affordability, or deliverability of urban development anticipated by the district plan.</u></p>