

## Summary of Public Submissions on Draft Plan Change 2 (Intensification)

Note: submissions shown highlighted blue are those where PC2 has been amended in response to the feedback received on draft PC2.

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
1.	Intensification	General Public	Not specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports appropriate, well considered residential intensification projects.</li> <li>Unclear on mechanisms KCDC plans to use to protect community interests and allow community members to have their say regarding individual projects.</li> <li>Interests of property developers must not be given precedence over the interests of affected communities.</li> <li>New developments, regardless of the intensity of dwellings, need to align closely and sustainably with a community's values and future vision.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
2.	Intensification	Landowner	Main Road South, Raumati South	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brilliant idea to intensify the area.</li> <li>Close to public transport options, so a good option for commuters travelling into Wellington city and access to services in Paraparaumu. Easy access to schools and active transport for young families.</li> <li>Replacing the 70/80's houses with quality townhouses at a reasonable price would improve the housing stock of the district.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
3.	Intensification	Landowner	Panorama Drive, Paraparaumu	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oppose the deletion of the Low Density Housing Zone, Precinct 12 – Panorama Drive.</li> <li>Zone is on the boundary of the residential and rural zones, provides a visual transition in housing density.</li> <li>Housing intensification will lead to increased Resource Consent applications to remove small sections of bush, which individually are minor but cumulatively will remove the natural and visual environmental benefits.</li> <li>Infrastructure in the precinct is limited. Concerns regarding internet connections for existing and future residents.</li> <li>~50% of dwellings in the precinct are off private roads, intensification would require a component of the development levy refunded to the existing landowners for the maintenance and repair of their existing assets.</li> <li>Properties have rules for subdivision registered against their titles (regarding maximum building heights, house positioning, section sizes etc.). What would the mechanism be for removing or altering these rules against existing titles? Additional housing would not always have road frontage without gaining a RoW over current private roads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including around Panorama Drive.</li> <li>Ecological sites (which include large areas of bush) in the Panorama Drive area that are scheduled within the District Plan will continue to be protected by operative District Plan provisions.</li> <li>Changes to the District Plan will not affect existing covenants on/over land.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
4.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A lot of empty land along Kāpiti Coast which could be used for housing, rather than intensifying current housing builds.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements to roading, medical centres, shops etc. are required.</li> </ul>	
5.	Intensification	Transpower	National Grid	Supports in part	<p>Notes the definition of 'Qualifying Matter Area' includes the National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor, and considers this appropriate given sections 77K and 77Q of the RMA</p> <p>Supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the new definition of 'Qualifying Matter Area' to the extent that the definition includes the National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor</li> <li>the following rules being part of the IPI: INF-MENU-R30, R31, and R38; and SUB-DW-R14 and R22</li> <li>the notification of the operative District Plan provisions in a manner that provides for the same activity status for the relevant subdivision and development activity as is included in the operative District Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought</b></p> <p>Generally supports new Policy UFD-Px but seeks an amendment to reflect and align with the outcomes required by the qualifying matters and rules included as part of the IPI that relate to the National Grid. That is, the Rules that regulate activities and buildings near the National Grid direct that certain activities and buildings are inappropriate within the National Grid Yard (as opposed to the height of density of buildings).</p> <p>The amendment that Transpower suggests to wording in the operative District Plan is as follows (shown bold and double underlined):</p> <p><u>"Provide for heights and densities of urban built form that enable more people to live in, and more businesses and community to be located in, the District's urban environment by:</u></p> <p>...</p> <p><u>While avoiding inappropriate <b>buildings, activities,</b> heights and densities within qualifying matter areas."</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relief sought by the submitter is consistent with the intent of the policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy UFD-Px is amended as follows (amendment is identified with a double underline):</li> </ul> <p><u>"Provide for heights and densities of urban built form that enable more people to live in, and more businesses and community to be located in, the District's urban environment by:</u></p> <p>...</p> <p><u>While avoiding inappropriate <b>buildings, activities,</b> heights and densities within qualifying matter areas."</u></p>
6.	Intensification	Cancer Society of New Zealand Inc., Wellington Division	Not Specific	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly supports the proposal to change the District Plan. We applaud KCDC for acknowledging the necessity of shade provision in planning guides.</li> <li>Feedback focuses on built and natural shade provision as part of the Proposed Residential Design Guide (Appendix C) and Proposed Centres Design Guide (Appendix D).</li> <li>KCDC is in a unique position to ensure that sun protection options are provided in all new housing</li> </ul>	<p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Centres and Residential Design Guides have been amended to include a guideline that requires consideration of the need to provide summer shade.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					development and shared outdoor public places, particularly with respect to shade. We recommend that requirements for shade provision be included in updated guides and regulations for public spaces and housing of all types.	
7.	Intensification	KiwiRail	Areas adjacent to the rail corridor	Support in part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased housing density around rail network will increase the number of people subject to rail noise and vibration.</li> <li>MDRS 1m boundary setback will result in larger number of buildings very close to rail corridor.</li> <li>Concerned about adverse effects on nearby residents and reverse sensitivity effects on operation of the rail network.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <p>KiwiRail wants the rail corridor recognised as a qualifying matter (as enabled by the Amendment Act), and seeks Draft PC2 is amended to apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Setbacks of 5m from the rail corridor as a permitted activity standard for sites that adjoin the rail corridor.</li> <li>An increased distance from the rail corridor for the application of existing acoustic insulation and ventilation permitted activity standards (from 40m to 100m).</li> <li>New vibration controls for any new (or altered) sensitive uses within 60m of the rail corridor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The operative district plan includes reverse sensitivity controls for noise sensitive activities established within 40m of the rail corridor designation (NOISE-R14). These will continue to apply.</li> <li>The amendments sought by KiwiRail would place additional development restrictions over a significant number of properties in the district adjacent to the rail corridor designation.</li> <li>Evidence would be required to support the inclusion of additional development restrictions, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence demonstrating how reverse sensitivity of development in relation to the rail corridor is a resource management issue specific to the Kāpiti Coast District;</li> <li>Evidence that the package of additional restrictions sought (including the spatial extents proposed) are the most efficient and effective means of managing reverse sensitivity effects on the rail corridor in the Kāpiti Coast District;</li> <li>Information on the vibration controls proposed, and evidence that these can be reasonably complied with through the design and construction of the types of development that the vibration controls would apply to;</li> <li>Evidence of alternative approaches investigated by Kiwirail to manage reverse sensitivity effects, including measures that could be undertaken within the rail corridor;</li> <li>Consideration of the costs imposed on new development as a result of complying with the restrictions, and whether these are reasonable in light of the alternative approaches investigated.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Additional evidence would also be required in order to meet the requirements of s77J(3) and s77P(3).</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
8.	Intensification	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waka Kotahi supports the proposed amendments to the Urban Form and Development chapter, allowing for greater heights around urban centres, in residential zones and in relation to papakāinga development. The changes not only align with the NPS-UD direction, but also Waka Kotahi guiding strategies, Arataki and Toitū te</li> </ul>	<p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MCZ-P8, TCZ-P8 (as well as LCZ-P6 and MUZ-P7) have been amended consistent with the relief sought.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>Taiao. Waka Kotahi also supports the simplification of precincts in the General Residential Zone, as proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waka Kotahi also supports the intent and content of the Centres Design Guide with design principles and guidelines that provide a useful resource for potential designers of high-density (town centre) development. The guide could be strengthened with greater emphasis on the important of integrating land-use and transport. This would improve liveability, accessibility, sense of place and safety, and enables sustainable transport behaviour.</li> <li>Waka Kotahi supports the proposed amendments to increase density and considers that integrating land-use with transport will be key to achieving further aspirations outlined in Te Tupu Pai and through the Wellington Regional Growth Framework (WRGF) under the Wellington Regional Leadership Committee (WRLC).</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MCZ-P5 - Amend MCZ-P5.4 to include "...maximised, with safe and direct micromobility routes."</li> <li>MCZ-P8 - For the sake of clarity and concision, remove references to other zones in this policy, and amend to "buildings of up to 12 storeys".</li> <li>MCZ-R7 - Amend MCZ-Diagram 1 to show the maximum permitted height at 21m, rather than 11m.</li> <li>TCZ-P3 - Amend TCZ-P3.4 to include "...maximised, with safe and direct micromobility routes."</li> <li>TCZ-P6 - For the sake of clarity and concision, remove references to other zones in this policy, and amend to "buildings of up to six storeys".</li> <li>TCZ-R6 - Amend TCZ-Diagram 1 to show the maximum permitted height at 12m, rather than 11m.</li> <li>Appendix 4 - On page 1's Why the design guide is necessary section add 'integrated' the text: "There is a heightened emphasis on the need for integrated higher density residential, commercial and mixed-use development..."</li> <li>Appendix 4 - On page 1, some reference to improved accessibility to services/amenities by low-emission modes would help. For example: "Mixed-use density improves choice of access to essential services including education, health as well as employment and retail services"</li> <li>Appendix 4 - In the design principles section, attention could be given to creating an environment that enables, caters to, encourages sustainable transport behaviour. This can include on-site design approaches that encourage active transport, and site-adjacent public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MCZ-R7, TCZ-R6 (as well as LCZ-R6, MUZ-R6 and HOSZ-R6) have been amended consistent with the relief sought.</li> <li>Appendix 4 (Centres Design Guide) page 1 has been updated consistent with the relief sought.</li> <li>Appendix 3 (Residential Design Guide) and Appendix 4 (Centres Design Guide) have been amended to include the following principle: "Create an environment that enables, supports and encourages sustainable transport behaviour."</li> </ul> <p><b>The following changes have not been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies MCZ-P5 and TCZ-P3, as these policies are considered sufficiently broad to enable micromobility to be considered as an opportunity for transport choice and efficiency to be maximised, without explicitly stating it.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					realm street / neighbourhood design as appropriate to the context.	
9.	Intensification	Landowner	Rangihiroa Street, Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the draft amendment to the District Plan allowing for 3x3 storey houses to be built.</li> <li>• Will remove the amenity values of the area (look, feel and character) as a quiet beach suburb.</li> <li>• Infrastructure and resources are already strained, and this proposal will result in more pressure. This includes the roads which will require costly and disruptive upgrades, particularly following the extensive development of State Highway 1.</li> <li>• The Waikanae Beach area is a tsunami zone and a large portion of the land is drained swamp, which creates additional flooding (and possible liquefaction) problems that would make it unsuitable for the development of multiple storey buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>• The Council has considered whether “special character areas” could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>• The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter.</li> <li>• Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
10.	Intensification	Landowner	Ngapaki Street, Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the draft amendment to the District Plan allowing for 3x3 storey houses to be built.</li> <li>• Will remove the amenity values of the area (look, feel and character) as a quiet beach suburb.</li> <li>• Many elderly residents in the area who have sought this location for the relaxation and enjoyment it offers. A risk this will not be maintained with the type of in-fill development proposed for the area.</li> <li>• The Waikanae Beach area is a tsunami zone and a large portion of the land is drained swamp, which creates additional flooding (and possible liquefaction) problems that would make it unsuitable for the development of multiple storey buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>• The Council has considered whether “special character areas” could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>• The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter.</li> <li>• Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<p>methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</p> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
11.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Competing information from the Ministry about where to build, so it would be sensible for KCDC to use section 77G to pause intensification in coastal areas that have a population under 5000 until their position becomes clearer.</li> <li>This should include the KCDC completing work on its coastal areas and a reconsideration of local centres and whether they are correctly zoned.</li> <li>The current draft is based on incomplete information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether the exemption for areas with a population under 5,000 can be applied, and found that this exemption cannot be applied to any areas in the District.</li> <li>There is no evidence to support a change in the location or extent of centres identified within the District's centre's hierarchy as part of PC2, in light of the requirement to incorporate the MDRS and give effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>Planning for managing the risks associated with coastal hazards is subject to a separate planning process (through Takutai Kāpiti).</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
12.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The 15-Minute City</b> Plan Change 2 (PC2) adopts walkable catchments of 400m and 800m to define areas of intensification around commercial areas and railway stations. This is a legacy of New Urbanism that fails to account for the diversity of people in our community, their reasons for travel and the range of mobility options now available. Current research and best practice promotes walkable catchments of 15 minutes, not 400m or 800m. <b>Relief sought by submitter:</b> Extend General Residential Zone Precincts A and B to 1.2km from commercial areas and railway stations.</li> <li><b>Missing Middle Housing</b> Missing middle housing is a modern housing paradigm that enables a variety of housing types to cater for a diverse community. The vacant lot requirements proposed in PC2 will discourage housing diversity and result in over-developed sites. This is because larger vacant lots incentivise out-of-scale development, like townhouses and apartments. Smaller lots, on the other hand, enable built form that is consistent with neighbourhood character and often more affordable. Current research and best practice promotes removing density standards from land use regulations. <b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An 800m walkable catchment (approximately 10 minutes walk) is considered a sufficient walkable catchment for the purposes of policy 3 of the NPS-UD. This distance is supported by the Ministry for the Environment's implementation guidance.</li> <li>The provisions of PC2 will enable a variety of housing types and sizes.</li> <li>Minimum allotment sizes do not apply for allotments that include residential units. Minimum allotment sizes only apply where subdivision will create a vacant allotment.</li> <li>It is not considered appropriate to provide for mixed use activity in Residential Intensification Precincts, as the policies within the Business Activities chapter seek to consolidate commercial activities in the district's centres zones.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>Remove minimum vacant lot size requirements (or significantly reduce them).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Smart Growth</b>  The areas created by PC2 where four and six storey development will be enabled do not provide for the social, cultural, and economic land uses that are required to support this level of intensification. Mixed use development must be enabled across an intensified residential zone if transport transformation is to be achieved. Combining residential, commercial and recreational land uses together reduces car dependency (making active travel and public transportation more viable) and improves quality of life. Current research and best practice promotes mixed use development.  <b>Relief sought by submitter:</b> </li> <li>Enable mixed use development in proposed General Residential Zone Precincts A and B.</li> </ul>	
13.	Intensification	Landowner	Waimea Road, Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allowing/enabling intensification in an area like Waikanae Beach, a flood zone with serious water table issues, is spectacularly reckless in the face of predicted sea-level rise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>Development that may occur in areas subject to flood hazard is managed will be subject to the District Plan's flood hazard provisions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
14.	Intensification	Landowner	Te Moana Road, Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the changes to the district plan for Waikanae Beach, in particular the residential intensification for the area marked as precinct x2.</li> <li>Fully support Waikanae Beach remaining as a special character area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether "special character areas" could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
15.	Intensification	Landowner	Ngapaki Street, Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the draft amendment to the District Plan allowing for 3x3 storey houses to be built.</li> <li>Will remove the amenity values of the area (look, feel and character) as a quiet beach suburb.</li> <li>The Waikanae Beach area is a tsunami zone and a large portion of the land is drained swamp, which creates additional flooding (and possible liquefaction) problems that would make it unsuitable for the development of multiple storey buildings.</li> <li>Infrastructure will need to be upgraded, which is disruptive and costly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether "special character areas" could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter.</li> <li>Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<p>development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effects on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
16.	Intensification	General Public (Note that this submitter submitted twice on the same matter. Only one submission summary has been included.)	Paraparaumu	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PRECx1 should be drawn to include all the properties on Main Road South (old SH1) between Ihakara Street and the corner of Raumati Road (extending the proposed PRECx1 boundary drawn at the original boundary of 104 Main Road South).</li> <li>The currently proposed boundary between PRECx1 and the Gen Residential Zone on Main Road South is only 475m from the Ihakara Street starting point. It needs to be applied to the extent and requirements laid out in the NPS-UD, 800m from edge of metropolitan zone.</li> <li>Will increase the number of housing units given the current low density in that zone. The area on Main Road South is prime for 6 storey buildings, which will not impact sunlight given the closeness of the hillside to the east.</li> <li>There appear to be no publicised 'qualifying matters' that stop this from being done.</li> <li>In the event that the recommendation above is not accepted, as a minimum the boundary of the PRECx1 needs to be extended to the southern boundary of 114 Main Road South.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has recently been a new footpath constructed on Main South Road in the area identified by the submitter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent of PRECx1 has been updated to account for the construction of the new footpath.</li> </ul>
17.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oppose the intensification of all existing suburbs, including the use of 3 or more storey buildings.</li> <li>Neighbouring houses will be shaded, outlooks will be ugly and the character of the existing neighbourhoods will be destroyed. Reduced garden size and peoples</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>connection to nature. Costs on mental health, physical health and social aspects.</p> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce vehicle garaging. Stop catering for as many cars at schools, retail and sports to encourage use of public transport and cycling. Do not limit the mobility of those who require vehicular mobility.</li> <li>• Build up on new subdivision where you can design for sun and sanity.</li> </ul>	
18.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the amendment to the district plan to allow neighbours to build 3 storey houses in Waikanae.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
19.	Intensification	Landowner	Waikanae	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of the proposed changes.</li> <li>• Currently a housing shortage, so an increase of good quality, well located houses is needed. Improve affordability of the housing stock and hopes more social housing will be implemented. Open the Kapiti Coast area for more people to enjoy.</li> <li>• Happy to see higher density housing in the neighbourhood and trust the impact will be well-managed by KCDC, with designs sympathetic to the area.</li> <li>• Increase of ratepayers will help fund growth and amenities in the area. Additional consumers will assist with the success of local businesses.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
20.	Intensification	Landowner	Paekākāriki	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to the intensification of development in Paekākāriki.</li> <li>• Paekākāriki community has not asked for intensification changes, and are in excess of the needs.</li> <li>• The overall adverse effects on nature will be extreme.</li> <li>• KCDC should prepare a section 32 analysis or equivalent and restart the public consultation process again, so that the community is fully informed before submitting.</li> <li>• Intensification is inappropriate because it will not reduce greenhouse gas emissions and will not sustain the current resilience of the community to the effects of climate change.</li> <li>• Paekākāriki has a population of less than 10,000 and is therefore not appropriate to be regarded as part of a larger market proxy.</li> <li>• Paekākāriki does not currently have adequate qualifying matters such as access to supermarket, primary school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Paekākāriki.</li> <li>• Paekākāriki is part of the Kāpiti Coast housing and labour market, which has a population of greater than 10,000 people.</li> <li>• Paekākāriki has access to open space and a primary school.</li> <li>• The absence of a supermarket from an area is not prescribed as a qualifying matter under s77I or s77O of the RMA.</li> <li>• There are a range of provisions contained in the operative District Plan, Proposed Natural Resources Plan and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater that manage the effects of development in relation to waterbodies.</li> <li>• Rules that restrict development in relation to heritage buildings that are scheduled in the District Plan will continue to apply as a qualifying matter.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>with capacity and open space. It is unlikely that these qualifying matter limitations can be remedied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intensification will reduce natural flows in the regionally significant indigenous fauna habitat of Wainui Stream. It will also increase flood flows and contaminated run-off.</li> <li>• Intensification will not protect and restore the Wainui Stream which is of cultural and traditional significance to Māori.</li> <li>• Intensification will be limited due to the number of heritage buildings limiting development in the Local Centre Zone.</li> <li>• Intensification will cause increased tsunami risk to the built environment.</li> <li>• Intensification will destroy the low-key beach character that the community wishes to retain.</li> <li>• KCDC has not provided the community with adequate open space. The community requested Tilley Road Triangle Reserve as a public open space Neighbourhood Park.</li> <li>• Water supply is currently inadequate and incapable of supplying additional population.</li> <li>• Paekākāriki does not have sewage infrastructure and the current septic tanks are unsuited to intense development.</li> <li>• The roading network pinch point is not suitable for an increase in traffic through the Beach Road Local Centre 30km/h pedestrian precinct and railway crossing.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paekākāriki be excluded from intensification measures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council has considered whether “special character areas”, including the Beach Residential Precinct at Paekākāriki, could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>• Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> <li>• Effects on the demand for stormwater, roading, water supply and open space infrastructure at Paekākāriki are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council’s Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process under the Local Government Act.</li> <li>• New development in Paekākāriki will be required to comply with a range of rules and standards under the District Plan, Proposed Natural Resources Plan, and Building Code in relation to the discharge of wastewater on site (such as through septic tank systems). This may limit the amount of development that would be realised until such time as Paekākāriki is connected to a reticulated sewer system. However, the absence of wastewater infrastructure at Paekākāriki does not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
21.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the proposal to increase building height limits to 3 storeys.</li> <li>• Beach areas should be special character areas with low-rise intensification only. Keep the scale of building harmonious.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>• The Council has considered whether “special character areas” could be provided for but found that they did not</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve vistas of the ranges, Kapiti Island and sunsets when walking around the area.</li> <li>• Ensure nature (trees, shrubs, grasses, sand dunes) aren't totally overwhelmed by the built landscape.</li> </ul>	<p>meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft PC2 includes policies that apply within the Beach Residential Precinct that requires consideration be given to effects on landform and established vegetation, where proposed development is of a greater density than required by the MDRS or policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
22.	Intensification	KCDC Older Persons' Council	Waikanae	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the high level of development proposed under the draft plan.</li> <li>• The existing character of the Waikanae Garden precinct would be irretrievably altered and lost. Not just for property owners, but many others who live outside that precinct and value being able to walk through green space without the 'passive surveillance' intensification brings.</li> <li>• The NPS-UD does not state that intensification development needs to go 360° around the town centre, nor is it clear whether the existing Metlink rail service deserves to qualify as a rapid transit stop.</li> <li>• Ensure the healing power of nature and birdsong is retained – actively protect and enhance it.</li> <li>• Consider the varying untenable pressures that will be brought to bear on schools and social infrastructure such as library and Chartered Club facilities.</li> <li>• Existing roading, drainage and water infrastructure will be under increase demand in an environment where increased traffic volumes are detrimental to pedestrians.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If only a minor proportion of 'redevelopment' or 'infill' capacity is currently needed, then the existing special zoning areas should be retained in the interim, with the MDRS intensification experimentally applied to the non-precinct general residential areas until issues and problems with the MDRS intensification can be fully appreciated and handled.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae.</li> <li>• The Council has considered whether "special character areas" could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>• Waikanae train station meets the definition of a rapid transit stop outlined in the NPS-UD.</li> <li>• Planning for the expansion of the school network to respond to projected population growth is the responsibility of the Ministry of Education.</li> <li>• Effects of new development on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
23.	Intensification	Landowner	Ngapaki Street, Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the draft amendment to the District Plan allowing for 3x3 storey houses to be built.</li> <li>• Will remove the amenity values of the area (look, feel and character) as a quiet beach suburb.</li> <li>• The Waikanae Beach area is a tsunami zone and a large portion of the land is drained swamp, which creates additional flooding (and possible liquefaction) problems that would make it unsuitable for the development of multiple storey buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>• The Council has considered whether "special character areas" could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>• The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure will need to be upgraded, which is disruptive and costly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> <li>Effects on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
24.	Intensification	Landowner	Major Durie Place, Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the proposal allowing for three storey houses in Waikanae.</li> <li>Recognises that providing for 6 storey buildings in areas close to rapid transit stops and metropolitan centres is important for the country's future.</li> <li>Not in my backyard, thanks.</li> <li>3 storeys in Waikanae will not qualify the area as one of special significance or high quality housing.</li> <li>There has been no consideration for daylight or sunlight planes, site coverage density, off-street parking and vehicle access, ground water percolation areas or runoff, sewerage servicing, or privacy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>The provisions proposed as part of PC2 are enabling only. The provisions do not require anyone to undertake development in their back yard should they choose not to.</li> <li>Consideration has been given to the potential effects of intensification on a range of matters, including daylight, sunlight, vehicle access and parking, stormwater runoff, sewerage servicing and privacy. A number of these matters are provided for through operative and proposed District Plan provisions (where this is authorised by the Act).</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
25.	Intensification	General Public	The Coastal Environment	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>KCDC is confronted by a conflict between central government directives. The Draft National Adaptation Plan and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement direct development away from areas that may subject to coastal hazards. On the other hand, the MDRS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The spatial extent of the Coastal Environment outlined in the District Plan maps is not, of itself, a qualifying matter.</li> <li>PC2 provides for a range of qualifying matters that relate to natural hazards within the area identified as the</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>amendment to the Resource Management Act requires KCDC to enable intensification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MDRS zoning in the area where the coastal environment is dominant will enable and encourage a massive increase in the amount of public and private assets exposed to inundation, both from intense rainfall events and sea surges, and tsunami risk.</li> <li>The Kāpiti District differs markedly from other Tier 1 authorities in the region in that much of the residential area of Kāpiti is essentially sand dunes, wetlands and low-lying areas subject to inundation and other coastal hazards. This area is decisively not suitable for intensification of the type the MDRS is intended to promote.</li> <li>KCDC's obligation is to prioritise coastal hazard management over intensification.</li> <li>The precautionary approach requires KCDC to invoke the NZCPS as a qualifying matter to exempt all areas where the District Plan maps describe the coastal environment as dominant from the MDRS.</li> <li>The recognition of the Special Character of the Beach Residential Zones is a further qualifying matter. This would require KCDC to undertake the analysis spelt out in s77G of the RMA. Other councils are applying this section and KCDC should also.</li> </ul>	<p>Coastal Environment in the District Plan maps. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct (which represents an area potentially susceptible to coastal erosion hazard over the next 100 years);</li> <li>Flood hazard category areas and associated provisions provided for in the operative District Plan;</li> <li>Fault avoidance areas and associated provisions provided for in the operative District Plan.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council has considered whether "special character areas" could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
26.	Intensification	Landowner	Rangihiroa Street, Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the draft amendment to the District Plan allowing for 3x3 storey houses to be built.</li> <li>The Waikanae Beach area is a tsunami zone and a large portion of the land is drained swamp, which creates additional flooding (and possible liquefaction) problems that would make it unsuitable for the development of multiple storey buildings.</li> <li>Infrastructure will need to be upgraded, which is disruptive and costly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter.</li> <li>Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> <li>Effects on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<p>development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</p> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
27.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not support KCDC's over the top plans for building intensification.</li> <li>Supports a degree of housing intensification and the development of 'walkable neighbourhoods' with bike paths and short cuts. But not at the expense of destroying the relaxed beach-side character of our neighbourhoods.</li> <li>Strongly opposes 12 storey buildings in central Paraparaumu.</li> <li>Strongly opposes buildings up to 6 storeys anywhere in Kāpiti.</li> <li>Strongly opposes the deletion of the 'special character' designations and design guides (APP3) for Ōtaki Beach, Waikanae Beach, Raumati and Paekākāriki.</li> <li>KCDC's proposed 6 and 12 storey buildings will be built on sand and swamp.</li> <li>Walkable neighbourhoods can be created with a degree of infilling and intensification, but not to this degree of inappropriate high rise building.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether "special character areas" could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>The structural stability of buildings developed on a range of soil types is managed under the Building Act 2004 and clause B1 of the Building Code.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
28.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the plan change allowing for 3x3 storey houses to be built.</li> <li>It would be a lack of foresight to allow intensive development in areas such as Waikanae Beach when properties could be subject to sea level rise.</li> <li>Waikanae Beach is in a flood zone and increasingly heavy rainfall already causes severe flooding for many properties. Intensive development increases the amount of impermeable surfaces which adds to the flooding issues.</li> <li>Drainage infrastructure in Waikanae is already stretched, intensive development will compound the problem of flooding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>The potential effects of sea level rise have been considered in the development of PC2. This has been considered through the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and through providing for existing flood hazard provisions as an existing qualifying matter.</li> <li>The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter.</li> <li>Effects on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
29.	Intensification	Low Carbon Kāpiti (LCK)	Not specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall we support Draft Plan Change 2: Intensification. From a climate perspective, it will create positive steps to encourage carbon reductions and help to mitigate against the impacts of climate change.</li> <li>There are some areas where LCK would like to see improvements.</li> <li><b>Tiny Homes:</b> LCK believes that tiny homes can play a significant role in alleviating the housing crisis and meeting the needs of population growth that Kāpiti is expecting, while minimising the impact on the environment. <b>Relief sought by submitter:</b> LCK would like to see KCDC enable the addition of tiny homes to existing sections and their connection to infrastructure as a part of its planning framework. Would also like to see KCDC develop mechanisms that prevent the unnecessary stifling of innovation in new development and building design, including the building of tiny homes.</li> <li><b>Green space and urban trees:</b> While densification is necessary and offers many benefits for our communities, it must be done in a way that maintains or enhances green space and provides for the retention, where possible, of mature trees. Daylighting of streams should also be a strong consideration during development. <b>Relief sought by submitter:</b> Through developing in a way that enhances, not detracts from, our environment and biodiversity, KCDC will help our communities to thrive, and to cope better with the flood events that are all too common in our District.</li> <li><b>Quality development:</b> Standards such as the New Zealand Green Building Council's Homestar are well established tools that support the building of environmentally friendly buildings, including homes. <b>Relief sought by submitter:</b> We would like to see KCDC incentivise environmentally friendly buildings in order to help motivate developers to build in a manner that minimises impact on the environment.</li> <li>Where existing dwellings are being removed to make room for new development, KCDC should explore ways to make it easier for buildings to be sold for removal and/or materials to be reused, to minimise construction waste going to landfill.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Tiny homes" are enabled by PC2, however they will need to comply with a range of other policies and regulations that sit outside the District Plan (for example, the Building Act 2004 and Building Code). These other requirements cannot be addressed by PC2.</li> <li>Tiny Homes must also be connected to infrastructure and are liable to pay development contributions under the Local Government Act. This cannot be changed by PC2, but rather would require review of the policy as part of the Council's Long-term Plan process.</li> <li>New development will be subject to development or financial contributions to fund the upgrade or provision of open space in accordance with the Council's Open Space Strategy. This recognises the relationship between intensification and increased demand for open space.</li> <li>Trees that are within ecological sites or are scheduled as key indigenous trees or notable trees in the District Plan will continue to be protected under PC2. In addition to this, development is required to set aside 20% of the site area for grass or planting. However, further protection of trees would require new ecological sites to be identified and scheduled, or new trees to be scheduled, within the District Plan.</li> <li>PC2 includes Design Guides that encourage energy efficient and environmentally sustainable design. However incentivising development to exceed the Building Code requirements for energy efficiency may require policies and methods that are beyond the scope of PC2, and/or are beyond the scope of the District Plan.</li> <li>While relocation of any building in the General Residential Zone is already a permitted activity, recycling of building materials is a matter that may need to be incentivised through methods outside of the District Plan.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
30.	Intensification	Landowner	Waikanae	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the development of 3 storey town houses near the Kāpiti Expressway on/off ramps.</li> <li>Opposes the development of 3 storey town houses in the Waikanae Beach area. Would be out of character with the Olde Beach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether “special character areas” could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
31.	Intensification	Landowner	Rangihiroa Street, Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to the proposed intensification of housing in the Waikanae area.</li> <li>The area has recently become a Special Character Zone. The proposed intensification would destroy what has only recently been approved.</li> <li>It would be inappropriate to ignore erosion and inundation advice and allow intensification of housing and commercial development in the Waikanae area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether “special character areas” could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>Erosion and inundation advice has been considered in providing for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and providing for flood hazard areas as an existing qualifying matter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
32.	Intensification	General Public	Peka Peka	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the proposed intensification at Peka Peka.</li> <li>The area does not have sufficient infrastructure to support any large increase in population.</li> <li>The lack of an off ramp from the expressway into Peka Peka and/or Te Horo does not support ease of movement for a larger population.</li> <li>It is important to keep green space and keep the village feel for these smaller rural areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS, including in the General Residential Zone at Peka Peka.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether a lack of infrastructure at Peka Peka could be provided for as a qualifying matter but found that it did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>Effects of new development on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
33.	Intensification	Landowner	Rangihiroa Street, Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the draft amendment to the District Plan allowing for 3x3 storey houses to be built.</li> <li>Will remove the amenity values of the area (look, feel and character) as a quiet beach suburb. In-fill housing like this will further strain resources and infrastructure, which are already under intense pressure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether “special character areas” could be provided for but found that they did not</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Waikanae Beach area is a tsunami zone and a large portion of the land is drained swamp, which creates additional flooding (and possible liquefaction) problems that would make it unsuitable for the development of multiple storey buildings.</li> </ul>	<p>meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter.</li> <li>Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> <li>Effects on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
34.	Intensification	Landowner	Paekākāriki	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to the intensification of development in Paekākāriki.</li> <li>Paekākāriki community has not asked for intensification changes, and are in excess of the needs.</li> <li>The overall adverse effects on nature will be extreme.</li> <li>KCDC should prepare a section 32 analysis or equivalent and restart the public consultation process again, so that the community is fully informed before submitting.</li> <li>Intensification is inappropriate because it will not reduce greenhouse gas emissions and will not sustain the current resilience of the community to the effects of climate change.</li> <li>Paekākāriki has a population of less than 10,000 and is therefore not appropriate to be regarded as part of a larger market proxy.</li> <li>Paekākāriki does not currently have adequate qualifying matters such as access to supermarket, primary school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Paekākāriki.</li> <li>Paekākāriki is part of the Kāpiti Coast housing and labour market, which has a population of greater than 10,000 people.</li> <li>Paekākāriki has access to open space and a primary school.</li> <li>The absence of a supermarket from an area is not prescribed as a qualifying matter under s771 or s770 of the RMA.</li> <li>There are a range of provisions contained in the operative District Plan, Proposed Natural Resources Plan and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater that manage the effects of development in relation to waterbodies.</li> <li>Rules that restrict development in relation to heritage buildings that are scheduled in the District Plan will continue to apply as a qualifying matter.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>with capacity and open space. It is unlikely that these qualifying matter limitations can be remedied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensification will reduce natural flows in the regionally significant indigenous fauna habitat of Wainui Stream. It will also increase flood flows and contaminated run-off.</li> <li>Intensification will not protect and restore the Wainui Stream which is of cultural and traditional significance to Māori.</li> <li>Intensification will be limited due to the number of heritage buildings limiting development in the Local Centre Zone.</li> <li>Intensification will cause increased tsunami risk to the built environment.</li> <li>Intensification will destroy the low-key beach character that the community wishes to retain.</li> <li>KCDC has not provided the community with adequate open space. The community requested Tilley Road Triangle Reserve as a public open space Neighbourhood Park.</li> <li>Water supply is currently inadequate and incapable of supplying additional population.</li> <li>Paekākāriki does not have sewage infrastructure and the current septic tanks are unsuited to intense development.</li> <li>The roading network pinch point is not suitable for an increase in traffic through the Beach Road Local Centre 30km/h pedestrian precinct and railway crossing.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paekākāriki be excluded from intensification measures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council has considered whether “special character areas”, including the Beach Residential Precinct at Paekākāriki, could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> <li>Effects on the demand for stormwater, roading, water supply and open space infrastructure at Paekākāriki are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council’s Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process under the Local Government Act.</li> <li>New development in Paekākāriki will be required to comply with a range of rules and standards under the District Plan, Proposed Natural Resources Plan, and Building Code in relation to the discharge of wastewater on site (such as through septic tank systems). This may limit the amount of development that would be realised until such time as Paekākāriki is connected to a reticulated sewer system. However, the absence of wastewater infrastructure at Paekākāriki does not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
35.	Intensification	General Public	Kāpiti Road, Paraparaumu	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oppose the proposal regarding medium/high density housing. Particularly the proposed development of 240 Kāpiti Road.</li> <li>Off street parking should be enforced to allowing charging of EV cars.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>The District Plan is not allowed to require off street parking unless the requirement is for accessible parking.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development should be kept within character of the surrounding subdivision dwellings. Consideration must be given regarding the visual effects of the mass and dominance of unbroken structure affecting neighbouring properties. Bulk dominance will inevitably restrict sun exposure to close neighbouring dwellings, affecting mental health and wellbeing.</li> <li>Bulk dominance of such structures shall not limit access to emergency services (e.g. firefighting).</li> <li>All neighbouring properties affected by such a development should have direct consultation and notification of potential proposals. Considerations should be given to vulnerable population groups (e.g. the elderly).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> <li>Resource consent applications for developments that breach some density standards may be notified to neighbours where the effects are considered to be minor or more than minor.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
36.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hopes that future intensified developments are done well. Quality designs created with quality materials developed with due consideration to the environment can lead to good outcomes. However, when those factors are not present, outcomes for communities can be bad.</li> <li>The difficulty with removing RMA processes to avoid NIMBYism is that it places more power in the hands of developers who stand to make more profit from each parcel of land. While many developers will consider quality of community, the reality is that there will be many developers who seek only their own interests. Those will be the developments that become the slums of the future.</li> <li>There needs to be a mechanism in the Intensification Plan to ensure that the competing interests have a voice.</li> <li>At this stage there is not a clear solution. It is recommended that groups such as Raumati Village Business Association or the Kapiti Coast Chamber of Commerce be involved in developing standards for their areas. Other ideas will emerge in this space as consultation continues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Residential and Centres Design Guides are intended to encourage high-quality development.</li> <li>Resource consent applications for developments that breach permitted activity standards will still function as a mechanism to provide for the consideration of the effects of development on other persons. Resource consent applications for developments that breach some density standards may be notified to neighbours or other affected persons where the effects are considered to be minor or more than minor.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
37.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support an exemption for the RMA amendment applying to the residential areas of the Kāpiti Coast where coastal hazards are dominant.</li> <li>The area in Waikanae known as the 'Old Beach Area' is particularly at risk from inundation and erosion. This and other such areas should be exempted from intensification.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct addresses areas that have been identified as being potentially susceptible to coastal erosion hazard.</li> <li>The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter. These provisions will apply to many of the areas that have been identified as at risk from coastal inundation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
38.	Intensification	Cuttriss – Surveyors, Engineers, Planners	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of the proposed changes to allow greater intensity on the Kāpiti Coast in line with the Resource Management Amendment Act 2021.</li> <li>• Support rezoning parts of the District to General Residential and enabling greater building heights in areas well services by public transport or a major activity centre.</li> <li>• Support the inclusion of a Papakāinga chapter.</li> <li>• Provides the following comments for consideration:</li> <li>• Rezoning of all land currently zoned Rural Lifestyle to General Residential around or near the Kāpiti Airport. We note that this land may have some development restrictions around filling of ponds and flooding, however the land is within a predominantly urban context with land to the east, west and south all within an existing urban area.</li> <li>• Extending the new zones and precincts to accord with physical and environmental boundaries rather than strictly based on distance.</li> <li>• Rezoning land that was identified in Te Tupu Pai Growth Strategy as medium priority greenfield growth area to General Residential where the land or surrounds are already well serviced and located away from any significant natural hazards. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Land bounded by Ratanui Road and Otaihanga Roads which has services ‘at the gate’ and is surrounded by General Residential development to the north, east and west; and</li> <li>○ Land to the north of Manu Park development which also has services ‘at the gate’.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Whether minimum height or minimum land area provisions should be incorporated to encourage consolidation and enable better integrated development, rather than on a fragmented and ad-hoc basis.</li> <li>• Adopting a wind effects chapter where the changes significantly alter existing height restrictions such as in major centres.</li> <li>• Consider whether intensification above that enabled within the General Residential zoning around Kāpiti Airport have fully considered effects on aviation safety (Obstacle Limitation Surface, glare roofing, lighting).</li> <li>• Consolidation of similar rules for ease of navigation and interpretation (e.g. GZR-Rx4-6).</li> <li>• Clarify whether it is proposed to adopt the Subdivision and Development Principles 2012 into the District Plan so that future changes to standards would be subject to proper consultation as part of a plan change process.</li> <li>• Consider the naming of Land Development Minimum Requirements to something more akin to their actual</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the rezoning of additional land in the Rural Lifestyle Zoned area adjacent to the Airport (106, 112 and 128 Milne Drive): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There are a range of constraints identified on the northernmost properties (106, 112 and 128 Milne Drive), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Large areas of flood storage hazard;</li> <li>▪ Large waterbodies.</li> <li>▪ Obstacle limitation surfaces and air noise overlays associated with the airport runway.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Development in relation to the constraints noted above is managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions, designations, provisions contained within the Proposed Natural Resources Plan and provisions contained within the National Environmental Standards for Freshwater. On the basis of these provisions, it is unlikely that these sites will make a notable contribution to plan-enabled residential development capacity.</li> <li>○ However, it is considered that extending the rezoning proposed to this area to include these properties will regularise the zoning pattern in the area, consistent with the General Residential Zoning in the surrounding environment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Regarding rezoning of land identified as medium priority greenfield growth areas in <i>Te tupu pai</i>. Both sites are part of an area that is of a sufficient size and complexity to require a comprehensive approach to planning (such as structure planning) in order to enable cohesive future urban development, rather than ad-hoc rezoning. It would be more appropriate to consider these areas through a future urban development plan change, rather than as part of PC2.</li> <li>• Requiring development to be constructed to a minimum height or on a minimum land area as a permitted activity would be contrary to the requirements of Schedule 3A (the MDRS).</li> <li>• While it may be appropriate to consider a wind effects chapter within the District Plan, there is insufficient evidence to support this as part of PC2.</li> <li>• Intensification around Kāpiti Airport is subject to the requirements of the Kāpiti Airport designation, which includes restrictions on height in relation to obstacle limitation surfaces (KCAHL-001).</li> </ul>



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>purpose of the document being a Guideline, Principles or Standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removal of requirements on rainwater tanks and outdoor taps for up to 3 dwellings as there is no clear link between the proposed retention of this provision and a qualifying matter under the Act.</li> <li>Clarify whether there is capacity in existing infrastructure networks (water supply, wastewater, stormwater, electricity and roading) to cater for the proposed upzoning above the minimum changes the Council is required to make under the Act.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GRZ-Rx4 to 6 are required to be separated out in order to provide for the different notification preclusion requirements of Schedule 3A.</li> <li>PC2 will propose to amend references to the “Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements 2012” to the “Land Development Minimum Requirements”.</li> <li>The requirement to provide rainwater tanks for new development is and infrastructure provision that supports freshwater demand management. The requirement to provide rainwater tanks does not need to be considered as a qualifying matter, as the requirement does not alter any of the density standards required by the MDRS or policy 3 of the NPS-UD to be less enabling of development, nor does it preclude up to 3 dwellings being constructed on a site as a permitted activity.</li> <li>The Council’s HBA provides an assessment of existing and planned infrastructure capacity over the short, medium and long term.</li> <li>Effects on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council’s Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PC2 is amended to include the properties at 106, 112 and 128 Milne Drive in the General Residential Zone.</li> </ul>
39.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect beach areas from any increase in building height limit to 3 stories in the Waikanae Olde Beach area.</li> <li>The area has a unique character, which deserves protection from the negative impacts of intensification.</li> <li>Concerns regarding increased noise levels, limitations on parking for current residents and visitors.</li> <li>Current infrastructure is limited and will not support a significant increase in residents without major investment and disruption.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether “special character areas” could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>New development will continue to be subject to the noise provisions of the operative District Plan.</li> <li>Effects on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<p>projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</p> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
40.	Intensification	General Public (Note that this submitter submitted twice on the same matter. Only one submission summary has been included.)	Paraparaumu	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports higher density near the Metropolitan Centre Zone and transport hub. Will provide affordability and reduce transport needs.</li> <li>The measurement of the 800m walkable catchment for the Metropolitan Centre Zone has been poorly applied. The current drawn boundary between Residential Intensification Precinct A (PRECx1) and the Gen Residential Zone on Main Road South is only 475m from the Ihakara Street starting point. It needs to be applied to the extent and requirements laid out in the NPS-UD, that is 800m from the edge of the metropolitan zone.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 800m walking catchment from the edge of the Metropolitan zone needs to be consistently applied.</li> <li>The area on Main Road South between Ihakara Street and Raumati Road needs to be fully brought into the Residential Intensification Precinct A.</li> <li>The frontage on Main Road South is prime for six storey buildings. The height plane is of less impact given the proximity of the hillside to the east.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has recently been a new footpath constructed on Main South Road in the area identified by the submitter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent of PRECx1 has been updated to account for the construction of the new footpath.</li> </ul>
41.	Intensification	General Public	Residential Intensification Precinct A	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports Kaimanawa Street, Paraparaumu, being included in PRECx1 as it is General Residential zoned land within a walkable catchment.</li> <li>Supports building heights of up to 6 storeys in PRECx1.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mention that there is no minimum section lot size, allowing for creative and diverse building design within small lot sizes. This should be explicitly stated as a Permitted Activity in the PRECx1.</li> <li>The categories of 'single dwelling (+ one infill dwelling)', 'infill (up to three dwellings of three storeys on one site)' and 'dual occupancy (semi-) attached' should be included as Permitted Activities in PRECx1. This should be explicitly stated, as not all land parcels are suitable for terraced housing or apartments but are suitable for providing additional housing to Kāpiti.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provisions of PC2 already provide for the matters identified by the submitter. Single dwellings, infill (up to 3 dwellings per site), and dual occupancy/semi attached dwellings will all be permitted activities (subject to standards) within PRECx1 of the General Residential Zone.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
42.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the proposed amendment to the District Plan regarding intensification.</li> <li>No allowance has been made for the potential and documented uncertain risks from hazards (tsunami,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>inundation, erosion) that may apply to a large area within the Coastal Plain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many Kāpiti residential areas are on sand dunes, low lying areas and wetlands. Implementation of the Council's proposed intensification amendment could put an increasing number of public and private assets at risk.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coastal erosion, inundation and tsunami have been considered in the preparation of PC2.</li> <li>The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct addresses areas that have been identified as being potentially susceptible to coastal erosion hazard.</li> <li>The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter. These provisions will apply to many of the areas that have been identified as at risk from coastal inundation.</li> <li>Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> <li>The District Plan, Proposed Natural Resources Plan and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater contain a range of provisions that manage development in relation to wetlands.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
43.	Intensification	Waikanae Community Board (WCB)	Waikanae and Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not support the intensification of the Waikanae Garden and Waikanae Beach areas.</li> <li>The Waikanae Garden Area: The proposal to enable intensification and the building of multistorey buildings up to 6 storeys within 800m of the rail interchange will have significant potential to destroy this character.</li> <li>Waikanae Beach Area: The current proposal put forward for this area will mean that the Waikanae Beach community will lose its special character and charm that has created such a community spirit.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognise the need for intensification but not for the degree described in the proposed plan. WCB believe a maximum ceiling of three storeys within 800 meters of the rail interchange.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including in the Waikanae Garden Precinct and at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether "special character areas" could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maximum of three storeys for the Waikanae Beach area and commercial development limited to those areas already outlined in the current plan.</li> <li>Explore alternative methods that are available to protect the special character of our community that are afforded under the Act.</li> </ul>	
44.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exceptions can and should be made to intensification measures in areas which are exposed to natural hazards.</li> <li>Kāpiti is exposed to erosion, inundation, and tsunami which have been recognised in various KCDC reports. Provision is made in PC2 for erosion risk but not for inundation or tsunami.</li> <li>There has been a noticeable increase in ponding/flooding in the area since the Expressway became operational. The area cannot support this level of intensification without adding to the situation for existing residents who bear the cost of repairing inundation on their properties.</li> <li>Intensification is not justified to address the needs, there are many alternative locations and vast areas of development occurring already.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>Coastal erosion, inundation and tsunami have been considered in the preparation of PC2.</li> <li>The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct addresses areas that have been identified as being potentially susceptible to coastal erosion hazard.</li> <li>The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter. These provisions will apply to many of the areas that have been identified as at risk from coastal inundation.</li> <li>Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
45.	Intensification	Land Matters Limited (LML)	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given that the IPI process will only occur once, we think KCDC should utilise this opportunity to give effect to the MDRS in as many urban areas within the Coast as possible to ensure what is considered feasible development within the urban environment is not limited by taking too conservative approach.</li> <li>Concerned that if these sites are left to a plan change under the Schedule 1 process, that there would be significant delays and that land may not be available when the market requires it to be.</li> <li>Examples of land that should be considered for inclusion in PC2 include: Future Urban zone in Waikanae and Ōtaki</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IPI/ISPP process should only be used for the purposes outlined in s80E of the Act. The Council is mindful that the ISPP limits public involvement in the planning process, and as such careful consideration has been given to the discretionary matters that are included in the IPI, such as new areas of General Residential Zone.</li> <li>PC2 does include some areas of new General Residential Zone where they meet certain criteria. This includes some areas identified by the submitter. However, other more complex or larger areas identified by the submitter would require a more comprehensive approach to planning (such as structure planning) in order to enable cohesive future urban development in</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>Rural Lifestyle Zone along Hadfield Road in Waikanae and off Waitohu Road in Ōtaki</p> <p>Privately owned non-public accessible Open Space zoned land</p> <p>Greenfield rural zoned land to the east of Elizabeth Street, Waikanae</p> <p>Rural Zoned land located between Te Moana Road and the Waikanae River</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>KCDC is limited by the Act to prepare one IPI. Once publicly notified there are no opportunities for Appeal, other than on points of law. There are significant opportunities to ensure compact urban areas by rezoning greenfield land within close proximity of the existing built environment.</li> <li>Inclusion of other non-serviced land and identified in KCDC's Growth Strategy as being suitable in the short term for residential development should be considered within PC2.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly encourage KCDC to include Future Urban zoned land, some Rural Lifestyle zones, privately owned Open Space zoned land, and greenfield areas identified for residential development in the short term in KCDC's recently released Growth Strategy in PC2.</li> <li>Sites larger than 3,000m<sup>2</sup> would be subject to Restricted Discretionary activity status under rule SUB-RES-R27. For specific and/or large and unserviced greenfield sites, the matters of discretion could include the provision of a structure plan.</li> </ul>	<p>the area, rather than ad-hoc rezoning. In these cases, it would be more appropriate to consider the area through a future urban development plan change, rather than as part of PC2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites larger than 3,000m<sup>2</sup> are only a restricted discretionary activity under rule SUB-RES-R27 if they are located in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. Otherwise, sites larger than 3,000m<sup>2</sup> are a controlled activity under proposed rule SUB-RES-Rx.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
46.	Intensification	Landowner	Paraparaumu	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of the intensification plans proposed.</li> <li>The building heights (up to 4 storeys) and ability to build closer to a property's boundaries give more flexibility to landowners when designing homes that look smart and are of a high quality.</li> <li>Most of the properties close to the shopping precinct at Paraparaumu beach along Marine Parade are between 600-700m<sup>2</sup>. Given the proposed changes, this means landowners would not be able to build 3 townhouses on these sections. The only other option for intensification would be to build multi-level apartments.</li> <li>Most people would prefer to live in townhouses where they are not sandwiched between other peoples apartments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subdivide sections smaller than 900m<sup>2</sup> into multiple lots for townhouses, especially at Paraparaumu Beach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The matters sought by the submitter can be achieved under the provisions proposed by PC2.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
47.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many retired/elderly residents in the area who deserve to have their environment protected. Chose to live in the area due to many factors such as quietness, sunlight, view, proximity to shops, medical services and transport links. It is unfair to disadvantage them and potentially force them to move to retirement villages.</li> <li>Concerned about rates. If there are zoning changes which permit greater intensification of some sites compared to others, this will have a disproportionate effect on capital values. Likely to mean higher rates for many people, which will be hard for those on fixed limited incomes.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
48.	Intensification	Paekākāriki Housing Trust (PHT)	Paekākāriki	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In general, PHT supports intensification to reduce the cost of housing and protect the environment.</li> <li>The needs of many outweigh the desires of the few.</li> <li>Good design can decrease the impact on neighbours and the community.</li> <li>Paekākāriki values its unique environment and community.</li> <li>Ngāti Haumia aspirations and views are significantly important. PHT have not had the capacity to consult Ngāti Haumia and are concerned their opinions may not have been sought by KCDC.</li> <li>Paekākāriki is a suburban village, not a town centre, and because of its very small geographic size and beach-village character, it is not appropriate for 6-storey development within 800m of the railway station.</li> <li>This zone needs to be much smaller because Paekākāriki is much smaller. It will have a significantly larger impact on the village than anywhere else on the Kāpiti Coast – an unfair and disproportionately devastating impact not seen anywhere else. PHT submits that well-managed 3-storey intensification is more appropriate, with any more intensive options limited to immediately adjacent to the railway station and village centre.</li> <li>KCDC has not fully considered 'qualifying matters' when considering the appropriateness of the proposed changes for Paekākāriki.</li> <li>There are not sufficient services to provide for the needs of a significantly increased population in Paekākāriki.</li> <li>Paekākāriki has minimal services – no medical centre, pharmacy, supermarket, community services or petrol station, minimal retail, a volunteer-only fire brigade.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to give effect to policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD at Paekākāriki. Policy 3(c) has a particular focus on enabling intensification in areas well-served by public transport (specifically "rapid transit stops" or train stations). All three stations on the Kāpiti line are equally served by the Kāpiti line train service, so a consistent approach has been applied to enabling intensification around each.</li> <li>The development of PC2 has included engagement with Ngāti Toa Rangatira.</li> <li>PC2 includes design guides that are intended to encourage high-quality development.</li> <li>Consideration has been given to a range of qualifying matters at Paekākāriki. Qualifying matters that apply to parts of Paekākāriki include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct;</li> <li>Historic heritage provisions that protect heritage features that are scheduled in the District Plan;</li> <li>Provisions that manage the design of development in relation to flood hazards;</li> <li>Trees that are scheduled in the District Plan to be protected.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Council has considered whether "special character areas" could be provided for, including at Paekākāriki but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>The absence of particular commercial activities or community services (such as those identified by the submitter) in an area is not prescribed as a qualifying matter under s771 or s770 of the Act. Further, because the Paekākāriki is served by a rapid transit stop, the area has access to a range of commercial activities and community services by public transport, where these are not locally provided.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether a lack of infrastructure (specifically wastewater infrastructure) at</li> </ul>



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<p>Paekākāriki could be considered as a qualifying matter, but found that this did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter under s771(j) or s770(j).</p> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
49.	Intensification	Paekākāriki Community Board (PCB)	Paekākāriki	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about the unfair and disproportionately devastating impact of allowing 6 storey development within 800m of the Paekākāriki railway station.</li> <li>PCB supports and agrees with the submission made by the Paekākāriki Housing Trust.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seek further advice on qualifying matters, including reaching out to Porirua City Council to understand the basis on which they intend to report qualifying matters for Paremata and Pukerua Bay,</li> <li>Consult Ngāti Haumia ki Paekākāriki directly.</li> <li>Attempt to exclude Paekākāriki from 6 storey development – or greatly reduce the area allowing 6 storey development to immediately adjacent the railway station and village centre, by reporting qualifying matters for the independent panel to consider.</li> </ul>	<p>Refer to the response to the Paekākāriki Housing Trust (PHT) submission.</p> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
50.	Intensification	Landowner	Paekākāriki	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to the intensification of development in Paekākāriki.</li> <li>Paekākāriki community has not asked for intensification changes, and are in excess of the needs.</li> <li>The overall adverse effects on nature will be extreme.</li> <li>KCDC should prepare a section 32 analysis or equivalent and restart the public consultation process again, so that the community is fully informed before submitting.</li> <li>Intensification is inappropriate because it will not reduce greenhouse gas emissions and will not sustain the current resilience of the community to the effects of climate change.</li> <li>Paekākāriki has a population of less than 10,000 and is therefore not appropriate to be regarded as part of a larger market proxy.</li> <li>Paekākāriki does not currently have adequate qualifying matters such as access to supermarket, primary school with capacity and open space. It is unlikely that these qualifying matter limitations can be remedied.</li> <li>Intensification will reduce natural flows in the regionally significant indigenous fauna habitat of Wainui Stream. It will also increase flood flows and contaminated run-off.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Paekākāriki.</li> <li>Paekākāriki is part of the Kāpiti Coast housing and labour market, which has a population of greater than 10,000 people.</li> <li>Paekākāriki has access to open space and a primary school.</li> <li>The absence of a supermarket from an area is not prescribed as a qualifying matter under s771 or s770 of the RMA.</li> <li>There are a range of provisions contained in the operative District Plan, Proposed Natural Resources Plan and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater that manage the effects of development in relation to waterbodies.</li> <li>Rules that restrict development in relation to heritage buildings that are scheduled in the District Plan will continue to apply as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether “special character areas”, including the Beach Residential Precinct at Paekākāriki, could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensification will not protect and restore the Wainui Stream which is of cultural and traditional significance to Māori.</li> <li>Intensification will be limited due to the number of heritage buildings limiting development in the Local Centre Zone.</li> <li>Intensification will cause increased tsunami risk to the built environment.</li> <li>Intensification will destroy the low-key beach character that the community wishes to retain.</li> <li>KCDC has not provided the community with adequate open space. The community requested Tilley Road Triangle Reserve as a public open space Neighbourhood Park.</li> <li>Water supply is currently inadequate and incapable of supplying additional population.</li> <li>Paekākāriki does not have sewage infrastructure and the current septic tanks are unsuited to intense development.</li> <li>The roading network pinch point is not suitable for an increase in traffic through the Beach Road Local Centre 30km/h pedestrian precinct and railway crossing.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paekākāriki be excluded from intensification measures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> <li>Effects on the demand for stormwater, roading, water supply and open space infrastructure at Paekākāriki are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> <li>New development in Paekākāriki will be required to comply with a range of rules and standards under the District Plan, Proposed Natural Resources Plan, and Building Code in relation to the discharge of wastewater on site (such as through septic tank systems). This may limit the amount of development that would be realised until such time as Paekākāriki is connected to a reticulated sewer system. However, the absence of wastewater infrastructure at Paekākāriki does not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
51.	Intensification	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Enabling Housing Supply plan change process represents a huge opportunity to better enable the provision of a diverse range of retirement housing and care options. If this opportunity is not taken now, the existing consenting challenges facing retirement village operators are likely to be perpetuated for many years.</li> <li>NPS-UD policies require district plans to respond to the need to provide suitable and diverse housing choices and options for our ageing population as part of the intensification of urban environments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IPI/ISPP process should only be used for the purposes outlined in s80E of the Act. The Council is mindful that the ISPP limits public involvement in the planning process, and as such careful consideration has been given to the matters that must or may be included in the IPI.</li> <li>It is considered that providing a planning regime for "retirement villages" based on the provisions proposed by the submitter is not consistent with the matters that must or may be included in an IPI under s80E. This does not suggest that a planning regime for retirement</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objectives: The RVA considers that existing District Objective DO-012 (Housing Choice and Affordability) appropriately recognises and enables the housing and care needs of the ageing population. No further amendments are considered necessary.</li> <li>Supports changing communities: Urban Form and Development Policy UFD-P11 (Amenity Values), which recognises that urban environment, including their amenity values, develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people and communities.</li> <li>Supports provision of housing for an ageing population: General Residential Zone Policy GRZ-P16, Ngārara Development Area Policy DEV1-P11, and Waikanae North Development Policy DEV2-P11 (Supported living and Older Persons Accommodation), which provides for retirement accommodation and accommodation for older persons in a range of forms.</li> <li>The RVA considers the District Plan/PC2 must provide a retirement village-specific regime to support the development of retirement villages. The RVA proposes a restricted discretionary regime for retirement villages in all relevant residential zones, with appropriate matters of discretion to recognise the unique features and needs of retirement villages.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GRZ-Px Larger Sites – Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [General Residential Zone, the Ngārara Development Area, and Precincts 1, 2, 4 and 5 of the Waikanae North Development Area] by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</li> <li>GRZ-Px Provision of housing for an ageing population –             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:                 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</li> <li>Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> <li>GRZ-Px Role of density standards – Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</li> <li>GRZ-R1 Retirement Villages, excluding the construction of buildings –             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activity status: Permitted.</li> </ol> </li> <li>GRZ-R2 Construction of buildings for a Retirement Village –             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>villages would be inappropriate, rather that the IPI is not an appropriate method for including the regime proposed by the submitter in the District Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the absence of a specific planning regime for retirement villages, the District Plan, as amended by PC2, would provide for the following:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing policy provides for supported living and older persons accommodation (GRZ-P16), and this is provided for as a permitted activity subject to standards under GRZ-R4. Larger supported living accommodation is a restricted discretionary activity (GRZ-R12);</li> <li>The provisions of PC2 would provide for the residential unit component of a retirement village as a restricted discretionary activity in the General Residential Zone, and the density standards proposed by PC2 would operate as a permitted baseline for the residential unit component of a retirement village;</li> <li>In addition to this, some community facilities are a permitted activity subject to standards in the General Residential Zone. This would provide for some non-residential facilities that could be included within a retirement village;</li> <li>Commercial activities as part of a retirement village would be a non-complying activity in the General Residential Zone.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>Matters of discretion are limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: GRZ-S1 – GRZ-S4 and excluding a non-compliance that does not trigger limited notification.</li> <li>2. The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: GRZ-S4 – GRZ-S8.</li> <li>3. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces.</li> <li>4. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces.</li> <li>5. When assessing the matter in (1), (2) and (3), consider: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites.</li> <li>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the Retirement Village.</li> </ol> <p>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a Retirement Village.</p> <p>Notification Status:</p> <p>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule GRZ-R2 is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule GRZ-R2 that complies with GRZ-S1 – GRZ-S4 is precluded from being limited notified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRZ-S1 Building height – [Standard to match RMA, Schedule 3A, clause 11, as provided in PC2 (GRZ-Rx1(2))].</li> <li>• GRZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary – Add to RMA, Schedule 3A, clause 12(2): (d) boundaries adjoining open space and recreational zones, rural zones, commercial and mixed use zones, industrial zones, special purpose zones and multi-zone precincts.</li> <li>• GRZ-S3 Setbacks – [Standard to match RMA, Schedule 3A, clause 13, as provided in PC2 (GRZ-Rx1(4))].</li> <li>• GRZ-S4 Building coverage – [Standard to match RMA, Schedule 3A, clause 14, as provided in PC2 (GRZ-Rx1(5))].</li> <li>• GRZ-S5 Outdoor living space – Add to RMA, Schedule 3A, clause 15: (3) For retirement units, clause 15(1) and (2) apply with the following modifications: (a) The outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally</li> </ul>	

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and</p> <p>(b) A retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space. Otherwise amend standard so that it applies to “retirement units”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GRZ-S6 Outlook space – Add to RMA, Schedule 3A, clause 16: (10) For retirement units, clause 16(1) – (9) apply with the following modification The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms.</li> <li>GRZ-S7 Windows to street – Amend RMA, Schedule 3A, clause 17 as follows: Any retirement unit facing a public street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors.</li> <li>GRZ-S8 Landscaped area – [Standard to match RMA, Schedule 3A, clause 18 with amendments so that it applies to “retirement units”].</li> <li>DEFINITION: Retirement Unit means any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing, and toilet facilities). A retirement unit is not a residential unit.</li> <li>DEFINITION: Retirement Village means a managed comprehensive residential complex or facilities used to provide residential accommodation for people who are retired and any spouses or partners of such people. It may also include any of the following for residents within the complex: recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (inclusive of hospital care) and other non-residential activities.</li> </ul>	
52.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the intensification of Waikanae Beach area, especially the special character zones.</li> <li>The area is already struggling with ageing or missing infrastructure, constant flooding and inundation, and threats presented by sea level rise. There is a complete lack of stormwater systems in the area between Te Moana Road and Rauparaha Street.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether “special character areas” could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>Flooding and the potential effects of sea level rise have been considered in the preparation of PC2.</li> <li>The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct addresses areas that have been identified as being potentially susceptible to coastal erosion hazard.</li> <li>The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter. These</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<p>provisions will apply to many of the areas that have been identified as at risk from coastal inundation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effects on the demand for stormwater infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
53.	Intensification	Ryman Healthcare Limited (Ryman)	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ryman supports in full the submission lodged by the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated on KCDC's key draft proposals for PC2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the response to the submission by Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA).</li> </ul>
54.	Intensification	Landowner	Ngāpaki Street, Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the draft amendment to the District Plan allowing for 3x3 storey houses to be built.</li> <li>Will remove the amenity values of the area (look, feel and character) as a quiet beach suburb. In-fill housing like this will further strain resources and infrastructure, which are already under intense pressure.</li> <li>The Waikanae Beach area is a tsunami zone and a large portion of the land is drained swamp, which creates additional flooding (and possible liquefaction) problems that would make it unsuitable for the development of multiple storey buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether "special character areas" could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>Flooding and tsunami have been considered in the preparation of PC2.</li> <li>The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter.</li> <li>Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> <li>Management of building design in relation to liquefaction is proposed to be removed from the District Plan by PC1B, as this matter is managed under the Building Act 2004 and the Building Code.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
55.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose the way the MDRS is proposed to be implemented by KCDC.</li> <li>• Oppose the construction of buildings 3 storeys or higher in the Waikanae Beach area, especially when KCDC is publishing information warning about sea level rise, tsunami, storm surges, and earthquake risks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>• A range of matters associated with coastal hazards and earthquake risks have been considered in the preparation of PC2.</li> <li>• The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct addresses areas that have been identified as being potentially susceptible to coastal erosion hazard.</li> <li>• The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter. These provisions will apply to many of the areas that have been identified as at risk from coastal inundation.</li> <li>• Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> <li>• The earthquake hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
56.	Intensification	Waikanae Beach Residents Society Incorporated (WBRSI)	Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WBRSI has concerns regarding the way in which PC2 was promulgated, its treatment of local centres and the sweeping inclusion of all residential areas for MDRS.</li> <li>• KCDC has been advise that the MDRS is required to be implemented through all residential zones. This advice ignores the amendments made by SOP 106 and now part of the RMA.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding why the current designated character areas in the Kāpiti District have not been considered as a qualifying matter and therefore are not excluded from the MDRS provisions.</li> <li>• Concerned about why the views expressed in the Waikanae Beach futures document have not been taken into account when producing PC2.</li> <li>• It seems there has been no analysis of whether remaining local centres have been correctly zoned or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PC2 has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. This requires that the district plan incorporate the MDRS and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>• The Council has considered whether “special character areas” could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>• Consideration was given to the views expressed in the Waikanae Beach futures document, however this does not obviate the requirement to incorporate the MDRS into the district plan or give effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Waikanae Beach. It is noted that this document was prepared prior to the introduction of the NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					not, or whether areas that are not zoned local centre should be.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location and extent of Local Centres Zones identified in the District Plan centre's hierarchy is considered an appropriate basis from which to apply policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD.</li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
57.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there any potential for apartments above the Waikanae shops and potentially above the Waikanae library.</li> <li>Many people living in houses that are too big for them, without a smaller option available to them. Could existing 3/4 bedroom houses be made into two liveable spaces with extra bathroom and kitchen facilities.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
58.	Intensification	Summerset Group Holdings Limited (Summerset)	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summerset wishes to express its support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand in its entirety. Summerset requests that KDCDC engages constructively with RVA in relation to PC2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the response to the submission by Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA).</li> </ul>
59.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the proposed district plan amendment permitting the building of three storey houses in the Waikanae Beach precinct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
60.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the provision of more and closer housing, but have qualms about the process. Development needs to be well-planned and actively supervised.</li> <li>Trees should not be sacrificed for new buildings. Special permission should be required.</li> </ul> <b>Relief sought by submitter:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No trees, native or exotic, over an agreed height (say three metres) should be cut down whether on public or private land, without good reason.</li> <li>15% of land in new developments should be set aside for open spaces. These could be playgrounds, playing fields, food growing areas, nature corridors, forest restoration areas, garden allotments, solar or wind generating areas etc.</li> <li>Development should proceed in an orderly manner beginning closest to the railway stations of Waikanae, Paraparaumu, Paekākāriki and Ōtaki (assuming there will soon be rail service there). No multistorey building should pop up in more distant streets.</li> <li>Developers should be encouraged to build environmentally sustainable homes.</li> <li>There needs to be a variety of sizes of homes.</li> <li>Retain and increase roadside tree planting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some trees will continue to be protected by the District Plan, where they are already scheduled as Key Indigenous Trees, Notable Trees or are trees located within Ecological Sites.</li> <li>Outside of these methods, there is limited ability to protect existing trees, as district plans are subject to the limitations on tree protection rules outlined in s76 of the Act.</li> <li>The provision of new land for open space is managed outside of the District Plan, under the Council's Open Space Strategy.</li> <li>The District Plan must enable intensification in accordance with the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD now, and does not have the ability to sequence the order in which intensification will occur.</li> <li>Developers are encouraged to incorporate environmentally sustainable design methods into the design of new developments through the proposed Centres and Residential Design Guides.</li> <li>A variety of sizes and types of home are enabled by PC2.</li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be no subdivision of the large protected properties on Te Moana Road and no high-rise in the Waikanae Beach area.</li> </ul>	
61.	Intensification	Landowner	Rangihiroa Street, Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the draft amendment to the District Plan allowing for 3x3 storey houses to be built.</li> <li>Will remove the amenity values of the area (look, feel and character) as a quiet beach suburb.</li> <li>Infrastructure and resources are already strained, and this proposal will result in more pressure. This includes the roads which will require costly and disruptive upgrades, particularly following the extensive development of State Highway 1.</li> <li>The Waikanae Beach area is a tsunami zone and a large portion of the land is drained swamp, which creates additional flooding (and possible liquefaction) problems that would make it unsuitable for the development of multiple storey buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether “special character areas” could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>Effects on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council’s Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> <li>Tsunami and flood hazard have been considered as part of the development of PC2.</li> <li>Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> <li>The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter.</li> <li>Management of building design in relation to liquefaction is proposed to be removed from the District Plan by PC1B, as this matter is managed under the Building Act 2004 and the Building Code.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
62.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 771(b) of the Act empowers KCDC to reduce the requirement of 3 houses of 3 or 4 storeys where there are coastal hazards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The operative flood hazard provisions contained within the District Plan are considered an appropriate means of addressing potential coastal inundation hazards until such time as the management of coastal hazards is addressed through a future plan change. In particular:</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note that the Jacobs report is not a formal 'risk assessment' as required by policy 24 of the NZCPS. However, it is the best evidence available.</li> <li>It is a high-risk strategy to allow and encourage intensification of houses when there is a recognised risk of inundation from two different sources (coastal and rainfall). Such a strategy is contrary to the precautionary approach KDCD is directed to take by the NZCPS.</li> <li>Tsunami is a constant risk for the Kāpiti Coast but the likelihood of a tsunami is probably much less than inundation. It is most unsatisfactory not to provide for an important hazard risk like tsunamis contrary to the direction of the NZCPS and then propose intensive density housing in zones already identified as being subject to tsunamis. Recommendations to citizens to self-evacuate do not replace proper planning to ensure their safety.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Areas identified in the Jacobs report as prone to inundation be classified in a special precinct and be treated in the same manner as the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. That there are no planning changes in the precinct until the Bolger Assessment Panel completes its report on coastal hazards or a formal assessment report is completed.</li> <li>Pending the outcomes of the Bolger report or a formal risk assessment report that the identified tsunami zones be classified as a special precinct and be treated in the same manner as the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.</li> <li>The multi-storey buildings be not permitted in areas prone to liquefaction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a reasonable correlation between the areas in the urban environment identified as susceptible to coastal inundation in the Jacobs' assessment, and the flood hazard areas in the operative District Plan.</li> <li>New buildings in a flood hazard area are required to have their building floor level located above the 1% AEP flood level. Breaching this standard requires resource consent. The determination of this level through the building or resource consent process is based on the best available information (which may include site-specific hydraulic modelling that would take into account the currently known effects of sea level rise).</li> <li>Any earthworks required to achieve this is subject to standards, and breaching these standards requires resource consent.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addition to the above, Council is in the process of updating its flood hazard modelling, and this will be used to inform a future plan change process to update the flood hazard areas contained in the District Plan.</li> <li>Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> <li>Regarding liquefaction, management of building design in relation to liquefaction is proposed to be removed from the District Plan by PC1B, as this matter is managed under the Building Act 2004 and the Building Code.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
63.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the submission made by Submission 62 opposing multi storey buildings being permitted in areas of liquefaction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the response to Submission 62.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
64.	Intensification	Landowner	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the submission made by Submission 62 regarding PC2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effects on the demand for stormwater infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The stormwater system is currently inadequate, and properties have constant trouble with ponding after rainfall. Intensification will only exacerbate the problem.</li> </ul>	<p>provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Long-term Plan provides for a programme of work to upgrade and maintain existing stormwater networks across the district.</li> <li>Refer also to the response to Submission 62.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
65.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the submission made by Submission 62 regarding PC2.</li> <li>The risk of inundation of low-lying coastal land on the Kapiti Coast needs to be recognised.</li> <li>KCDC should not permit building of three or four storeys in low lying coastal areas when they may be uninsurable and consequently worthless well within 100 years.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the response to Submission 62.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
66.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the submission made by Submission 62 regarding PC2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the response to Submission 62.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
67.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the submission made by Submission 62 regarding PC2. Exceptions should be made in areas exposed to coastal hazards. KCDC should take a precautionary approach until the community has worked through the eventual planning outcomes for these areas.</li> <li>Strongly in favour of retaining the special character status of the Waikanae Beach area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council has considered whether "special character areas" could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>Refer also to the response to Submission 62.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
68.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the submission made by Submission 62 regarding PC2.</li> <li>Major risks of inundation (particularly flooding), liquefaction and tsunamis having an impact on properties in the area. Any proposals to allow individual residential lots to build up to 3 houses of 3 storeys must be fully and strictly investigated to ensure such intensification is appropriate.</li> <li>The unique character of Waikanae Olde Beach would be severely threatened should KCDC allow this to happen.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council has considered whether "special character areas" could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>Refer also to the response to Submission 62.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
69.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The whole of the Old Beach/Beach area should be exempt from development.</li> <li>The idea that there is a 'qualifying matter to apply for exemptions to the height issue but this is based on 'high quality character housing'. Concerning as it is completely open to subjective interpretation – doesn't</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae Beach.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether "special character areas" could be provided for but found that they did not</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>take into consideration the special character of a unique beachside community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Waikanae Beach area is a tsunami zone and a large portion of the land is drained swamp, which creates additional flooding (and possible liquefaction) problems that would make it unsuitable for the development of multiple storey buildings.</li> <li>The roads into Waikanae Beach will likely be unable to support increased population.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work on infrastructure and services first, before introducing a massive number of new builds and increasing the height of buildings in a previously unique low rise area.</li> </ul>	<p>meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tsunami and flood hazard have been considered as part of the development of PC2.</li> <li>Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> <li>The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter.</li> <li>Management of building design in relation to liquefaction is proposed to be removed from the District Plan by PC1B, as this matter is managed under the Building Act 2004 and the Building Code.</li> <li>Effects on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
70.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about the heights and distances from boundaries for the proposed new dwelling rules.</li> <li>Oppose developers being able to build 3 storey houses 1 metre from the boundary, especially to the west of current dwellings. The draft plan seems to negate the effects of sunlight and privacy on neighbouring properties.</li> <li>The resulting loss in rates revenue from the revaluation of any affected property would seem to negate any extra revenue from having 3 additional buildings next to a property.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The District Plan is required to incorporate the density standards (including set-backs and height in relation to boundary standards) outlined under Schedule 3A of the Act.</li> <li>Development constructed to the density standards provided for by PC2 is likely to generate more shading than development currently provided for under the provisions of the operative District Plan. However, it is highly unlikely that a 3-storey building could be constructed 1m from the boundary under the proposed height in relation to boundary standard. This standard</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						would typically provide for a 2-storey high building 1m from the boundary.  <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
71.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reservations regarding the multi-storey structures as they don't look appealing and there isn't room for children to play outside. Unclear if these will be affordable for first home buyers.</li> <li>Concerned about the dust and noise of the plant equipment – dust already gets through houses and noise lasts until 7pm.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to see trees on the kerbside outside housing blocks to help it blend in more with surrounding established housing.</li> <li>Would like to see extensive management of land developers as they prepare for big builds (including drainage if the development is on the side of the hills in Waikanae).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outdoor living space is required to be provided for each residential unit in a new development under the provisions proposed by PC2.</li> <li>Existing district plan provisions manage dust and noise emissions from construction activity. These will continue to apply to new development.</li> <li>The Council's Streetscape Strategy and Guideline, and the Council's Best Practice Subdivision and Development Guide require the consideration of street trees.</li> <li>Large developments are not a permitted activity, and will be required to manage a range of effects associated with development, under the provisions of the District Plan and the Proposed Natural Resources Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
72.	Intensification	General Public	Raumati South	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support providing more housing opportunities.</li> <li>Oppose any new structures in existing communities with a character that doesn't support such buildings for aesthetic reasons (e.g. Raumati South).</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow for the proposed building density and height only in communities which already contain such structures and/or areas close to transportation hubs.</li> <li>Retain the character of communities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether "special character areas" could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
73.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the intensification of housing and allowing 3x3 housing on blocks of land as of right.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
74.	Intensification	General Public	Paraparaumu/Kenakena	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support intensification around towns and local centres. The limits on heights are reasonable and will give towns and local centres more of a European feeling.</li> <li>Would like to see more opportunity for intensification and mixed-use development in Kenakena.</li> <li>Would like to see more walking and cycling infrastructure fed into the plan.</li> <li>Would like to see other businesses around the Kenakena shops, including a green grocer.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow for more mixed use around Kenakena.</li> <li>Plan for car-free streets as part of intensification.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provisions of PC2 would support the development of further commercial activities, community services and mixed use activity (residential development over commercial activities/community services) in the Local Centre Zone at Kena Kena.</li> <li>The development of further walking and cycling infrastructure, and the provision of car-free streets, are matters that would be addressed through the Council's Sustainable Transport Strategy, and the Infrastructure Strategy prepared as part of the Long-term Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan for more cycling inclusive paths to make the 'final mile/kilometre' of transport more accessible for those without cars.</li> </ul>	
75.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the creation of residential areas with quality, accessible and affordable medium density housing located within easy 'walking' distance to shared community spaces, food and grocery outlets, some retail, education, healthcare and public transport.</li> <li>Unconvinced that KCDC will ensure all residential areas are located within a reasonable distance of accessible shared community spaces.</li> <li>Supports more land being freed up for medium-density residential dwellings.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
76.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports additional housing, to account for population growth.</li> <li>Disagree that all residential sites would be allowed to be packed with small, tall houses and roads covered with the resulting parked cars. The low-rise, low-density housing in Kapiti is what makes it special and creates a quality of life. Allowing uncontrolled development will ruin views and light, change the character of neighbourhoods, and could bring the whole area down.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A more detailed plan needs to be submitted which identifies areas suitable for denser development such as brownfield/industrial sites and those closer to urban centres (Coastlands, Paraparaumu Beach, Otaki centre). Allow considered development and reduce car use. This will provide the needed housing without changing the unique character of Kapiti.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD. Areas can only be excluded where a qualifying matter exists.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
77.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for greater intensification around public transport hubs.</li> <li>Supports the whole proposal. Development needs to happen.</li> <li>It needs to be cheaper to develop near urban transportation sites. KCDC fees are prohibitive and discourage what the government is trying to do.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
78.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support concentrating intensification around public transport routes and social amenities.</li> <li>Disagree with enabling urban intensification in areas that are not well served by public transport or easy access to social amenities. This will isolate people and encourage inequity/poor social outcomes.</li> <li>Unclear on the reasoning for the location of the Residential Intensification Precinct B. Do not seem to be served by good public transport so will not be consistent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD. Areas can only be excluded where a qualifying matter exists.</li> <li>Residential Intensification Precinct B specifically provides for policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. This policy does not require an area to be served by public transport.</li> <li>In several locations, Residential Intensification Precinct A has been extended beyond the walkable catchment to</li> </ul>



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>with other policies and criteria such as sustainability, community, equity, diversity, and lowering the regions carbon emissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It seems that some boundaries of Residential Intensification Precinct A run along one side of the street and not the other. If the criteria in the NPS-UD is a walking catchment then could homes on the other side of the street be in the same catchment (particularly in the Waikanae hill area)?</li> </ul>	<p>the next block, to provide for a sensible zoning pattern. The geometry of the precinct seeks to minimise the length of intrablock boundary in order to reduce the effects of intensification over private boundaries.</p> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
79.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports intensification and increases to building heights in town centre of Paraparaumu, and the need to open up more land for development.</li> <li>Opposes the development of 6 storey apartment buildings in low level residential areas (within 800m of train station). This has the potential to negatively impact the lives of many people, loss of sunlight, privacy and general outlook from adjoining properties.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow for increased heights (6+ levels) in areas not already built up (west of Paraparaumu town centre) and in existing commercial/industrial areas.</li> <li>Protect existing property owners. There is a need for intensification, but it needs to be measured and this proposal is extreme.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD requires building heights of at least 6 storeys to be enabled within a walkable catchment of the Paekākāriki, Paraparaumu and Waikanae train stations.</li> <li>Where density standards are breached, resource consent will be required and the effects on existing property owners will be considered as part of this process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
80.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensification is required to make maximum use of existing infrastructure.</li> <li>3 storey development should not be allowed in residential areas.</li> <li>Developments appear to be allowed in areas which are low lying. Sea level increase and associated ground water level increase means many areas will be under water given the latest IPCC forecasts – even at medium level.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure properties are only allowed to build 4-5 metres above existing mean high water level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification (including 3-storey development) by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>PC2 considers the potential effects of sea level rise in relation to a number of qualifying matters.</li> <li>The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter. These provisions will apply to many of the areas that have been identified as at risk from coastal inundation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
81.	Intensification	General Public	Kena Kena	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission in opposition of the Intensification Areas shown on Map 08.</li> <li>Looking at the definition of “local centre” in Policy LCZ-P1, the Kena Kena shop area somewhat could fit the local centre definition due to the shops and adjacent recreational activities at Te Atiawa Park. However, this area lacks a mix of retail activities, since the shops are only food and beverage outlets. Furthermore, this local centre area is neither an existing and planned rapid transit stop, nor city centre zone, nor a metropolitan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Centre Zones provide for the development of new commercial activities and community services to serve the neighbourhood area both now and into the future. In interpreting policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD, the relevance of a Local Centre, or the level of commercial activities or community services within the Centre, is not based solely on existing established activity. Rather, it is the planned level of activity that could be provided for in the future that is also considered in interpreting policy 3(d).</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>centre zone. Therefore, the level of intensification proposed within approximately 200m radius from this local centre zone (Kenakena Shops) is not guaranteed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the level of limited commercial and community activities in this area, the proposed intensification (PRECx2 as shown on Map 08) should be reduced to within 100m from the middle of this local centre zone, in order to commensurate with the existing level of commercial and community services. And also, remove from the proposed intensification area over the Kenakena School land which is subject to a designation.</li> <li>Looking at the definition of “local centre” in Policy LCZ-P1, the Jolly pub land does not fit the local centre definition because there are no retail activities, except for a pub and a small kiosk. However, it has to be local centre zoned land because it couldn't be anything else. This local centre area is neither an existing and planned rapid transit stop, nor city centre zone, nor a metropolitan centre zone. Therefore, the level of intensification proposed within approximately 200m radius from this local centre zone (the Jolly pub) is not guaranteed, unless KCDC wants people to be within walking distance to a pub.</li> <li>Given that realistically there are no retail activities (except for a pub and a small kiosk) and no community activities in this area, the proposed intensification of this area (PRECx2 as shown on Map 08) should be removed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensification around any local centre zone in the district should be reviewed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both the Kena Kena shops and the area of land at Mazengarb Road are provided for as Local Centre Zones within the District Plan centres hierarchy. As such it is considered necessary to provide for intensification in accordance with policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD to both areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
82.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High density housing and height changes mean a look and feel that is unique to the Coast will be lost. Already lost green/nature places in the name of 'progress'. The infrastructure can't support the changes (water reticulation, sewage).</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Every new house should fit and supply a water tank as part of the Building Consent process. Solar panels or equivalent green technology to be fitted in every building/house in every instance. Encourage plant walls on the side of buildings to mitigate pollution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>The operative District Plan requires new houses to install rainwater tanks, and this requirement will continue to apply.</li> <li>The District Plan includes measures that encourage the installation of solar panels, and these will continue to apply.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
83.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree that there needs to be more affordable housing for people in the area, and grow housing to accommodate those moving to this district.</li> <li>Don't agree with intensifying urban areas without integrating policies and principles of sustainability,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Act places limitations on the kinds of standards that can be applied to residential units within the District Plan.</li> <li>The provision for healthy homes and standards for the energy efficiency of the building envelope (such as that</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>passive housing standards, and ensuring we create green urban environments. That include local food networks, gardens, green spaces for children to play, and healthy homes.</p> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change policies to ensure building standards for our region require passive housing standards to be applied. Rethink how we design neighbourhoods to create 20-minute neighbourhoods, connected communities and healthy spaces including environmental regeneration and protection. Apply thinking from design principles such as permaculture and retrosuburbia. Ensure communities have 'hubs' where communities can gather, share resources, and connect.</li> </ul>	<p>required to achieve passive housing standards) is regulated under the Building Act 2004 and Building Code.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provisions of PC2 require outdoor living space to be provided for every new residential unit.</li> <li>New development is required to provide development or financial contributions towards the provision of new open spaces in accordance with the Council's Open Space Strategy.</li> <li>Rethinking of neighbourhood design is likely require broader and more comprehensive urban planning processes outside of the District Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
84.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports intensification provisions. We need more intensification because there is insufficient affordable and appropriate housing.</li> <li>Not enough recognition of the need for safely connected cycle routes. Waikanae East already has issues with reliable and safe vehicular and safe cycle connectivity with the rest of the Kapiti Coast. Increased intensification of the east side of the Waikanae railway tracks will require an underpass or overpass for cyclists in particular.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased intensification on the east side of the Waikanae railway tracks will require an underpass or overpass for cyclists in particular, traversing the old SH1 and the Te Moana Road/old SH1 intersections.</li> <li>A second vehicular access or cycle only access to the east side needs to be built north of the Waikanae Railway Station, that traverses the Ngaio Road intersection to facilitate safe connection with the Greater Kapiti Coast region.</li> <li>People in Waikanae East are effectively prevented from safely accessing the west side by active means at present. Access to the beach and river, playing fields, supermarkets is therefore also limited to us, if wanting to cycle around. Build at least one of the cycleway underpass/overpass described above over/under the dangerous intersections first before increasing intensification on the east side (or concurrent with that).</li> <li>More covered bicycle stands needed at Waikanae Railway Station.</li> <li>Marked cycleways needed north of Waikanae along old SH1 to join up with existing cycleways at Pekapeka interchange.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The range of matters associated with the provision of walking, cycling and other accessibility infrastructure are relevant to improving accessibility between eastern and western Waikanae. However these are matters that would need to be addressed through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not everyone will be commuting elsewhere by train. We want increasing numbers of people living and working locally. Safe connectivity of cycleways over dangerous intersections will facilitate work and leisure activity using active transport options.</li> </ul>	
85.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the intensification of land and development of more houses for the people who are interested in moving to Kapiti Coast since the opening of Transmission Gully.</li> <li>Need more intensification on Main Road South and have more houses in the large parcel of land.</li> <li>Suggest KCDC promote more passive homes to be more eco-friendly to the environment.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
86.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the proposal of high buildings.</li> <li>Disagrees with the destruction of ecosystem.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
87.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree that we need higher density housing, especially closer to the town centre. Developments such as apartment buildings up to 6 storeys sound long overdue.</li> <li>Strongly disagree with allowing more intense housing in areas that are currently single storey residential suburban areas. This proposal will have huge negative effects for existing residents, reducing privacy, impeding quality of life and fundamentally misunderstanding the reason people move to Kapiti in the first place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD. Areas can only be excluded where a qualifying matter exists.</li> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing amenity values, however, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
88.	Intensification	General Public	Paraparaumu	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the concept of more intensive housing, but in a controlled way that does not imping on already established areas, and the social and financial detriment of those established areas.</li> <li>References the proposed medium density development at 240 Kapiti Road, Paraparaumu as an example of their concerns. Includes traffic, non-conformity with surrounding subdivisions, affordability, distance to community and commercial services, and emergency services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD. Areas can only be excluded where a qualifying matter exists.</li> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing amenity values, however, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> <li>There are a range of provisions in the operative District Plan that manage the effects of development in relation to infrastructure matters such as traffic. These will continue to apply.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
89.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that the area needs more homes for people.</li> <li>• KCDC should be careful in deciding what type of housing and intensification is needed. It's great that more houses are to be built but the needs of home owners in the adjacent and surrounding areas in any new subdivision should be considered.</li> <li>• There should be no hidden agendas when it comes to intensification and real consideration needs to be given. KCDC should inform homeowners more and involve them.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the safety of Kapiti Road for pedestrians and fear that this will only be made worse with intensification. Additionally there is a blind corner along Cedar Drive and the road cannot take more traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While PC2 enables an increase in the variety and types of housing that could be developed within the district, the District Plan has limited ability to control the types of housing that are actually developed, as this is largely driven by decisions made by property owners and developers.</li> <li>• The safety of the traffic network is a relevant matter. However in general this is a matter that would need to be addressed through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> <li>• Notwithstanding this, new development will need to comply with a range of transport standards contained within the District Plan. Where developments do not comply with these standards, upgrades to the road network may be required.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
90.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports increased density in town centres.</li> <li>• Has concerns regarding intensification in residential areas – suburban homes will feel too crowded and views will be obstructed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD. Areas can only be excluded where a qualifying matter exists.</li> <li>• It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing amenity values, however, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
91.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal does not consider existing housing in the area. New development should be keeping of what is already existing in the area.</li> <li>• Concerned about the increase in traffic.</li> <li>• Concerned with the lack of consultation with existing residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD. Areas can only be excluded where a qualifying matter exists.</li> <li>• It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing amenity values, however, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> <li>• Notwithstanding this, new development will need to comply with a range of transport standards contained within the District Plan. Where developments do not comply with these standards, upgrades to the road network may be required.</li> <li>• Broader impacts of population growth on the transport network would need to be addressed through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
92.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports intensification of housing and the proposed changes.</li> <li>Would like to see sustainable services and an environmental that us thoughtfully populated.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to see more thought given to the roading access to the intensification.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broader impacts of population growth on the transport network would need to be addressed through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
93.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports intensification.</li> <li>Has concerns regarding the size of units and whether they will support the elderly and disabled communities.</li> <li>Concerned about the increased road traffic and carparking. This could cause problems for existing residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provisions provide for a range of housing sizes and types to be developed, including housing for elderly and the disabled communities.</li> <li>Broader impacts of population growth on the transport network would need to be addressed through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
94.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the increase in housing stock.</li> <li>Concerned about the size of properties and double storey. Discriminates against elderly and disabled.</li> <li>Concerned about increase in traffic and carparking.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to see houses in similar style to the Langdale Villas being built to help single people, elderly and disabled people into homes.</li> <li>A mixture of housing styles – some apartments, some single level and a higher proportion of 3 bedroom homes to suit young families.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provisions provide for a range of housing sizes and types to be developed, including a mixture of housing styles, and housing for elderly and the disabled communities.</li> <li>Broader impacts of population growth on the transport network would need to be addressed through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
95.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree that more housing is needed – there is not enough stock for the growing population.</li> <li>Concerned that intensification will be 'higgley piggley' with little control to the effects on existing residential areas.</li> <li>Does not think that high-rises are the whole answer.</li> <li>Roading infrastructure is a major concern – need more roads dissecting the major arterial roads, with new developments near them.</li> <li>Consideration needs to be given to the ageing populations housing needs – houses that are incorporated into smaller titles.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are many older houses in Kapiti – these could be replaced with townhouse (semi-detached) houses. The development of the Georgia Estate in Paraparamu and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provisions of PC2 enable a range of housing types and sizes to be developed.</li> <li>High rise development are only provided for in areas with access to commercial activities and community services, or with access to rapid transit stops.</li> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing amenity values, however, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> <li>Broader impacts of population growth on the transport network would need to be addressed through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					the houses in Margaret Street, Raumati are prime examples of intensification that are pleasant additions to the area.	
96.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensification around Waikanae, especially around the shopping centre reaching down Ngaio Road, will destroy the village community that attracts people to the area.</li> <li>Remove the quality of life of existing residential development in Waikanae.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove the intensification zone down Ngaio Road, Waikanae</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Waikanae.</li> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing amenity values, however, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
97.	Intensification	General Public	Paekākāriki	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oppose any plans allowing for 6 storeys in the vicinity of the Paekākāriki railway station, or for 3 storeys over the rest of the village.</li> <li>Concerns that the water and septic system would not allow for a large increase in population.</li> <li>Paekākāriki thrives because of a village atmosphere and it would be a crime to destroy this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Paekākāriki.</li> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing amenity values, however, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> <li>New development in Paekākāriki will be required to comply with a range of rules and standards under the District Plan, Proposed Natural Resources Plan, and Building Code in relation to the discharge of wastewater on site (such as through septic tank systems). This may limit the amount of development that would be realised until such time as Paekākāriki is connected to a reticulated sewer system. However, the absence of wastewater infrastructure at Paekākāriki does not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
98.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area will lose its character by allowing multiple storey buildings to be built (Waikanae Beach especially).</li> <li>Development of 12 storey buildings in the town centre is excessive.</li> <li>Be specific about what KCDC is intending to allow on the Airport land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing character and amenity values, however, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> <li><i>Te tupu pai</i> (the District Growth Strategy) indicates that development up to 12 storeys in the Metropolitan Centre Zone is anticipated as part of the future growth of the district.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The District Plan provides for a range of uses at the Airport, including air transport and terminal facilities. PC2 does not propose to change this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
99.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the intensification provisions because we need to enable capacity around rapid transit and the city and town centres. Also support the greater density and dwelling provisions across the residential areas. Critical for ensuring we have enough housing for people in the district and so the district can have a zero carbon transport system that enables people to meet their usual needs without having to drive their car everywhere.</li> <li>Some concerns with specific provisions:</li> <li>The explanations for the objectives (DO03, DO011) that have been amended tend to focus on 'managing change', but this is not consistent with the RMA or the NPS-UD. NPS-UD Policy 6(b)(ii) specifies that changes that affect amenity values are not an adverse effect, and the RMA purpose (Part 2, section 5) is to promote sustainable management while avoiding adverse effects. There is a risk that the objectives will be interpreted in a way that managing change is taken into consideration.</li> <li>Does not support the wording of UFD-P11 2 which requires consideration of effects on amenity values for the same reason above.</li> <li>Does not support the changes to GRZ-P10 which are too restrictive and will not enable intensification. Principles 3, 4, 5 and 6 will not result in good urban form because of excessive and unnecessary setbacks from boundaries or the street. Does not support the reference to amenity, planned built character, separation distances between buildings, and building setbacks. These four principles should be removed because they could be used to restrict intensification and lead to poor urban form outcomes.</li> <li>GRZ-P12 principle 2 should be removed. It is inevitable that larger buildings will be developed under the intensification rules and requiring planting to enhance amenity does not recognise that anticipated changes in amenity could include more visibility and presence of larger buildings in residential areas, and in fact this will be a necessity to achieve greater densities. Requiring landscaping and vegetation to conceal them does not support the ease of developing them and will lead to poor urban form outcomes.</li> <li>Does not support the wording of MCZ-P5, TCZ-P3, LCZ-P3 and MUZ-P4 principle 1, which requires amenity values to be maintained and enhanced. This does not</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter's support for a range of provisions is noted.</li> <li>The proposed amendments to Objective DO-O3 and DO-O11 to reorient objectives away from an unqualified requirement to "maintaining and enhance" existing character and amenity values in urban environments, and towards providing sufficient flexibility for character and amenity values in urban environments to change over time (consistent with objective 4 of the NPS-UD). It is appropriate that in some instances change be managed (for example through guidance at a policy level), so long as the level of development required by the MDRS and policy 3 of the NPS-UD is provided for in the District Plan. The relevance of policy 6(b)(ii) of the NPS-UD is noted. The changes proposed to objectives DO-O3 and DO-O11 do not conflict with this policy, and in fact support its application at a local level.</li> <li>The proposed requirement in UFD-P11 to consider effects on amenity values (which replaces a requirement to not compromise amenity values) is considered to be compatible with Objective 4 of the NPS-UD, and is not inconsistent with Policy 6(b)(ii) of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>Principles 3, 4, 5 and 6 are not inconsistent with the requirement to incorporate the MDRS and give effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD. These policies are interpreted in the context of the planned built character of the zone, which under the provisions of PC2 is defined by the MDRS and policy 3 of the NPS-UD. On this basis, the policy will not have the effect of restricting intensification below that required by the MDRS or policy 3 of the NPS-UD. Where development breaches density standards, the matters outlined in principles 3, 4, 5 and 6 are relevant considerations for decision makers.</li> <li>GRZ-P12 principle 2 continues to be relevant, particularly for higher density development that may involve larger consolidated servicing, loading or outdoor storage areas. A policy that requires these areas to be screened is not considered to materially impact the ability to achieve higher development densities.</li> <li>Proposed amendments to policies MCZ-P5, TCZ-P3, LCZ-P3 and MUZ-P4 avoids an unqualified requirement to maintain and enhance amenity values, and provides sufficient flexibility to recognise that amenity values</li> </ul>



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>reflect the NPS-UD policy 6(b)(i) that changes may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people but improve amenity values appreciated by other people, communities, and future generations, including by providing increased and varied housing densities and types.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MUZ-P1 2 d of amenity for Kāpiti Road should be deleted. This is not consistent with the NPS-UD.</li> <li>• In the proposed residential design guide, does not support 37 to 41 in relation to building mass and height. The requirements to create visual interest, reduce the effects of physical dominance, reduce the effects of massing, and reduce visual monotony are all subjective assessments of the built form and relate to subjective opinions about the physical effects of buildings on the street.</li> <li>• Disagree with the intent of diagram 10 and number 43 and similarly with the centres design guide. Do not support 46 to 51 for the reason above regarding subjective assessment of the built form.</li> <li>• For the permitted residential standards (GRZ, MCZ, TCZ, LCZ, MUZ, HOSZ) – front and side yard setbacks, and height in relation to boundary restrictions should be removed for the first 20m of a site/allotments (from the street). By removing the HIRTB and yard requirements at the front of the site, development can occur right up to the front and side boundaries of the property. This means windows and balconies can become oriented towards the street and backyard (rather than having sausage flats with windows overlooking the neighbours), and all the open space gets unified as a single, large backyard. There could also be a 6m rear setback to support the creation of backyard space.</li> </ul>	<p>appreciated by the community will vary. The amended policies provide for the consideration of amenity values without being inconsistent with Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design guides apply where a development breaches the MDRS density standards. In these instances, it is relevant that development design considers the effects of building height and mass by providing for the matters outlined in guidelines 37 to 41 of the Residential Design Guide, given that Council is required to encourage high-quality development.</li> <li>• Similar to the response noted above, the matters highlighted by the submitter in relation to the Centres Design Guide are considered relevant in order to encourage high-quality development.</li> <li>• It is not considered necessary to remove height in relation to boundary and yard setbacks from the first 20m of a site boundary, as both standards do not apply where there is a common wall between two buildings. The outcome sought by the submitter can already be achieved under the proposed standards.</li> <li>• Amending the proposed standards to require a 6m rear yard setback is not consistent with the requirements of the MDRS (which require no more than a 1m setback).</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission has been noted, the following amendments have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy MUZ-P1(2)(d) is amended so that its wording is consistent with other similar policies (MCZ-P5, TCZ-P3, LCZ-P3 and MUZ-P4):  <i>“amenity values of Kāpiti Road will be maintained or enhanced where practicable, while recognising that these values develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations.”</i></li> </ul>
100.	Intensification	General Public	Paraparaumu	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support intensification as proposed. Building houses on the former airport would support this goal. Using this space will intensify central Paraparaumu and is near shops and transport links.</li> <li>• Would like to see a plan for the inevitable airport closure.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
101.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to have these sorts of places within very close proximity to rail routes for ease of accessibility to commute into Wellington.</li> <li>• Don't want these places in established suburbs as concerned about lowering the value of areas, limitations of parking and few rubbish facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MDRS are required to be applied in all parts of the General Residential Zone, regardless of accessibility by public transport to the area.</li> <li>• It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing amenity values, however, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<p>amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council's Land Development Minimum Requirements document provides guidance on the provision of rubbish facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
102.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support medium density housing. There are many empty lots of Paraparaumu that would be ideal for medium density housing and would have no impact of people already living in the area.</li> <li>Don't support medium density housing in already established residential areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including within established neighbourhoods.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
103.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support medium density housing.</li> <li>Don't support medium density housing going into already established residential areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including within established neighbourhoods.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
104.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the changes that encourage and enable the development of new local communities.</li> <li>A key issue is the absolute preservation of local community values and lifestyles without fear of the inappropriate intensification of urban development to the detriment of existing residents.</li> <li>Disagree with any plan change that removed or restricts the ability of existing urban communities to retain and maintain their chosen preferred community values.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including within established neighbourhoods.</li> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing amenity values, however, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
105.	Intensification	General Public	Ōtaki	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with greater height limits in the railway and main street areas of Ōtaki to support the retail/commercial areas. Help address the growth pressure put on the Ōtaki area which is forecast to double in population.</li> <li>This growth needs to support and compliment current town centres with intensification around transport hubs (SH1, bus, railway) and/or service areas (shops etc.) to support those areas while minimising vehicle movements and encouraging low carbon forms of transport.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
106.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need more housing but not at the expense of open air space.</li> <li>Don't agree with multi-storey buildings – they don't look nice and create less sun and air space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, include multi-storey buildings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
107.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree in principle that there needs to be more dense housing in certain areas of the district, more housing for the younger and lower income members of the community.</li> <li>There needs to be more controls.</li> <li>The proposed changes would allow developers to do as they want and potentially damage the historic characters of well established communities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There needs to be rules to ensure affordable housing and protect the community from developers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including within established neighbourhoods.</li> <li>While it may be possible to include rules that require affordable housing to be provided as part of development, there is insufficient evidence to support including such provisions as part of PC2.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
108.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports more intensification around the urban centres.</li> <li>Acknowledges that the plan change is driven by government, KCDC still need to strive to protect some of the overall attractiveness of the district without making the rule requirements too complicated.</li> <li>The rules regarding proximity to boundary, site coverage and height planes as proposed are reasonable, but need to be firmly managed once implemented and provide some reassurance to existing homeowners that their sun and space is not going to be eroded.</li> <li>Does not support the special status of the current beach zones being removed, but acknowledges that intensification means intensification. The engineering challenges of beach areas (liquefaction, flooding, sea level rise) need to be addressed before intensification occurs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>KCDC need to ensure that all development meets overall sustainability objectives. Innovative design to provide a range of dwelling and lifestyle options.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The density standards included within PC2 are the standards required by Schedule 3A of the Act. Where development is undertaken up to the level provided for by these standards, it is likely that there will be effects on sunlight access enjoyed by existing homeowners (the extent of which will vary depending on the design of new development, and the location of existing surrounding development.</li> <li>The Council has considered whether “special character areas” could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>PC2 considers the potential effects of flooding and sea level rise in relation to a number of qualifying matters.</li> <li>The flood hazard provisions of the District Plan will continue to apply as an existing qualifying matter.</li> <li>The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct addresses areas that have been identified as being potentially susceptible to coastal erosion hazard. This accounts for the potential effects of sea level rise.</li> <li>Management of building design in relation to liquefaction is proposed to be removed from the District Plan by PC1B, as this matter is managed under the Building Act 2004 and the Building Code.</li> <li>The Residential and Centres Design Guides incorporate a range of sustainability and energy efficiency design considerations. This is on top of a range of other initiatives that are already incorporated into the District Plan, including support for solar panels, and water sensitive urban design measures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
109.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the principle of greater utilisation of land but through a realistic controlled process.</li> <li>Concerned at the opportunity for random multi-storey dwellings in existing single storey locations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PC2 includes a number of greenfield sites rezoned for residential development, to provide new land for housing.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The housing shortage has been exacerbated by non-availability of new land for building so this should be in the equations of resolving the housing shortage.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognition, encouragement and special dispensations for minor dwellings erected on existing sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minor dwellings on existing sites are enabled under the MDRS.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
110.	Intensification	General Public	Paraparaumu	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports medium density housing but it should be moved further north of Paraparaumu.</li> <li>Has concerns regarding busy roads, current schools already at capacity, infrastructure needs upgrading, medical facilities, fire/police.</li> <li>With the new expressway it makes more sense to put housing north of Paraparaumu.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While urban development to the north of Paraparaumu may be appropriate in the medium to long term, there are a range of existing constraints in this area that makes it unsuitable for a straight rezoning as part of this plan change. Further work to resolve these constraints, including structure planning, is required.</li> <li>Effects on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
111.	Intensification	General Public	Kapiti Road, Paraparaumu	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oppose the medium density housing project planned for 240 Kapiti Road, Paraparaumu. Will increase traffic in surrounding streets and ruin a lovely area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This submission refers to a resource consent for a specific development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
112.	Intensification	General Public	Paraparaumu	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A lack of roading, water, medical and most other community infrastructure to support the planned population increase.</li> <li>Seems crazy to create more housing in a way which spoils the character of Paraparaumu when it is the character which draws people there.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing character and amenity values, however, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> <li>Effects on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> <li>Enabling intensification provides for the housing needs of an increasing population, which in turn supports the demand for and provision of a range of social infrastructure.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
113.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the matter of housing densification is being viewed in a limited way.</li> <li>The government's plan for maximising dwellings on residential sites will forever change the way we live in and experience the Kapiti District.</li> <li>There may be a need for such densification in places, but this submission strongly advocates for an alternative, low cost, low impact, healthy housing initiative which can contribute to densification as well as housing affordability. This must be included in KCDC's adoption of a housing densification plan.</li> <li>Mobile 'tiny house' dwellings, built to building code standards with permanent building materials is one way of achieving this.</li> <li>Refer KCDC to developments in Fresno, California where this method was employed successfully.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD throughout the district.</li> <li>"Tiny homes" are enabled by the MDRS, however they are required to comply with a range of other requirements outside of the District Plan, including the Building Code.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
114.	Intensification	General Public	Paraparaumu	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the intensification of buildings in Paraparaumu.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, including at Paraparaumu.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
115.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the matter of housing densification is being viewed in a limited way.</li> <li>The government's plan for maximising dwellings on residential sites will forever change the way we live in and experience the Kapiti District.</li> <li>There may be a need for such densification in places, but this submission strongly advocates for an alternative, low cost, low impact, healthy housing initiative which can contribute to densification as well as housing affordability. This must be included in KCDC's adoption of a housing densification plan.</li> <li>Mobile 'tiny house' dwellings, built to building code standards with permanent building materials is one way of achieving this.</li> <li>Refer KCDC to developments in Fresno, California where this method was employed successfully.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Tiny homes" are enabled by the MDRS, however they are required to comply with a range of other requirements outside of the District Plan, including the Building Code.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
116.	Intensification	General Public	Paraparaumu	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the development of 4 storey buildings in Raumati, Paraparaumu beach.</li> <li>It will ruin the character and the views of existing properties.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build out, no more that 2 stories high in these areas. We have plenty of land, so make it easier for existing owners to subdivide.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD throughout the district, including at Raumati and Paraparaumu Beach.</li> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing amenity values, however, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time. <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
117.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports intensification, but can see the following issues: Maintaining an appropriate balance between increased housing density and easily accessible open spaces for safe recreation and social gatherings. KCDC moderate development proposals to ensure individual developments satisfy good design principles and visually coordinate with surrounding developments. It is KCDC's responsibility to keep in mind the bigger pictures and protect the interests of the wider community. Ensuring development intensification is undertaken in a context that recognises the known, and considers the unknown, needs of future generations.</li> <li>Agree with the removal of the 'special character' designations which, by and large, have primarily benefited residents of those areas without having any benefit to the wider community.</li> <li>Support intensification as a better way to maximise the use of existing infrastructure. In some areas, current methods of addressing water and other infrastructure will be adequate until new infrastructure is put in place.</li> <li>DO-011 Character and Amenity Values reflects this submission, but there is often a gap between the written word and implementation because development is mainly in private sector hands.</li> <li>No objections to the proposed plan changes, but there is a need for KCDC to become more proactive in protecting and promoting community values.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Centres and Residential Design Guides included as part of PC2 are intended to promote high quality design, and provide for a range of matters identified in this submission.</li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
118.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the definition of Residential Intensification Precincts and Coastal Risk Precincts – useful to have them precisely defined in location.</li> <li>Supports the inclusion of various modes of transport – but also need to include older persons needs (mobility scooters) and younger persons needs (electric scooters).</li> <li>Opposes the set backs in Residential Intensification Precinct B – Light to lower floors if side yards only 1m and sight lines of 60degrees from 4m above ground level, should have something like '4m between adjacent buildings' whether on the same plot or not. Front setback should allow room for off-road parking, suggest 4m as at present.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The height in relation to boundary and setback standards proposed in Residential Intensification B are those required by Schedule 3A of the Act.</li> <li>PC2 does not propose any amendments to Objective DO-O1 of the District Plan.</li> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing character and amenity values, including in the coastal area of Paraparaumu Beach. However, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy DO-01 appears that tangata whenua have final decision, need clarification of the precise meaning of the words used do not subject to later 'interpretation'.</li> <li>The coastal part of Paraparaumu Beach should be acknowledged as having distinct beach ambience. This should be included in any assessment of planning needs and decisions.</li> </ul>	
119.	Intensification	General Public (Note that this submitter submitted twice on the same matter. Only one submission summary has been included.)	Paraparaumu	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the inclusion of 6 storey capable rezoning within a walkable catchment of a metropolitan centre zone.</li> <li>The proposed walkable catchment from the edge of the metropolitan zone on Ihakara Street and Main Road South towards Raumati Road does not extend far enough as indicated by Map 14 of the PC2. This means the proposed 'Residential Intensification Precinct A' and therefore 6 storey capability is much smaller than it should be under the NPS-UD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extend 'Residential Intensification Precinct A' to Raumati Road so that large undeveloped sections can be better utilised creating a more vibrant urban neighbourhood close to the Metropolitan Centre Zone and meeting NPS-UD requirements, where 800m is provided as guidance for a more appropriate walkable catchment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has recently been a new footpath constructed on Main South Road in the area identified by the submitter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent of PREC<sub>x1</sub> has been updated to account for the construction of the new footpath.</li> </ul>
120.	Intensification	Landowner	Main Road South, Raumati	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The property currently has split zoning due to a boundary change in July 2021.</li> <li>This property should be entirely zoned 'Residential Intensification Precinct A' allowing for building heights of up to six storeys as it is only 370, from the edge of a Metropolitan Centre Zone and within 800m of an existing rapid transit stop.</li> <li>Having potential development land like this so close to a Metropolitan Centre Zone is likely a rare circumstance in Tier 1 local authorities and one which KCDC should be making better use of.</li> <li>The property is free of any flood hazard or ponding and has the benefit of the recently added stormwater drain on Main South Road, acquired by KCDC from Waka Kotahi. It has also been deemed suitable for 6 storeys by a local Geotech engineer after on-site analysis.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like 104 Main Road South, Raumati to be included in the 'Residential Intensification Precinct A' as one whole section, rather than having one part in 'Residential Intensification Precinct A' and the remaining</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has recently been a new footpath constructed on Main South Road in the area identified by the submitter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent of PREC<sub>x1</sub> has been updated to account for the construction of the new footpath.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					part in 'General Residential' as the draft intensification map currently suggests.	
121.	Intensification	Landowner	Main Road South, Raumati	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The property is within the commonly deemed walkable catchment of 800m by being only 410m away from the edge of the Metropolitan Centre Zone.</li> <li>There are no qualifying matters applicable to this property that would prevent it being zoned six storeys. By omitting this property from a six-storey capable zoning, KCDC are failing to follow the intent and objectives of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>Having potential development land like this so close to a Metropolitan Centre Zone is likely a rare circumstance in Tier 1 local authorities and one which KCDC should be making better use of.</li> <li>Engineering solutions around stormwater detention could actually benefit the management of extreme weather events and should not deter development, but should be included in design guidelines. This should not preclude a higher density zoning under the NPS-UD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like 112 Main Road South, Raumati to be included in the 'Residential Intensification Precinct A' and therefore allow for building heights of up to six storeys as it is within a walkable catchment of the edge of Metropolitan Centre Zone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has recently been a new footpath constructed on Main South Road in the area identified by the submitter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent of PREC<sub>x1</sub> has been updated to account for the construction of the new footpath.</li> </ul>
122.	Intensification	General Public	Paraparaumu	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports higher density near the Metropolitan Centre Zone in Paraparaumu.</li> <li>The measurement of the 800m walkable catchment for the Metropolitan Centre Zone has been poorly applied. The current boundary along Main Road South is only 475m from the Ihakara starting point. It needs to be extended 800m as required by the NPS-UD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistently apply the 800m walking catchment. The area on Main Road South between Ihakara Street and Raumati Road needs to be brought into the Residential Intensification Precinct A.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has recently been a new footpath constructed on Main South Road in the area identified by the submitter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent of PREC<sub>x1</sub> has been updated to account for the construction of the new footpath.</li> </ul>
123.	Intensification	General Public	Ōtaki	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the proposed intensification of Ōtaki. Current infrastructure cannot sustain the current population, so won't be able to handle additional development.</li> <li>There is recognition in the Strategy that qualifying matters such as natural hazards, ecological sites, and sites of significance to mana whenua are grounds to exempt land from housing intensification. The proposals for new general residential zones in Ōtaki make no</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effects on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul>



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					reference to potential qualifying matters except for flood hazards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Areas of new General Residential Zone proposed at Ōtaki will be subject to the full range of existing district-wide provision outlined in the District Plan. The primary qualifying matter relevant to these sites is flood hazard, and the flood hazard provisions contained within the operative District Plan are considered appropriate to manage development in relation to this hazard.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
124.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Kapiti area is not suited to high density housing. It is close to a major metropolis (Wellington) which is where the high density growth should occur, close to a harbour and international airport.</li> <li>Shade will be a major issue if too many dwellings are built on one residential section.</li> <li>Does not agree with new subdivisions, land use or development in reserves and ecologically sensitive areas.</li> <li>The wording is too vague and leaves too much room for interpretation. For example 4.3 GRZ-Px3 'encourage' or 2.2(4) 'avoids'. Would be good to be more specific.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD across the district.</li> <li>It is acknowledged that there is likely to be an increase in shading effects associated with development constructed under the MDRS, however the bulk and location standards for development included in PC2 are those required by Schedule 3A of the Act.</li> <li>Development in ecologically sensitive areas that have been scheduled in the District Plan will be subject to the provisions contained in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter of the District Plan.</li> <li>The wording of policy GRZ-Px3 is mandatory policy wording required by Schedule 3A of the Act.</li> <li>The wording of policy UFD-P1(4) is considered to be sufficiently clear.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
125.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with intensification. Allows for smaller, less expensive houses to be built. Compact development will mean people are closer to amenities such as shopping centres and services resulting in less travel by car and active transport will become viable.</li> <li>KCDC will need to ensure that any intensification is 'well done'. People are concerned about losing views, sunlight etc.</li> <li>The 'Fifteen Minute Neighbourhood' concept should be fully explored, where people live with 15 minutes walking distance of services and shops.</li> <li>The issue of lack of land would be quickly solved with the closure of the airport and this land used for medium density housing and green spaces.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Centres and Residential Design Guides included as part of PC2 are intended to promote high quality design.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
126.	Intensification	General Public	Paraparaumu	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the higher density classification new the Metropolitan Centre Zone in Paraparaumu.</li> <li>The measurement of the 800m walkable catchment for the Metropolitan Centre Zone has not been applied. The current drawn boundary along Main Road South is only 475m from the Ihakara St starting point and needs to be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has recently been a new footpath constructed on Main South Road in the area identified by the submitter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>extended to the Raumati Road corner which is closer to 800m as required by the NPS-UD.</li> <li>As a minimum boundary PRECx1 be extended to the southern boundary of 120/122 Main Road South.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent of PRECx1 has been updated to account for the construction of the new footpath.</li> </ul>
127.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree the Kapiti needs more housing, built under controlled means and in a sensible location which will not be to the detriment of surrounding residents living or house values.</li> <li>Opposes removing the requirement of needed a resource consent, not allowing residents any rights to stop these developments, allowing three storeys and higher in the middle of a residential street.</li> <li>Multistorey blocks have no garages, so all cars line the streets and berms. Cast shadows over the people living next door.</li> <li>Ruins privacy, peace and quiet, enjoyment of life, blocks views and light and devalues peoples most important asset.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the MDRS provides for a greater level of permitted development, it does not remove resource consent requirements for developments that are denser than the MDRS (in particular, multi-storey buildings that are taller than 3-storeys or have more than three residential units).</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
128.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not agree with the proposed changes. The area has a garden or rural feel to it and the intensification proposed would change this character forever.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Don't implement the plan as set out and remove special character areas from the intensification rules.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD throughout the District.</li> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing character and amenity values. However, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
129.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter is generally concerned with the effects of housing intensification on standards of living.</li> <li>Concerned that the historic areas of Auckland will be lost.</li> <li>Concerned that New Zealanders will be forced to live in apartments without gardens.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
130.	Intensification	General Public	Waikanae	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports well-designed intensification, with a short walk to transport hubs.</li> <li>Disagrees with KCDC's definition of 800m being the walkable boundary of transport hubs, especially when the internationally recognised distance is 400m.</li> <li>Disagrees with the complete land of open spaces within the intensive zones.</li> <li>Disagrees with the lack of recognition of the impacts of the proposed intensification on climate change (by destroying established native trees and gardens within the garden area of Waikanae).</li> <li>Disagrees with the lack of protection for native birds and trees within the garden area and river corridor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Centres and Residential Design Guides included as part of PC2 are intended to promote high quality design.</li> <li>The 800m walkable catchment is consistent with Ministry for the Environment guidance on implementing policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>PC2 does not propose or require the removal of trees, although this may be an outcome of development undertaken under the provisions of PC2. However, the removal of non-protected trees for development can already occur under the provisions of the operative District Plan.</li> <li>Existing ecological sites and scheduled indigenous trees within the current Waikanae Garden Precinct will</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagrees with the disregard of the health, wellbeing and safety of residents (psychological impact of loss of privacy and impact on house prices).</li> <li>Disagrees with safeguarding the objective of providing a variety of housing types, such as single storey houses on decent size sections. A defined zone would protect this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change the defined walkable area for intensive housing of town centres to 400-500m.</li> <li>Not accept the rezoning of Waikanae garden area based on environmental and climate factors, mature native trees and its native birdlife.</li> <li>Design open spaces within the new intensive zones.</li> </ul>	<p>continue to be protected by the District Plan as existing qualifying matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing character and amenity values, including in the current Waikanae Garden Precinct. However, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> <li>An objective to provide for a variety of housing types is consistent with the requirement to give effect to the NPS-UD.</li> <li>The provisions of PC2 require outdoor living space to be provided for every new residential unit.</li> <li>New development is required to provide development or financial contributions towards the provision of new open spaces in accordance with the Council's Open Space Strategy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
131.	Intensification	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing is a problem, this might help but too little too late. Attractive 2 storey units would be a good option.</li> <li>Proposed height of buildings doesn't fit the area at all. Block sun to existing houses, backyard privacy will be lost, increased traffic and noise from density housing, decreased property values around density housing.</li> <li>The Jolly Pub is not a community hub.</li> <li>The proposed units are a long distance from doctors, pharmacy, supermarkets.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lowering the heights and decreasing density.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district plan is required to enable intensification by incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD throughout the District.</li> <li>The building heights and density standards proposed by PC2 are consistent with the requirements of the MDRS and policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing character and amenity values. However, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> <li>The Local Centre Zone at Mazengarb Road is a Local Centre Zone in the District Plan centre's hierarchy, and the zone can provide for the establishment of a range of commercial activities and community services to meet the needs of local population growth.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
132.	Intensification	Landowner	Main Highway, Ōtaki Rahui Road, Ōtaki	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed zoning for the submitter's properties would place them in the PREC<sub>x2</sub> – Residential Intensification Precinct B. The area has historically and is currently used for commercial purposes, activities which fit with surrounding land uses (petrol station, motel, railway, expressway). The quality of residential development on these sites would be severely compromised.</li> <li>A mixed use or commercial zoning would allow for development of modern commercial premises (or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Including the area within PREC<sub>x2</sub> – Residential Intensification Precinct B is consistent with the requirements of policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>Existing uses can continue to occur on the site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					preferably mixed use developments) beyond the prevalent retail premises as Ōtaki township expands. It would also allow for more effective utilisation of land in this location.	
133.	Intensification	Landowner	Main Road South, Raumati	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rezoning their section into 'Residential Intensification Precinct A' will achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>Now that the highway has moved, it is an easy 5 minute walk to Coastlands and 8 minute walk to the train station, so virtually no need to own a car.</li> <li>Would like to see modern urban design in the area, bringing more people and creating a vibrant community. Intensification will increase community numbers quickly. Would like to see options for struggling first home buyers and elderly.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
134.	Intensification	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Specific	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is critical for Fire and Emergency that water supply infrastructure is in place prior to any development commencing and that this water supply has adequate capacity and pressures available to service the future growth.</li> <li>The KCDC only requires the provisions of a firefighting water supply, and sufficient access to that supply, in accordance with the Code of Practice for subdivision proposals in the Rural Zone. As a result, there is a risk that water supply to new developments outside of the Rural Zones may not be adequate for fire suppression, particularly in the residential zones where the implications of the MDRS and NPS-UD are realised.</li> <li>Fire and Emergency consider that structure planning and staging programmes to align with infrastructure upgrades will be essential to ensure that urban development does not occur out of sequence with the delivery of key strategic infrastructure (network extensions or upgrades), such as water supply.</li> <li>Adequate access to both the source of a fire (or other emergency) and a firefighting water supply is essential to the efficient operations of Fire and Emergency. In general, the key access requirements include specific roading and access widths, and surface and gradients to support the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency appliances. This includes, but is not limited to the following: The minimum roading and carriageway widths should not be less than 4m for general appliance access. A clearway/vehicle crossing of no less than 3.5m wide should be provided as site entrances, internal entrances and between buildings. The maximum negotiable gradient is 1:5, but in general the roading gradient should not exceed 16%.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensuring adequate water supply pressure in the Council reticulated water supply to provide for firefighting is most appropriately addressed through the Council's management of water supply infrastructure, and through Council's Land Development Minimum Requirements, rather than through District Plan provisions.</li> <li>The General Residential Zone at Te Horo Beach is not connected to the Council reticulated water supply. In this instance it would be relevant to extend the requirement to provide a water supply for new development that currently applies in the Rural Zone to the General Residential Zone at Te Horo Beach. This would support the ability to undertake firefighting in this area.</li> <li>The design of the public roading network to provide adequate access for emergency services vehicles is most appropriately managed under the Council's Land Development Minimum Requirements, rather than district plan provisions. Because the LDMR is a district-specific amendment to NZS4404:2010, it may be more efficient for FENZ to seek changes to that standard (unless requirements sought by FENZ are specific to the Kāpiti Coast District).</li> <li>A range of matters raised by FENZ are regulated under the Building Act 2004 and Clause C of the Building Code. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access requirements for Fire and Emergency New Zealand vehicles to access buildings within sites;</li> <li>Requirements for buildings to be separated from boundaries;</li> <li>Requirements for buildings to include a range of fire safety systems, including sprinklers.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>The height clearance along accessways (for example trees, hanging cables and eaves) must exceed 4m.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A specific concern for Fire and Emergency relates to the proximity of buildings, particularly multi-storey developments to property boundaries. In order to respond to fires in multi-storey developments, it is often necessary to use aerial appliances for the purposes of creating a 'water curtain' to prevent fire spread to neighbouring buildings. Aerial appliances require minimum roading and carriage widths of 6.5m for such access.</li> <li>Fire and Emergency notes that a blanket rule for all properties may not be practicable. A restricted discretionary activity standard could be formulated such as where no vehicle access is provided to a lot/site, that an unobstructed path must be provided either, between buildings on the same site or between buildings and the property boundary to provide for sufficient emergency service access to the site/buildings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fire and Emergency considers that all subsequent subdivision and development should be subject to development standards within a district plan and/or development standards requiring all applicants to demonstrate that their development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the Code of Practice across all zones.</li> <li>In order to respond to local matters of interest, Fire and Emergency wishes to strongly promote the installation of sprinkler systems within all new built development across the district.</li> <li>Fire and Emergency request that local planning documents require all new developments across the District to comply with the Code of Practice, with sprinkler systems referenced as the preferred means of compliance.</li> </ul>	<p>On this basis, it is not considered efficient or necessary to address these matters within the District Plan as part of PC2.</p> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend rule INF-MENU-R29 to apply to residential buildings in the General Residential Zone at Te Horo Beach.</li> <li>Amend rule SUB-RES-Rx to add a standard that requires water supply for firefighting purposes for new subdivision within the General Residential Zone at Te Horo Beach.</li> </ul>
135.	Intensification	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (Kāinga Ora)	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General support for enabling intensification.</li> <li>Seeks the use of a Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone, in lieu of the General Residential Zone.</li> <li>Supported Living Accommodation (General Residential Zone): Seeks an increase in the maximum number of residents accommodated at any time in supported living accommodation from 6 persons to 10.</li> <li>Height in relation to boundary (Residential Intensification Precinct A and B): To enable heights and scale of urban built density, seeks an exclusion to the requirement to comply with the HIRB standard for any boundary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The general support for enabling intensification is noted.</li> <li>In the context of the Kāpiti Coast District Plan, it is not considered efficient or necessary to create a Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone in order to give effect to the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. The approach proposed by PC2 is the most efficient way of incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, and is not inconsistent with the National Planning Standards.</li> <li>The submission seeks a range of increases in building height and walkable catchment extent across the district, beyond what is required to give effect to policy 3</li> </ul>



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>between a site in the same zone (precinct) as well as site boundaries adjoining land zoned for centres, mixed use, or industrial purposes. Alternatively, seeking a more lenient HIRB increasing the vertical point at which the 60° control applies. Enable an increase of density of the urban built form in accordance with the policy framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outdoor Living Space, Unit above ground floor (RIP-A Metropolitan Centre Zone, Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone): Supports the minimum requirement of 8m<sup>2</sup> of outdoor living space per unit (with a minimum dimension of 1.8m), however, Kāinga Ora asks that this standard applies to units with two bedrooms or more. It is considered that for studio and one-bedroom units a minimum requirement of 5m<sup>2</sup> (with a minimum dimension of 1.8m) may be an appropriate standard for outdoor living space requirements. Further, Kāinga Ora seeks consideration be given to enabling a proportion of a residential development to not require provision of an outdoor balcony.</li> <li>Height (All zones): Seeks a more progressive consent pathway be provided once the enabled height limit is exceeded, as opposed to escalating straight to a non-complying activity status.</li> <li>Height (RIP-A): Seeks an increased provision of height of up to 10-storeys within 5-minute walking distance (400 metres) from the edge of Paraparaumu's metropolitan centre; and to increase the proposed height within 5-10 minute walking distance (800 metres) of the Paraparaumu metropolitan centre and train station from 6 storeys to 8 storeys.</li> <li>Height (RIP-B): In addition to increasing the walkable catchments around Town Centres and Local Centres, Kāinga Ora seeks an increased provision of height of up to 6-storeys within 10- minute walking distance (800 metres) from the edge of Town Centre Zone.</li> <li>Height (Metropolitan Centre Zone): Seeks no maximum height limit in the Metropolitan Centre Zone.</li> <li>Height (Town Centre Zone): Supports an enabled height of 6 storeys within Town Centres. However, Kāinga Ora seeks an increase in the permitted height limit of 12m, noting this is identical to the Local Centre Zone permitted height limit.</li> <li>Height (Local Centre Zone): Seeks the removal of a height limit that may be achieved via an RDA consent pathway. Delete the reference to the height up to 15m and amend the standard as 'Building heights exceed permitted standard' as RDA consent pathway.</li> </ul>	<p>of the NPS-UD. Given that the provisions of PC2 already provide for a significant increase in plan-enabled development capacity, the submission does not provide evidence as to why the further increases proposed are necessary to meet demand for housing or business land in the district. The submission also does not include evidence on the costs and benefits of the proposed increase on the community, and whether these are reasonable,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A range of HIRB standards were tested in the development of PC2, including the standard proposed Kāinga Ora. Given that the provisions of PC2 (which account for the proposed HIRB standard) already enable a significant increase in plan-enabled development capacity, there is not a compelling argument to provide for a more enabling HIRB standard in the Residential Intensification Precincts, for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The increased effects of shading would be increasingly likely to extend well beyond the site boundary;</li> <li>Comprehensive development of sites is still supported by the exception that HIRB standards to not apply at common walls;</li> <li>Breaching the HIRB standard is a restricted discretionary activity, which is consistent with the meaning of "plan-enabled" outlined in clause 3.4 of the NPS-UD.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Regarding consent pathways for breaching height limits, the only centre zone where the activity status jumps from restricted discretionary to non-complying status is the Local Centre Zone. Amending this to discretionary activity status would be consistent with the approach taken in the Town and Metropolitan Centre Zones.</li> <li>The submission does not include evidence to support reducing the size of outdoor living space requirement for studio and one bedroom units. However, it is noted that some flexibility is already provided for by the MDRS, which enable outdoor living space to be grouped cumulatively by area in a communally accessible location.</li> <li>The submission provides no evidence to support an increase in the supported living accommodation standard.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The activity status for breaching the restricted discretionary height standard in the Local Centre Zone</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						has been amended from non-complying to discretionary activity status (except within the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct).
136.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landlink Ltd.	Not Specific	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The modest rezoning of 13 small areas to residential does not give adequate effect to the NPS-UD or MDRS in accordance with the requirements of the RMA.</li> <li>There are several other areas which should be considered for rezoning which are either within or on the peripherals or urban areas, are well serviced for roading and infrastructure and have been overlooked without due justification. Waikanae Future Urban Development Land and WA-02A Lindale Centre PA-03 110 Te Moana Road and adjoining properties</li> <li>The proposed rezoning approach is narrow and unrealistic to deliver the quantities of housing identified in Te tupu pai and the revised District Plans strategic objectives. The limited approach to rezoning (particularly the lack of greenfield) will inhibit efficient development. Development will only be prosperous where there is demand to support regardless of how permissive or restrictive policy is.</li> <li>KCDC's ambitions for infill are unlikely to achieve the housing choice/different types of homes as advocated in Te tupu pai. The significant focus on infill and intensification as a first point of enablement in isolation of enabling other types of development does not play to Kāpiti's strengths or the character of the district.</li> <li>KCDC's approach to facilitating and providing infrastructure has to complement this plan change otherwise housing will not be enabled in line with the intent of this policy change. This includes how intensification will be facilitated alongside revised infrastructure requirements 'Land Development minimum requirements'.</li> <li>Monitoring and review of proposed changes are encouraged.</li> <li>A potential reliance on private plan changes to enable housing in other areas will be administratively cumbersome for all parties involved.</li> <li>Retaining minimum allotment sizes for subdivision given the proposed changes to permitted baseline for mot sites given MDRS and associated changes does not appear pragmatic. A blanket approach to intensification based on public transport infrastructure in Kāpiti potentially not as feasible as it would be in other urban centres.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IPI/ISPP process should only be used for the purposes outlined in s80E of the Act. The Council is mindful that the ISPP limits public involvement in the planning process, and as such careful consideration has been given to the areas that are included in the IPI.</li> <li>PC2 includes a range of sites proposed to be rezoned as General Residential Zone, where they meet specified criteria. This includes some parts of the Waikanae Future Urban Zone. A number of additional sites are proposed to be added to the General Residential Zone because submissions have demonstrated that they meet these criteria.</li> <li>Regarding enabling housing variety and choice, the HBA identifies that a key issue for the district is a shortfall in development capacity for joined dwelling types (semi-detached, terraced, and apartment housing typologies). The provisions of PC2 are intended to address this.</li> <li>The requirement to facilitate the development of infrastructure is noted. Effects on the demand for infrastructure throughout the district are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> <li>Minimum allotment sizes are only retained for vacant allotments, and allotments located within the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.</li> <li>The IPI is not the only plan change that will give effect to <i>Te tupu pai</i>. Other future urban development plan changes, initiated or facilitated by Council (where this is consistent with <i>Te tupu pai</i>) and private plan changes, will all contribute to providing for future urban development over the next 30 years.</li> <li>Regarding the further rezoning of properties at 269, 283 and 298 Ngarara Road, based on the information provided in the submission, and on information contained within the operative District Plan, the site does meet the criteria identified in PC2 for including within the General Residential Zone. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sites are located adjacent to the Ngarara Development Area (which is included in the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure provision remains concerning in relation to the proposed changes – this includes some areas where major infrastructure upgrades are needed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>174-211 Ngarara Road, Waikanae – broaden to include 269, 283 and 298 Ngarara Road.</li> <li>Part of 59-69 Raumati Road and part of 58 Kiwi Road, Raumati Beach – broaden to include three small isolated rural zoned sites on Rata Road.</li> <li>160-222 Main Road/39 Rongomau Lane, Raumati South – broaden to include other small pockets of remaining rural land (at the risk of leaving very small pockets of remaining rural land).</li> </ul>	<p>definition of <i>existing urban area</i> in the District Plan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing water supply and wastewater services pass through the area;</li> <li>The site is subject to flood hazards identified in the District Plan. Development of the land must meet the requirements of the provisions for flood hazards outlined in the operative District Plan.</li> <li>The site is located adjacent to a stream, and development on the site will be required to meet the requirements of district plan, regional plan and national environmental standards related to development near waterbodies.</li> <li>The site is a fragmented part of the Future Urban Zone, and is not sufficiently large or complex enough to require a structure planned approach.</li> <li>The site could provide a notable contribution to plan-enabled residential development capacity.</li> <li>Some parts of the site at 298 Ngarara Road are located in the General Rural Zone outside of the Waikanae North Urban Edge. This part of the site would be inappropriate to include in the General Residential Zone as part of PC2.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submission does not provide evidence to support including three small isolated rural zoned sites on Rata Road.</li> <li>The land excluded from rezoning in and around the Expressway on SH1 at Raumati South has been excluded on the basis that it is either covered by the Expressway designation, or is covered by significant constraints.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rezone parts of 269, 283 and 298 Ngarara Road within the Future Urban Zone (to the south of the Waikanae North Urban Edge) to General Residential Zone.</li> </ul>
137.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landlink Ltd.	WA-03 Site Specific Submission  14 Greenaway Road, Waikanae		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study area identified as 'WB-03' is a well-connected and well serviced site primed and ready for future growth and development. The site is well located in an established urban community and has services and infrastructure available to support new development. Believe that the site constraints identified are overstated and not reflective of the easy to support development potential.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is located in an area that was given consideration as part of the preparation of PC2. It was found that the area is subject to a range of constraints, resulting in an area of sufficient complexity that it would be more appropriate to address the zoning of the site through a future plan change process. The submission identifies that further investigation is required to address these constraints.</li> </ul>



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<b>Relief sought by submitter:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly recommend the site is further investigated and re-evaluated from Priority Group '2b' to 'Priority Group 1', realising its potential for short term development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rezoning of this individual site would result in an incohesive zoning pattern. It may be more appropriate to consider including other sites as part of any proposed rezoning to provide for a cohesive edge to the General Residential Zone (if there is sufficient information to support this).</li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
138.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landlink Ltd.	WB-02 Site Specific Submission  100-110 Te Moana Road, Osborne	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area identified as site 'WB-02' is a well-connected and well serviced area primed for future growth and development. As such it is strongly recommended it is further investigated and re-evaluated to 'Priority Group 1'.</li> <li>Investment in infrastructure and services over the years have brought services 'to the door' of the site. There is accessible sewer, water, roading, electric and telecommunications infrastructure.</li> <li>Further development of this site would be complementary to the adjacent and recently developed mixed use area.</li> <li>The provisional '2B' priority rating of this site overlooks its positioning as a pragmatic and strategic greenfield (upzoning) development option to support shorter term growth in an established and well serviced area.</li> </ul> <b>Relief sought by submitter:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further investigation is undertaken on site 'WB-02' focusing on: Technical assessments, Cultural and ecological investigation, Geotechnical and liquefaction issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is located in an area that was given consideration as part of the preparation of PC2. It was found that the area is subject to a range of constraints, resulting in an area of sufficient complexity that it would be more appropriate to address the zoning of the site through a future plan change process. The submission identifies that further investigation is required to address these constraints.</li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
139.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Not Specific	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If someone has a large amount of rural land, restrictions still seem to be for a small number of buildings (1 residential, 1 minor flat &lt;60m2, and a bunch of sleep outs 30m2). This is not adding to intensification.</li> <li>Plan uses words that are very subjective, have little defined meaning left open to interpretation. Inhibits a sound platform for an investor to accurately plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MDRS will apply to land rezoned as General Residential Zone as part of PC2.</li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
140.	General Residential Re-Zone	Maypole Environmental Limited (Maypole)	Waimeha Neighbourhood Development Area	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the main element of offering different kinds of homes and more options for how people live, such as apartments, semi-detached and terraced houses, and including more affordable homes, and encouraging more mixed uses in centres.</li> <li>Supports the intention to increase density for existing suburbs to enable a wider choice of housing to be delivered – including affordable housing.</li> <li>Surprised that the intensification provisions to be included in the General Residential Zone has not been</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MDRS are required to be incorporated into <i>relevant residential zones</i> in the District Plan. The Ngārara Development Area does not meet the definition of a <i>relevant residential zone</i>, because it is not a residential zone listed and described in standard 8 of the National Planning Standards.</li> <li>The Ngārara Development Area is subject to a structure plan, and a detailed and integrated set of bespoke provisions to carefully manage development in the area. These provisions include a requirement to develop area</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>brought into the Ngarara Development Area Zone, which is clearly identified as an existing urban area in Te Tupu Pai, with a future planned local centre identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Ngarara Development Area is a bespoke zone with a number of environmental areas that need to be balanced, and any proposed changes to implement the intensification provisions will need to be carefully managed, in conjunction with Maypole to be workable and to ensure that these fit in with existing development plans and achieve desired results.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include the intensification provisions introduced by the draft PPC2-I for the General Residential Zone into the Ngarara Development Area zone in maps in Appendix 1 – Map 06 Zones.</li> </ul>	<p>specific development plans and comply with design guides specific to the development area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rezoning of all or parts of the Ngarara Development Area would require careful consideration in order to ensure the integrated management approach for the Development Area is maintained in a manner that is consistent with the requirements of the MDRS. Evidence would be required to identify how this could be achieved. It would be more appropriate to undertake this through a future plan change designed to achieve this purpose.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
141.	General Residential Re-Zone	General Public	Rangiuru Road, Ōtaki	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree that more housing is needed and housing close to the town centre is vital particularly for the elderly and those without personal transport.</li> <li>254 Rangiuru Road backs onto Te Kura but 234 Rangiuru Road backs onto farmland. The whole reason for a 'buffer' zone between residential and rural land is to mitigate any issues around farming activities.</li> <li>The Rangiuru spring and the creek runs on the boundary of these properties. Preserve areas of such significance.</li> <li>Ōtaki is a small rural township and part of the attraction is the semi-rural feel. Intensive and high-rise housing will destroy that.</li> <li>An additional 90+ dwellings will change the volume of traffic and worsen an already dangerous piece of road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The potential effects of development on Rangiuru spring and creek that runs to the north of the proposed rezone area are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions, as well as provisions contained within the Proposed Natural Resources Plan and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater.</li> <li>Development in the new area of General Residential Zone will be subject to the transport rules in the District Plan, including rules around vehicle trip generation. A range of measures, including development contributions and resource consent conditions, may contribute to managing the effects of additional development on the existing road network.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
142.	General Residential Re-Zone	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like KCDC to set up a subdivision campaign to encourage property owners to subdivide.</li> <li>Agree that the district needs more residential land and appreciates that productive farming land has not been targeted for development.</li> <li>Recommends focussing development efforts on the big dwelling gains Ngarara 390, Raumati/Kiwi 290, Main/Rongomau/Poplar 320.</li> <li>Three of the sites have possible flood hazards which will need to be managed very carefully.</li> <li>As well as new developments, the district should be consolidating the urban land already in use. Making better use of public land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Managing the design of development in relation to existing flood hazards identified in the District Plan is a matter that would be addressed through the resource consent/subdivision consent process for new development. New development will need to meet the requirements of the range of flood hazard provisions contained in the Operative District Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
143.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Not Specific	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposed rezoning of their site to General Residential Zone enabling subdivision.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council is in the process of undertaking a review of flood hazard modelling across the District. Any development that triggers the flood hazard provisions contained within the District Plan will need to be</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review the flood zone on their property and possible other properties too.</li> <li>Reassure that there is the infrastructure in Kapiti to handle increased developments.</li> </ul>	<p>designed to manage flood hazards based on the best available information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effects on the demand for infrastructure are managed through a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to apply, in addition to the collection of development or financial contributions for new development. Planning to manage the effects of projected population growth on the demand for and capacity of infrastructure more broadly is undertaken through the Council's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
144.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Stetson Rise, Waikanae	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not understand how the intensification of this subdivision fits into the government's vision.</li> <li>The sites on this road are only just big enough to fit all requirements of septic, water tanks, soak pits, and soak fields.</li> <li>Concerned about additional traffic on the road if surrounding land was developed, as it is already deemed unsafe by users.</li> <li>Do not want to be connected to KCDC services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Act enables the District Plan to include new residential zones as part of incorporating the MDRS into the District Plan.</li> <li>Rezoning areas as General Residential Zone contributes to the ability for the district plan to provide for increased housing supply and increased housing variety.</li> <li>New development within the Zone will be subject to a range of requirements to support the upgrading or development of new infrastructure, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development/financial contributions;</li> <li>Requirements to meet a range of district plan provisions to manage the effects of development on transport, stormwater, wastewater and water supply networks;</li> <li>Meeting the Council's infrastructure requirements (which are a permitted activity standard in the District Plan).</li> </ul> </li> <li>PC2 does not require existing sites to be connected to Council infrastructure, although future redevelopment of any site may trigger a requirement to connect to Council infrastructure where this is available.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
145.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the re-zoning of this property.</li> <li>Has a concern regarding the lack of services, currently no access to town sewer.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New development within the Zone will be subject to a range of requirements that support the upgrading or development of new infrastructure, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development/financial contributions;</li> <li>Requirements to meet a range of district plan provisions to manage the effects of development on transport, stormwater, wastewater and water supply networks;</li> <li>Meeting the Council's infrastructure requirements (which are a permitted activity standard in the District Plan).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
146.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	The Parade, Paekākāriki	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the rezoning of 104 The Parade, Paekākāriki, to be consistent with neighbouring properties.</li> <li>Concerns about the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct rules – large allotment sizes which are outside the intent of the new law changes, which is to allow greater density of housing. An inappropriate restriction, so would like this matter to be addressed at the same time as other plan changes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is to identify the area where it is not considered appropriate to enable the level of development otherwise required by the Medium Density Residential Standards and policy 3 of the NPS-UD until the management of coastal hazards is addressed through a future coastal environment plan change.</li> <li>The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct would apply regardless of whether the site was rezoned.</li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
147.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Milne Drive, Paraparaumu	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In agreement with the proposal and support the rezoning of their property.</li> <li>No aware of any particular matters which would need to be considered and are interested in investigating subdivision.</li> <li>Informal discussion with a neighbour indicated a similar position.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
148.	General Residential Re-zone	Landowner	Field Way, Waikanae Beach	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter seeks that land at the end of Field Way in Waikanae Beach is rezoned from General Rural Zone to General Residential Zone. The submitter states that this would enable 4 to 5 sections to be made available immediately.</li> <li>The submitter notes that the site is connected to existing services.</li> <li>The submitter notes that rezoning the site would support government direction to enable housing supply, and would support implementation of the NPS-UD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is located outside of the “Waikanae North Urban Edge”. This is a line that spans from the coast to the foothills north of Waikanae, and defines the northernmost extent of the urban area intended by the operative District Plan (see policy UFD-P1(2)).</li> <li>While it may be appropriate to review this line in future, doing so would need to be undertaken in a comprehensive manner that considers the full extent of the future urban form to the north of Waikanae. As this is not required in order to incorporate the MDRS or give effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, it would be more appropriate to address this line, and the rezoning of any sites beyond the line, as part of a future plan change process.</li> <li>In the meantime, it would be inappropriate to rezone individual sites to the north of this line in an ad-hoc manner as part of PC2.</li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
149.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Poplar Avenue, Raumati South	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal to rezone this area should be delayed. It may become acceptable under careful management at a later date.</li> <li>99-105 Poplar Avenue is adversely affected by stormwater events to the west. Drainage to the coast is via one culvert, which is not located at the lowest point.</li> <li>All existing properties on the block have experienced flooding, and while new development will be required to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Managing the design of new development in relation to existing flood hazards identified in the District Plan is a matter that would be addressed through the resource consent/subdivision consent. New development will need to meet the requirements of the range of flood hazard provisions contained in the Operative District Plan, based on the best available information. Flood hazard mapping for the area identified by the submitter is currently in the process of being updated.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>observe hydraulic neutrality, hard areas will still be created resulting in run-off.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding that there used to be a stream running through these properties to a park which is no longer there.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Until the MOH block of land to the west of 99 Poplar Avenue, which is the lowest point, has the ability to allow runoff of surface water to the other side of the road and into water courses which drain naturally to the coast, further development the impacts the volume of water on surrounding properties should not be considered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New subdivision for development would be required to meet the hydraulic neutrality requirements in the District Plan. Where new development causes hydraulic effects outside the site, the development will be required to undertake measures to mitigate these effects as part of the resource consent process.</li> <li>The Long-term Plan provides for a programme of work to upgrade and maintain existing stormwater networks across the district.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
150.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Milne Drive, Paraparaumu	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal to rezone 132-188 Milne Drive.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
151.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Main Road South, Paraparaumu	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the rezone, but has some concerns.</li> <li>The manuka glade across the expressway to the west of 198 Main Road South holds cultural and environmental value and should not be compromised by any proposed zoning changes.</li> <li>Reduce the speed limit along Main Road South to 50km/h for the safety of current and future residents.</li> <li>Introduce noise restriction legislation to confine construction noise to 7.30am-5pm Monday-Friday out of consideration for residents next to new development. Should include the playing of commercial radio or similar at volumes upsetting to locals.</li> <li>Consideration given to minimise dust levels where possible.</li> <li>Soft boundaries between existing small holding and larger surrounding holdings which are marked for residential development. For example, a tree/shrub line rather than high fences.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area of vegetation to the west of 198 Main South Road is not identified as an ecological site or scheduled as a key indigenous tree in the operative District Plan.</li> <li>Significant indigenous vegetation on the site identified by the submitter will continue to be protected by the rules of Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter of the District Plan, until such time as the site is subdivided into sections smaller than 4,000m<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>Noise and dust emissions from construction activity are managed under the provisions of the operative District Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
152.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Milne Drive, Paraparaumu	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the proposal to rezone 132-188 Milne Drive.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
153.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	40 and 52 Te Roto Road, Ōtaki	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear as to why this area is zoned as rural and rated as residential.</li> <li>A perfect area for high density subdivision, a major upgrade to the area would be necessary and very welcome.</li> <li>The area is well positioned to the town centre, town facilities, cycling, public transportation, walking distance to shops, green spaces, river, ocean, and schools.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seeks rezoning of two sites on Te Roto Road in Otaki.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is part of a larger “longer-term greenfield growth area and future urban study area” identified in <i>Te tupu pai</i> (the District Growth Strategy). If urban development is considered to be appropriate in this area, the area is of a sufficient size and complexity to require structure planning in order to enable cohesive future urban development.</li> <li>It would be more appropriate to consider this area through a future urban development plan change, rather than as part of PC2.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On Te Roto and Rahui Roads, Otaki: footpaths on both sides, street lighting, stormwater provisions, residential subdivision on both sides including the racecourse, street widening.</li> </ul>	
154.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Otaihanga	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applied for resource consent to subdivide their property in Otaihanga (RM210147).</li> <li>Believe that the subdivision and development that they have sought resource consent for at Otaihanga has already been investigated and the constraints associated with a greenfield development on that site, and demonstrated that Council three waters infrastructure is able to service this proposed development.</li> <li>This proposed subdivision borders the western side of the northern part of Tieko Street, which is zoned General Residential and which will have intensification provisions applying to this land.</li> <li>Believe that their property meet the criteria to have this rezoning occur, and including their property in PPC2-I would meet the Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include the Mansell farm west of the Kapiti Expressway in Otaihanga in maps in Appendix 1 – Map 09 Zones – General Residential Rezone.</li> <li>Include reference to the Mansell farm in any relevant provisions subject to change by PPC2-I where other areas are being rezoned from rural lifestyle to General Residential are referenced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area is part of a larger “medium priority greenfield growth area” identified in <i>Te tupu pai</i> (the District Growth Strategy). If urban development is considered to be appropriate in this area, the area is of a sufficient size and complexity to require structure planning in order to enable cohesive future urban development.</li> <li>It would be more appropriate to consider this area through a future urban development plan change, rather than as part of PC2.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
155.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oppose the rezoning of their property and surrounding properties to General Residential.</li> <li>The character and atmosphere of Waikanae is a main draw, which needs to be preserved. There is plenty of space to infill residential areas which already have little character.</li> <li>Residential development of the big scale will wreak havoc to the local wildlife. Habitats will disappear, and increased numbers of domestic cats, stoats, pests will move into the native bush areas. Street lighting will drive away the Ruru.</li> <li>The increase in rates due to a zone change and development potential would be more than the submitter could afford. They do not want to be driven out of the area yet.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A suitable structure plan that allowed subdivision but with bigger sections, lower density housing with green</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land is located within the Future Urban Zone. The district plan signals that land within the Future Urban Zone may be incorporated into the urban environment in the future.</li> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing character and amenity values in the area, however, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> <li>There are no identified ecological sites or significant habitats of indigenous fauna identified within the area proposed to be rezoned.</li> <li>There are a range of reasons why structure planning would be of little benefit to the area, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The size and shape of the area;</li> <li>The existing road network that passes through the area already provides for access to the area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					spaces to blend the residential areas on Ngarara Road and the rural Jacks Bush area would provide a more gradual transition, reduce environmental impacts, allow for the provision of wildlife corridors, and keep the character of the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing urban-scale subdivision within the area has limited the ability to provide for new access networks through the area.</li> <li>PC2 does not change the rates associated with a site (unless a site is subdivided). Rates are based on rating area boundaries, and amendment to these boundaries is only undertaken with full consultation undertaken alongside the Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
156.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neither supports nor opposes the rezone of their property.</li> <li>Bottom end of property was under water during the floods of December 2021, low lying and swampy.</li> <li>Has engaged with KCDC previously regarding a native reforestation project on their property, which they would like to see protected (now and for the future).</li> <li>Would like clarity regarding rates, and whether these will increase after a rezone regardless of subdivision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The District Plan does identify areas of flood hazard within this area. Flood hazards within the area in relation to new development are managed through the provisions of the operative District Plan.</li> <li>Reforested areas may be able to be protected through a range of mechanisms within and outside of the District Plan, although there is not sufficient evidence to support this as part of PC2.</li> <li>PC2 does not change the rates associated with a site (unless a site is subdivided). Rates are based on rating area boundaries, and amendment to these boundaries is only undertaken with full consultation undertaken alongside the Long-term Plan process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
157.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed zone change is fully supported as it is logical and sensible.</li> <li>The area has been signalled as 'future urban' for approximately 20 years.</li> <li>Rezoning will provide an opportunity for the land to be developed wisely whilst taking into account the sites unique features.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
158.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the rezoning as it is currently planned.</li> <li>Rezoning without some limitation as to lot size/density will negatively impact the areas ecology (Jack's Bush and Nga Manu) and will be counter to KCDC's stated policy of integration and protection of areas of environmental and cultural importance with any future urban development.</li> <li>The Draft PC2 report fails to recognise or acknowledge the Key Native Ecosystem (KNE) plan for the Nga Manu Wetland Complex (NMWC). KCDC would be responsible for the continued decline of New Zealand's indigenous biodiversity by allowing rezoning and intensified urban development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area proposed to be rezoned does not include the ecological sites identified at Jack's Bush and Ngā Manu.</li> <li>New development within the area will be subject to a range of requirements that support the upgrading (or development of new) infrastructure such as roading where this is required, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development/financial contributions;</li> <li>Requirements to meet a range of district plan provisions to manage the effects of development on transport, stormwater, wastewater and water supply networks;</li> <li>Meeting the Council's infrastructure requirements (which are a permitted activity standard in the District Plan).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ngarara Road is narrow, windy and dangerous. Future development will generate significant additional traffic and pose a material increase in road safety for all users, particularly walkers and cyclists as well as car users turning into the road. PD2 does nothing for walkability and safety.</li> <li>A structure plan would seem prudent to address the aforementioned roading safety issues and environmental impacts as well as facilitating a more coordinated development programme.</li> <li>Disconnect between what is actually required to meet Kāpiti's growing population and what PC2 could deliver demonstrates significant scope to par back development densities in areas that exhibit special environmental characteristics such as Ngarara.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request KDCDC gives consideration to these notable characteristics by imposing a lower development density under a revised PC2 than would otherwise prevail.</li> <li>Rezoning of the WFUZ be postponed until the safety issues associated with this section of Ngarara Road are addressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are a range of reasons why structure planning would be of marginal benefit to the area, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area is not so large that it would clearly benefit from a structure planned approach;</li> <li>The existing road network that passes through the area already provides for access to the area.</li> <li>Existing urban-scale subdivision within the area has limited the ability to provide for new access networks through the area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
159.	General Residential Re-Zone	General Public	Karu Crescent	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1-3 Karu Crescent would be better zoned as commercial/mixed use activity as opposed to residential.</li> <li>The land is on a corner site, adjacent other commercially zoned land and has a sloping topography.</li> <li>The theoretical dwelling estimate is 6 dwellings, which is ambitious given the topography and not significant enough to warrant a change to residential.</li> <li>The land would better serve the community as commercial use or left as open space zone and developed as a village park/playground.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rezoning the area as General Residential Zone is consistent with land use zoning to the south and west of the site. A change in topography to the east provides reasonable separation to commercial land uses to the east.</li> <li>Rezoning the area as General Residential Zone is consistent with the requirement to incorporate the MDRS as give effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
160.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Main Road South, Paraparaumu	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the rezoning of their land.</li> <li>Believes it will devalue their property and make it more difficult to sell.</li> <li>Does not want to live next to a complex of three storey dwellings. Concerned about a loss of privacy and peace in the neighbourhood.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rezoning the area as General Residential Zone is consistent with the requirement to incorporate the MDRS into the District Plan.</li> <li>Rezoning areas as General Residential Zone contributes to the ability for the district plan to provide for increased housing supply and increased housing variety.</li> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing character and amenity values in the area, however, Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
161.	General Residential Re-Zone	Lindale Investments Limited and Lindale Residential Limited	111 (Old) State Highway 1, Paraparaumu	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A recently approved subdivision consent proposes to create three allotments, two of which are intended for residential development.</li> <li>Land to the immediate south-west of Lot 2 is zoned General Residential. Lot 2 does not contain and is not required for commercial activities or car parking and is currently fallow.</li> <li>Land use consent has been lodged for a 15 unit development on Lot 3.</li> <li>This area is no longer a 'North Gateway' to Paraparaumu. The zoning and precinct requirements need to be reviewed and amended to reflect this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This submission requests that these parcels (Lots 2 and 3 on the approved subdivision plan) be rezoned General Residential to reflect the intended land use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submission seeks rezoning of two sites of the Mixed Use Zone (Paraparaumu North Gateway Precinct) from Mixed Use Zone to General Residential Zone.</li> <li>While this may be appropriate in relation to the individual sites, this would disrupt the existing cohesive zoning pattern in the area. On this basis, it would be more appropriate to consider whether these sites should be rezoned as part of a broader review of the Paraparaumu North Gateway Precinct in its entirety.</li> <li>There is insufficient evidence or indications from other landowners to undertake a broader review of the extent of the Mixed Use Zone and Paraparaumu North Gateway Precinct as part of PC2.</li> <li>Rezoning of the Mixed Use Zone in this area would require a more comprehensive review, including looking at the demand for employment land within the district more broadly.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
162.	General Residential Re-Zone	Classic Developments Limited	Rangiuru Road, Ōtaki	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the further residential development of 234-254 Rangiuru Road.</li> <li>The site is in close proximity to the main town centre and various schools, and is serviced by footpaths, water, and sewer. The District Plan will also manage any servicing upgrade requirements and management of flood hazards across the site to enable the appropriate level of development for the site.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
163.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Mazengarb Road, Paraparaumu	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to see the PREC2 designation adjacent to the Meadows precinct (PREC31 Local Centre Zone) extended to include the Rural Lifestyle Zone which incorporates the property 333 Mazengarb Road, Paraparaumu.</li> <li>Believe the property (which is currently in the Rural Lifestyle Zone) meets all of the criteria with the exception of the low degree of constraints.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is part of a larger "medium priority greenfield growth area" identified in <i>Te tupu pai</i> (the District Growth Strategy). If urban development is considered to be appropriate in this area, the area is of a sufficient size and complexity to require structure planning in order to enable cohesive future urban development.</li> <li>It would be more appropriate to consider this area through a future urban development plan change, rather than as part of PC2.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
164.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Main Road South, Paraparaumu	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed rezoning not only provides an opportunity to create areas of affordable housing, but will be the catalyst needed for the area to be revitalised.</li> <li>A much better use of an existing resource located near the town centre. It is convenient for commuting and within service range of transport and existing shopping precincts.</li> <li>In full support of the proposal in its current form.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
165.	General Residential Re-Zone	General Public	234 and 254 Rangioru Road, Ōtaki	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is insufficient open space in the area, and the land should be considered for open space uses. Using the land for open space purposes would help the Council implement its Open Spaces Strategy.</li> <li>Alternatively, the land could be considered for food producing purposes, such as maara kai.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is acknowledged that there is a lower degree of access to open space along Rangioru Road. New development that occurs within the area will be required (through financial or development contributions) to contribute towards the upgrading of existing open spaces, or development of new open spaces, consistent with the Open Spaces Strategy. This could include the provision of open space as within the area as part of any new development.</li> <li>The area of land is intended by the Council to be developed for housing. The area is located within close proximity to Ōtaki Main Street town centre, and rezoning the area is consistent with the requirement that the Council incorporate the MDRS and give effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
166.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	40 and 52 Te Roto Road, Ōtaki	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear as to why this area is zoned as rural and rated as residential.</li> <li>A perfect area for high density subdivision, a major upgrade to the area would be necessary and very welcome.</li> <li>The area is well positioned to the town centre, town facilities, cycling, public transportation, walking distance to shops, green spaces, river, ocean, and schools.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seeks rezoning of land around Te Roto Road in Ōtaki.</li> <li>On Te Roto and Rahui Roads, Ōtaki: footpaths on both sides, street lighting, stormwater provisions, residential subdivision on both sides including the racecourse, street widening.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is part of a larger “longer-term greenfield growth area and future urban study area” identified in <i>Te tupu pai</i> (the District Growth Strategy). If urban development is considered to be appropriate in this area, the area is of a sufficient size and complexity to require structure planning in order to enable cohesive future urban development.</li> <li>It would be more appropriate to consider this area through a future urban development plan change, rather than as part of PC2.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
167.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Te Moana Road, Waikanae	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally support the intent of KCDC to investigate land use changes to enable residential development of this site through PC2.</li> <li>A land use consent has recently been issued from both KCDC and GWRC to undertake earthworks across this site. The purpose of the consent was to enable an access track into the property that could be used for a range of vehicles for future residential activity.</li> <li>There is an identified ecological site that borders the property. This is within a low-lying area at the south end of the site and has been identified as a significant natural wetland in GWRC PNRP.</li> <li>Access to the site would be via a paper road located between 54 and 56 Te Moana Road.</li> <li>A General Residential Zone would be an appropriate buffer between the adjoining rural land to the south and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is considered that there is insufficient evidence to support the rezoning of this site as part of PC2. In particular, it is noted that this site is scheduled as wāhi tapu site W4 in Schedule 9 of the District Plan.</li> <li>The area is identified as the Takamore Urupā. Consideration would need to be given to the impact on Takamore urupā, and consultation with Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai would be required.</li> <li>The area is subject to the <i>wāhanga rima</i> provisions of the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter. The Council and mana whenua have identified that the <i>wāhanga rima</i> provisions of the district plan do not sufficiently manage development in relation to sites of significance listed under this category. These provisions are subject to review and a future plan change process. On this basis, it is not considered that the operative</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>the Intensification Precinct to the west and north. The site can be adequately serviced and access can be provided via the paper road to Te Moana Road.</p> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the site at Lot 1 DP 88064 held on Certificate of Title 494921 located at Waikanae Beach be included in PC2 and rezoned General Residential.</li> <li>That the Restricted Discretionary Subdivision Rule SUB-RES-R27 be amended to allow for a land use consent for comprehensive residential development be applied for at the same time as an RDA subdivision. The comprehensive residential development of the site could be listed as one of the matters of discretion as opposed to a standard (i.e. delete standard SUB-RES-R27(2)(b)).</li> </ul>	<p>District Plan provisions for wāhi tapu on the site would appropriately manage urban development in relation to the wāhi tapu.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the changes sought to SUB-RES-R27 is unclear.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
168.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stetson Estate is a special subdivision in which purchasers have sought much larger than the current norms of approximately 500sq.metres. The covenants do not permit subdivision, and each lot owner needs to provide their own services so, in effect, this subdivision is self-regulating. In the foreseeable future no services appear to the planned by KCDC. If they do eventually occur, the subdivision would already be serviced.</li> <li>The current levels of traffic using Ngarara Road are too high, with potential for serious accidents. An increase in development would only exacerbate this danger.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PC2 does not affect private covenants over land.</li> <li>Part of the rationale for the resource consent application for Stetson Estate was that the land's Future Urban Zoning indicated that urban development is intended in the area.</li> <li>New development within the rezoned area will be subject to a range of requirements that support the upgrading or development of new infrastructure where required (including roading infrastructure), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development/financial contributions;</li> <li>Requirements to meet a range of district plan provisions to manage the effects of development on transport, stormwater, wastewater and water supply networks;</li> <li>Meeting the Council's infrastructure requirements (which are a permitted activity standard in the District Plan).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
169.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Huia Street, Waikanae	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest KCDC look at the five acre blocks from 70 Huia Street northwards to Amokura Street (there are at least 4/5 of these) to zone residential.</li> <li>Significant area of land not too far from the town centre. Housing shortage is partly blamed on the lack of building sites, so it could be time to look into these blocks.</li> <li>The gradients of this area are the same as Kapiti Estate that is 150m from the boundary, a block that will have 36 houses on it.</li> <li>The Long Term Plan has a Huia Street/Hadfield Road extension in 2045 and clearly any new subdivisions would require this to be revised and brought forward before the Elizabeth Street/Main Road intersection grinds to a complete halt.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is part of a larger "longer-term greenfield growth area and future urban study area" identified in <i>Te tupu pai</i> (the District Growth Strategy).</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
170.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Huiawa Street, Waikanae	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open Space zoning over 18 Huiawa Street, Waikanae be amended to a more suitable Residential Zone.</li> <li>The site adjoins the General Residential Zone to the east. The land of the western side of Huiawa Street and its immediately surrounding land is also zoned General Residential and is within the Beach Residential Precinct.</li> <li>If this site was to be rezoned as General Residential or General Residential – Residential Intensification Precinct B, the site could be able to be developed for residential housing.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the definitions for ‘qualifying matters’ be amended to allow for intensification of privately owned open space zoned land.</li> <li>That the site at 18 Huiawa Street, Waikanae be included in PC2 and rezoned General Residential or Residential Intensification Precinct B.</li> <li>That the Restricted Discretionary Subdivision Rule SUB-RES-R27 be amended to allow for a land use consent for comprehensive residential development be applied for at the same time as an RDA subdivision. The comprehensive residential development of the site could be listed as one of matters of discretion as opposed to a standard (i.e. delete standard SUB-RES-R27(2)(b)).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site (adjacent to the Waikanae Beach Bowling Club) is zoned Open Space (Private Recreation and Leisure Precinct). It is privately owned.</li> <li>The site is located adjacent to the General Residential Zone and in close proximity to the Local Centre Zone at Waikanae Beach. Rezoning the area as General Residential Zone is consistent with the requirement that the District Plan incorporate the MDRS and give effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>The entire extent of the site is subject to flood hazards identified in the District Plan. Development of the land must meet the requirements of the provisions for flood hazards outlined in the operative District Plan, and this is likely to impact on the development capacity of the site. Further flood risk assessment would highlight whether there are any key issues for development on the site that need to be considered.</li> <li>The site is located adjacent to a stream, and development on the site will be required to meet the requirements of district plan, regional plan and national environmental standards related to development near waterbodies.</li> <li>It is considered that the site meets the criteria for rezoning sites as General Residential Zone as part of PC2.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subject to further flood risk assessment, rezone the site at 18 Huiawa Street, Waikanae Beach as General Residential Zone (PRECx2 – Residential Intensification Precinct B).</li> </ul>
171.	General Residential Re-zone	Landowner	Morepork Drive, Waikanae	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like KCDC to rezone their site to General Residential.</li> <li>The site is currently vacant and located within Stage 1 of the Manu Park subdivision approved in 2017. The consent allows for one residential dwelling and a minor dwelling to be constructed on it.</li> <li>The subdivision approved under RM160213 has substantially different lot, roading arrangement and open space network to what was envisaged by the Precincts identified in the Waikanae North Precinct Plan.</li> <li>The open space zoning severely restricts the landowners ability to intensify and develop the site as provided for under Policy 3 and the MDRS. The site is not subject to inundation and does not contain the ecological site K133.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MDRS are required to be incorporated into <i>relevant residential zones</i> in the District Plan. The Waikanae North Development Area does not meet the definition of a <i>relevant residential zone</i>, because it is not a residential zone listed and described in standard 8 of the National Planning Standards.</li> <li>While the Development Area may be considered an urban environment, based on the operative District Plan no changes are required in order to give effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD in the area.</li> <li>The Waikanae North Development Area is subject to a structure plan, and a detailed and integrated set of bespoke provisions (including design guides) to carefully manage development in the area. Rezoning of all or parts of the Waikanae North Development Area would require careful consideration in order to ensure</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is sully serviced for potable water, wastewater, power and phone.</li> <li>Don't believe there are any qualifying matters that would apply to the site, and consider that the site meets the criteria for intensification under the NPS-UD and MDRS.</li> </ul>	<p>the integrated management approach for the Development Area is maintained in a manner that is consistent with the requirements of the MDRS. Evidence would be required to identify how this could be achieved. It would be more appropriate to undertake this through a future plan change designed to achieve this purpose.</p> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
172.	General Residential Re-Zone	Waikanae North Limited	Waikanae	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given that the Waikanae North zone is within the urban environment of the Kapiti District and currently meets the definition of being a relevant residential zone, the area should also be included within PC2 to enable further intensification in accordance with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD and the MDRS set out in the RM-EHS.</li> <li>With the exception of the public open space areas, there are no qualifying matters that would allow KCDC to make this land less enabling of development under Policy 3 and the MDRS.</li> <li>With the exception of the Mixed Use Precinct which allows for commercial activities, and the Open Space Precinct where it is in public open space, the provisions of the MDRS are not more enabling than what is provided in the Waikanae North zone.</li> <li>The incorporation of Waikanae North in PC2 would regularise the area into the surrounding and immediate zoning and existing development pattern. The zoning and level of development proposed under PC2 for the General Residential Zone would be consistent with the Waikanae North Precinct Plan provisions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rezone the land from Future Urban Zone to General Residential zone within Precincts 1, 2, 4 and 5 and delete all references to Precincts in the District Plan maps.</li> <li>Rezone Precinct 3 where it is not public open space land from Future Urban Zone to General Residential zone and to delete all references to this Precinct.</li> <li>Rezone all public open space land as Open Space zone.</li> <li>Rezone Precinct 6 as a Local Centre Zone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MDRS are required to be incorporated into <i>relevant residential zones</i> in the District Plan. The Waikanae North Development Area does not meet the definition of a <i>relevant residential zone</i>, because it is not a residential zone listed and described in standard 8 of the National Planning Standards.</li> <li>The provisions of the MDRS are likely to be more enabling than the existing provisions associated with the Development Area.</li> <li>While the Development Area may be considered an urban environment, based on the operative District Plan no changes are required in order to give effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD in the area.</li> <li>The Waikanae North Development Area is subject to a structure plan, and a detailed and integrated set of bespoke provisions (including design guides) to carefully manage development in the area. Rezoning of all or parts of the Waikanae North Development Area would require careful consideration in order to ensure the integrated management approach for the Development Area is maintained in a manner that is consistent with the requirements of the MDRS. Evidence would be required to identify how this could be achieved. It would be more appropriate to undertake this through a future plan change designed to achieve this purpose.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
173.	General Residential Re-Zone	General Public	Waikanae	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree that the plan change should 'rezone some small areas within or next to existing urban areas for future residential use' because it is efficient use of this land, they adjoin infrastructure, they have been earmarked for growth for over 20 years.</li> <li>Disagree that areas of high priority growth should not be shown as proposed new general residential zones.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submission relates to a series of sites around the intersection between Ngarara Road and Nga Manu Reserve Road that are located within the Future Urban Zone.</li> <li>Based on the information provided in the submission, and on information contained within the operative District Plan, the site does meet the criteria identified in</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>Specifically, 283 and 298 Ngarara Road have all of the characteristics which are listed as attributes of the land in the same zone, further south.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They are surrounded by General Residential land – the existing Waikanae Future Urban Zone has been fragmented over time into a number of smaller areas. Due to their size, there is little value in structure planning these fragments. As a result, it is appropriate to rationalise the zoning of the area by rezoning to a zone that is consistent with adjacent development patterns.</li> <li>They cohesively sit within General Residential zoned land – there are cohesive areas of relatively unconstrained land within the area.</li> <li>The area is adjacent to the existing urban environment, and services could be extended into the area.</li> <li>Constraints such as flood hazard can be managed through existing district plan provisions.</li> <li>Could yield some 50-150 residential sections/dwellings.</li> <li>The land has KCDC sewer trunk main through or adjoining it.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>KCDC should include 283 and 298 Ngarara Road (and other relevant land) as proposed new General Residential zoned land. This is consistent with the 'Future Urban Development Land' zoning which has existed for 20 years. It is outrageous that 'high priority growth' land should not be proposed general residential land, it is contrary to the NPS-UD, the KCDC Growth Strategy and the Wellington Regional Growth Framework documents.</li> </ul>	<p>PC2 for including within the General Residential Zone. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sites are located adjacent to the Ngarara Development Area (which is defined as an <i>urban area</i> in the District Plan;</li> <li>Existing water supply and wastewater services pass through the area;</li> <li>The site is subject to flood hazards identified in the District Plan, although these only cover parts of the site. Development of the land in the parts covered by flood hazards must meet the requirements of the provisions for flood hazards outlined in the operative District Plan. Further flood risk assessment would highlight whether there are any key issues for development on the site that need to be considered.</li> <li>The site is located adjacent to a stream, and development on the site will be required to meet the requirements of district plan, regional plan and national environmental standards related to development near waterbodies.</li> <li>The site is a fragmented part of the Future Urban Zone, and is not sufficiently large or complex enough to require a structure planned approach.</li> <li>The site could provide a notable contribution to plan-enabled residential development capacity.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some parts of the site at 298 Ngarara Road are located in the General Rural Zone outside of the Waikanae North Urban Edge. This part of the site would be inappropriate to include in the General Residential Zone as part of PC2.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subject to further flood risk assessment, rezone parts of 283 and 298 Ngarara Road within the Future Urban Zone (to the south of the Waikanae North Urban Edge) to General Residential Zone.</li> </ul>
174.	General Residential Re-Zone	General Public	Milne Drive, Paraparaumu	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the five sections at 132-188 Milne Drive, Paraparaumu being rezoned Residential as it will bring them in line with the rest of the subdivision.</li> <li>Would like to see all 8 of the 1 hectare sections rezoned to Residential in keeping with other Residential sections along Milne Drive. Rural Lifestyle zone is only separated by standard fencing, which does not leave a buffer zone to protect from adverse effects on residential neighbours.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are a range of constraints identified on the northernmost properties (106, 112 and 128 Milne Drive), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large areas of flood storage hazard;</li> <li>Large waterbodies.</li> <li>Obstacle limitation surfaces and air noise overlays associated with the airport runway.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Development in relation to the constraints noted above is managed through a range of operative District Plan</li> </ul>



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<p>provisions, designations, provisions contained within the Proposed Natural Resources Plan and provisions contained within the National Environmental Standards for Freshwater. On the basis of these provisions, it is unlikely that these sites will make a notable contribution to plan-enabled residential development capacity. However there are still small portions of these sites that could be developed without triggering these provisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is considered that extending the rezoning proposed to this area to include these properties will regularise the zoning pattern in the area, consistent with the General Residential Zoning in the surrounding environment. In addition to this, a small amount of additional development capacity would be provided.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include the sites at 106, 112 and 128 Milne Drive in the General Residential Zone.</li> </ul>
175.	General Residential Re-Zone	General Public	Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the rezoning of land at 174-211 Ngarara Road, Waikanae.</li> <li>The land needs to be filled in with development of houses due to the close proximity to the residential part of Waikanae.</li> <li>Have no disagreement with the future rezoning.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
176.	General Residential Re-Zone	Landowner	Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to rezoning 174-211 Ngarara Road to General Residential.</li> <li>The proposal does not comply with a number of the objectives and policies laid out in the NPS-UD.</li> <li>The site specific constraints means the number of dwellings built in the area will be a fraction of the theoretical number provided in PC2.</li> <li>Ngarara Road will need to be straightened and upgraded to meet residential standards before medium density subdivision.</li> <li>Adhoc development of medium density dwellings will be more economically achieved within the existing residential area as the large number of existing substandard houses are replaced.</li> <li>Rezoning will turn the area into an ecological desert.</li> <li>Concern for the character of the area to be ruined.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on consideration of the range of constraints identified with the site, the size of the area, its potential yield (which considers constraints) and its status as a Future Urban Zone, it is considered appropriate to rezone the area as General Residential Zone as part of PC2. It is noted that urban-scale subdivision is already occurring.</li> <li>New development within the Zone will be subject to a range of requirements to support the upgrading or development of new infrastructure, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development/financial contributions;</li> <li>Requirements to meet a range of district plan provisions to manage the effects of development on transport, stormwater, wastewater and water supply networks;</li> <li>Meeting the Council's infrastructure requirements (which are a permitted activity standard in the District Plan).</li> </ul> </li> <li>There are no scheduled ecological sites identified within the area proposed to be rezoned.</li> <li>It is recognised that development under the provisions proposed by PC2 may have effects on existing character and amenity values. However, Objective 4 of</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.
177.	General Residential Re-Zone	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Multiple areas	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GW note that flood hazard is likely to increase the potential impacts of climate change are generally understood to have worsened since previous assessments have been carried out.</li> <li>• Because of this, GW suggest a precautionary approach to rezoning by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adding an additional buffer to existing high risk flood hazard overlays in the District Plan; or</li> <li>○ Reducing the areas proposed to be rezoned in size, and rezoning the remainder as open space.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• GW have particular comments on the following areas proposed to be rezoned: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 17 Jean Hing Place, Ōtaki: recommend protecting stream corridor with 10m buffer width;</li> <li>○ 174 – 211 Ngarara Road, Waikanae: recommend protecting stream corridor with 10m buffer width;</li> <li>○ 132 – 188 Milne Drive, Paraparaumu: flood impact may not be easy to manage through existing provisions. Updated flood hazard assessment should be carried out to support rezoning.</li> <li>○ 160 – 222 Main Road, 39 Rongomaru Lane, 99 – 105 Poplar Ave, Raumati South: flood impact may not be easy to manage through existing provisions. Updated flood hazard assessment should be carried out to support rezoning.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The flood hazard rules in the District Plan will apply to subdivision and development in the areas proposed to be rezoned as General Residential Zone as part of PC2.</li> <li>• The flood hazard mapping contained in the District Plan takes into account the potential impacts of climate change. The following climate change assumptions are incorporated into the existing District Plan flood hazard mapping: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 0.8 metre sea level rise;</li> <li>○ 16% increase in rainfall.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The Council is currently in the process of updating its flood hazard modelling across the district, which will incorporate updated assumptions about the potential impacts of climate change. This work will inform a future change to the District Plan to update flood hazard mapping and other stormwater related provisions.</li> <li>• As part of identifying areas proposed to be rezoned as General Residential Zone as part of PC2, Council sought additional assessment of flood hazards associated with each area. The purpose of this assessment was to identify constraints to development associated with flood hazard in each area, taking into account the latest modelling. This assessment is appended to the Section 32 Evaluation Report.</li> <li>• Based on the matters outlined above, it is considered that subdivision and development in relation to flood hazards identified in these areas can be managed through the flood hazard provisions in the District Plan.</li> <li>• Regarding the individual sites noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 17 Jean Hing Place, Ōtaki: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The existing stream corridor flood hazard area identified in the District Plan is buffered by residual overland flow path flood hazard and ponding flood hazard areas. It is considered that the district plan provisions appropriately manage development in relation to flood hazard in this area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ 174 – 211 Ngarara Road, Waikanae: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The existing stream corridor flood hazard area identified in the District Plan is buffered by ponding flood hazard areas. It is considered that the district plan provisions appropriately manage development in relation to flood hazard in this area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 132 – 188 Milne Drive, Paraparaumu: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The primary hazard associated with this area is flood storage hazard. Existing rules for flood storage hazard require any development in a flood storage hazard area to provide compensatory storage or use another method to achieve hydraulic neutrality. Where this cannot be achieved, development is restricted. It is therefore considered that the district plan appropriately manage development in relation to flood hazard in this area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ 160 – 222 Main Road, 39 Rongomaru Lane, 99 – 105 Poplar Ave, Raumati South: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Parts of this area are subject to flood storage hazard, stream corridor hazard and flood ponding hazard. These are typically located in areas close to the Expressway. It is therefore considered that the district plan appropriately manage development in relation to flood hazard in this area.</li> <li>▪ The area located at 99 – 105 Poplar Ave is not identified in the existing District Plan maps as being subject to flood hazard, however recent modelling of the area indicates that it would be subject to flood hazard. Because this hazard will be provided for through a future plan change to update flood hazard mapping, it is considered acceptable to include this area (which has already been developed as a residential area) within the proposed rezoning.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In the case of all the areas outlined above, the estimate of theoretical development capacity recognises that existing flood hazard is likely to impact on development capacity. To account for this, the estimates conservatively do not factor the areas subject to flood hazard identified in the District Plan. Further, in all the areas outlined above, there are sufficient areas of land not subject to flood hazard to provide for residential development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
178.	Financial Contributions	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In any areas subject to MDRS, financial contributions should not be set at a level where development above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New development (including development undertaken as a permitted activity) will continue to be subject to the</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					existing (pre-MDRS) Plan controls must pay the full cost of the new infrastructure required to service the growth potential enables by MDRS. That cost should not be borne by the existing community. Financial contribution rules should be in place as soon as MDRS takes effect, and can be removed when the development contribution provisions have been updated.	<p>Council's Development Contributions Policy, in addition to a requirement to provide contributions for reserves under the operative District Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes to the financial contributions provisions ensure that the Council can take contributions under circumstances where the existing Development Contributions Policy does not apply.</li> <li>The Development Contributions Policy is regularly reviewed by Council as part of the LTP process, to ensure that it is aligned with the need for new development to fund the demand for infrastructure that it creates.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
179.	General Comments	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The District Plan must give effect to the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region (RPS). The RPS changes in 2022 will have implications for District Plans.</li> <li>The Kāpiti Whaitua programme is the key process for giving effect to the National Objectives Framework under the National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management 2020. Currently, the Whaitua programme for Kāpiti is in the establishment phase. KCDC and GW should work together on the Kāpiti Whaitua programme to ensure that KCDC adopt an integrated management approach as directed by the NPS-FM.</li> <li>The Proposed Natural Resources Plan (PNRP) establishes the rules for activities associated with discharge of contaminants into water or land where the contaminant might enter water; i.e. stormwater or wastewater discharges. The PNRP also restricts certain uses of land. UPS-UD</li> <li>GW note that the current priorities of the Wellington Regional Growth Framework are: housing supply; affordability and choice; transport choice and access; Iwi/Māori housing, capacity and taonga; and climate change and resilience. Significant housing growth is expected in the Kāpiti area.</li> <li>Te Mana o te Wai is not referenced in draft Plan Change Two. KCDC and GW should collaborate to ensure urban development provisions are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai, alongside, and following, the Whaitua process.</li> <li>GW support well-planned intensification as the best way of achieving multiple objectives of the Regional Policy Statement.</li> <li>GW support the significant housing growth potential created by Proposed Plan Change two - the high level estimated number of dwellings through the plan change indicates an excess of the estimated shortfall over the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The general support for PC2 indicated by GWRC is noted.</li> <li>PC2 has been prepared in accordance with <i>Te tupu pai</i>, the Council's adopted growth strategy. The Regional Growth Framework was given consideration as part of the preparation of <i>Te tupu pai</i>.</li> <li>The ongoing development by GWRC of draft amendments to the RPS is noted.</li> <li>The National Policy Statement for Freshwater (including Te Mana o te Wai) Management has been given consideration as part of the development of PC2.</li> <li>Regarding the proposed Centres and Residential Design Guides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The content of the design guides is not inconsistent with the Regional Growth Framework, although the design guides operate at a very different scale to the Framework.</li> <li>Consideration was given to whether the design guides should include content on WSUD. Because WSUD is addressed through other guidelines and district plan provisions (such as the Land Development Minimum Requirements) it was considered appropriate to leave this out of the Centres and Residential Design Guides, to avoid duplication.</li> <li>It is not considered necessary to provide for building floor levels to be elevated above surrounding ground level in flood hazard areas as part of the Design Guides, as this is already provided for through District Plan rules for development in flood hazard areas.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>next thirty years, which is consistent with the Regional Growth Framework expectations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GW support the addition of an objective to deliver urban environments that support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and are resilient to the current and future effects of climate change.</li> <li>• GW support that PC2 proposes to recognise indigenous biodiversity rules as existing qualifying matters.</li> <li>• GW encourages alignment with the development of draft changes to the Regional Policy Statement.</li> <li>• Regarding the Design Guides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Suggest alignment with the design elements of the Wellington Regional Growth Framework.</li> <li>○ Support the inclusion of the 'Integrate with public realm and surroundings' in the Proposed Residential Design Guide and the 'Integrate and connect with public realm and surroundings' in the Proposed Centres Design Guide.</li> <li>○ Suggest the inclusion of Water sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) in the principles of the Proposed Residential and Centres Design Guides.</li> <li>○ Support inclusion of the 'Providing for Variety and Choice' design principles in the Proposed Residential and Centres Design Guides.</li> <li>○ Design guides should require flood resilient building approaches, such as ensuring floor levels are elevated above surrounding ground level in flood hazard and residual flood hazard areas.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
180.	General Comments	General Public	Not Specific	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General submission concerned with the provision of emergency housing in the district.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
181.	General Comments	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose all of the changes.</li> <li>• KCDC should think about how development will affect wildlife.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PC2 provides for a range of existing District Plan provisions that provide for indigenous biodiversity as an existing qualifying matter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
182.	General Comments	General Public	Not specific	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No issues with the proposal.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
183.	General Comments	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the potential for an increase in rates. Make sure that KCDC can cover these changes with the funds that they already have.</li> <li>• Agree that development needs to start to equip the area for growth, including increased carpark capacity at schools.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
184.	General Comments	General Public	Not Specific	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see better public transport and have these provisions included in the District Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is acknowledged that population growth may lead to an increased demand for public transport services.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public transport provision is the responsibility of Greater Wellington Regional Council.</li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
185.	General Comments	General Public	Not Specific	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the whole plan change. Has nothing to add.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
186.	General Comments	General Public	Te Horo Beach	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter is unclear as to whether the changes proposed by PC2 will apply at Te Horo Beach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PC2 applies the MDRS to the General Residential Zone at Te Horo Beach.</li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted.</b>
187.	General Comments	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding water meters, lack of rubbish collection, rise in rates. Would like the plan to be scrapped.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
188.	General Comments	General Public	Not Specific	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projections for increased population growth, but no proposals for increased healthcare facilities in the way of a hospital in the Kapiti/Horowhenua district.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is acknowledged that population growth may lead to an increased demand for healthcare services.</li> <li>Providing for healthcare facilities to meet the needs of a growing population is the responsibility of the District Health Board and Ministry of Health.</li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
189.	General Comments	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports DO-03 in general, but in particular point 10.</li> <li>Disagree with intensification if it does not go hand in hand with KCDC putting value on nature and our current carbon sink. This includes all forms of native vegetation and biodiversity.</li> <li>KCDC has the Strategy in place and the ability to actively encourage climate mitigation through the resource and building consent process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to see value placed on actions that will mitigate climate change. Actions KCDC have control over in resource and building consents.</li> <li>Would like KCDC to develop real incentives for developers to: recognise and work with the historical geology and ecology of the land they want to develop, enhance and restore native vegetation and biodiversity, build passive housing, go off grid partially or completely, incorporate cycle and walking paths, reduce reliance on individual car ownership, create a sense of community in their development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is acknowledged that the effects of climate change and on climate change are key concerns for urban development within the district.</li> <li>PC2 includes a range of measures that acknowledge the impact of climate change on development, and the impact of development on climate change. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providing for a range of district plan provisions as existing qualifying matters, such as flood hazard provisions and provisions that protect existing ecological sites and scheduled trees.</li> <li>Providing for a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in parts of the coast potentially susceptible to coastal erosion hazards, including the impacts of climate change.</li> <li>Enabling greater intensification in areas well served by public transport.</li> <li>Including a range of matters to encourage provision for active modes of transport, environmentally sustainable and energy efficient design for denser development as part of the Centres and Residential Design Guides.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
190.	General Comments	General Public	Not Specific	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep the Paraparaumu airport open and the land protected from development, because it is vital for travellers, some business activities and emergencies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PC2 does not propose to change the zoning of the Airport.</li> <li>PC2 maintains existing public reserve spaces.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep and develop green spaces, to ensure recreational and lifestyle needs are met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New development will be required to contribute funding to the upgrading or development of new reserves through Development Contributions and in line with the Council's Open Space Strategy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
191.	General Comments	General Public	Not Specific	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document produced to 'shoe-horn' the plans of central government and therefore are not consistent with the needs and aspirations of residents in Kapiti.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include Paraparaumu Beach as an area of natural beauty. Make it an area of special character which people are attracted to visit and enjoy a unique environment.</li> <li>Mitigate climate change and carbon emissions in built up areas with the retention and protection of existing vegetation and trees, develop planting plans to 'retro-fit' vegetation and trees into existing built-up areas and ensure that further built developments include suitable planting plans.</li> <li>Minimise disruption to long standing residential areas from higher density housing which will alter the characteristics of those areas (over-crowding, noise pollution, roads and infrastructure, emergency services, visual pollution).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council has considered whether "special character areas" could be provided for but found that they did not meet the statutory requirements to be considered as a qualifying matter.</li> <li>Objective 4 of the NPS-UD requires that urban environments, including their character and amenity values, are allowed to develop and change over time.</li> <li>Existing provisions that protect vegetation such as identified ecological sites and scheduled key indigenous trees will continue to provide protection to some vegetation.</li> <li>The provisions of PC2 require a minimum of 20% of the site area to be set aside for grass or planting.</li> <li>New development will continue to be subject to provisions of the district plan that manage the effects of noise and traffic.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
192.	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (Kāinga Ora)	The draft Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New buildings, adds and alts to buildings in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct (General Residential Zone, Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone): Kāinga Ora seeks a refinement of development controls applying in this qualifying matter precinct. The less enabling standards within this rule should only be applied where they are required to manage the effect being controlled by this qualifying matter, in this case, coastal hazards. Standards that are more applicable to managing effects from the bulk and form of buildings and/or character considerations should not be controlled through this rule.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provisions of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct maintain the status quo level of development in the parts of the urban environment that have been identified as being potentially susceptible to coastal erosion hazard over the next 100 years, until the management of coastal hazards is addressed through a future coastal environment plan change.</li> <li>The precinct represents a precautionary approach, consistent with policy 3 of the NZCPS, towards enabling development in areas near the coast where a hazard management regime is still in the process of being developed.</li> <li>As part of developing the precinct, consideration was given as to whether it would be appropriate to apply any of the MDRS standards, however it was found that applying any of these standards would be likely to promote an increase in permitted development density within the precinct beyond what is currently provided for in the District Plan.</li> <li>Retaining the operative District Plan provisions for development in the Precinct is considered an appropriate approach to ensure that PC2 does not</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						further reduce the degree to which the District Plan gives effect to the NZCPS 2010. <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
193.	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Landlink Ltd.	The draft Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent of the Coastal Qualifying Matters Precincts does not align with the extent of the effects shown in the 'Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Volume 2: Results' report or appendices, released in 2022. The extent of PFSP shoreline out to 2120 (100 years) is less than the extent of Coastal Erosion Qualifying Matters extent in most cases, or at least the Coastal Qualifying Matter extent is inconsistent with the report.</li> <li>There appears to be no justification for a greater extent of restrictions than those shown in the reports. We recommend that the final version of the Plan Change align with the February 2022 report.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The precinct is consistent with the 2120 P10 projected future shoreline position using the RCP 8.5+ (with - 3mm/year vertical land movement) relative sea level rise scenario outlined in the February 2022 Jacobs' Assessment.</li> <li>This scenario is referred to in the <a href="#">Coastal Erosion Susceptibility Mapping Tool online GIS viewer</a> as the "1.65m RSLR Range of Potential Shoreline Positions (99-10%)."</li> </ul> <b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b>
194.	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	General Public	The draft Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support considering coastal hazards within the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and not allowing further development unless solutions have been found and the issues addressed (4.5).</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
195.	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree with any permanent development in coastal areas that will be affected by projected 100 year sea level rises. Structures in this area should be able to be moved intact to another site.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
196.	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	General Public	The draft Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A sensible approach which takes into account many of the directions in the NZCPS including the precautionary approach.</li> <li>Takes into account the highest risk as assessed in the Jacobs report.</li> <li>There are effectively no planning changes in the precinct until the Community Assessment Panel completes its report on coastal hazards.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
197.	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Greater Wellington Regional Council	The draft Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GW support maintaining the current level of development in the Coastal Qualifying Matter precinct areas, until management of coastal hazards is addressed through a future coastal environment plan change.</li> <li>GW note that PC2 proposes to rezone a site within this area from Local Centre Zone to General Residential Zone.</li> <li>GW seeks to engage further with KCDC on natural hazards and flood protection.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
198.	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Coastal Ratepayers United (CRU)	The draft Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	<p>CRU submits that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not required by the NPS-UD or the NZCPS, and if it is required, that the “Jacobs 2 report” is unsuitable to determine its spatial extent, or satisfy the information requirements for qualifying matters as part of a section 32 evaluation.</p> <p>Key matters raised by the submission include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct will be interpreted as a pre-determining future coastal hazard areas that may or may not be determined through a future coastal hazards planning process.</li> <li>The Jacobs 2 report is not sufficient to establish a qualifying matter under clauses 3.32 and 3.33 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>The Jacobs 2 report is not sufficient to meet the site specific analysis and evaluation requirements under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>The most appropriate approach to identify and manage coastal hazards is through a Coastal Hazards chapter in the District Plan. Coastal hazards zones and controls should be determined through a future coastal hazards plan change.</li> <li>It is inevitable that a future coastal hazards planning process will result in identification of coastal hazard areas that are not congruent with the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and it would therefore be more efficient to leave the location of these areas to a future plan change.</li> <li>The “2120 1.65m RSLR P10” scenario from the Jacobs 2 report does not give effect to policy 24 of the NZCPS, because this scenario is not a likely effect of climate change.</li> <li>The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct would wrongly imply that the area is likely to be subject to coastal hazards and associated coastal hazard development restrictions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the coastal qualifying areas based on the Jacobs 2 report be removed from draft PC 2 before it is notified.</li> <li>That so far as the Council considers that CQMPs are necessary to meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement Urban Development, that such areas be based solely on coastal set back lines shown in the Operative District Plan.</li> <li>That before it is notified, PC2 be amended to include a clear statement that the Plan Change 2 does not address the identification or management of coastal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is considered necessary in order to ensure that PC2 does not reduce the degree to which the District Plan gives effect to the NZCPS 2010, until such time as the management of coastal hazards is addressed through the Takutai Kāpiti and future coastal environment plan change process.</li> <li>The precinct represents a precautionary approach, consistent with policy 3 of the NZCPS, towards enabling development in areas near the coast where a hazard management regime is still in the process of being developed.</li> <li>After considering a range of potential sources of information the Jacobs Assessment was found to be the most appropriate source of information on which to base the extent of the precinct.</li> <li>While the findings of the assessment have been used to inform the extent of the precinct, there are no references to the Jacobs Assessment proposed to be incorporated into the district plan through PC2.</li> <li>It is considered that the wording that explains the purpose of the precinct can be strengthened to ensure that it is clear that the precinct is intended to be reviewed as part of the future coastal environment plan change process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, the following changes have been made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add the following text to the end of the “Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct” section of the introductory text of the General Residential Zone, Town Centre Zone and Local Centre Zone chapters has been amended as follows:</li> </ul> <p><b><u>“The precinct and the provisions associated with it will be reviewed as part of this future plan change process.”</u></b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>hazards and that this will be a matter for a subsequent Plan Change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That if the Proposed PC2 includes any CQMPS, that it indicates clearly, that the CQMPS do not represent known coastal hazard areas and indicate that the boundaries of the CQMPS will eventually be amended to reflect the outcome of the future Plan Change dealing with Coastal Hazard Management.</li> <li>That all references to Jacobs 2 in PC2 are removed.</li> </ul>	
199.	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MDRS should not apply to any area on the Kāpiti Coast which is identified as vulnerable to SLR coastal erosion or inundation in a 100 year period. This is consistent with NZCPS Policy 25 which Council must give effect to in any plan change.</li> <li>Council cannot cherry pick hazards from the 2022 Jacobs report – it's all or nothing. A precautionary approach strongly indicates that all identified hazards within the coastal environment are relevant, with inundation affecting far more properties than coastal erosion.</li> <li>Given that the Jacobs report is a work in progress, with some elements in dispute, the MDRS should not apply to any land identified as subject to SLR hazards, at least pending a resolution of the coastal hazard process currently in place. It would be a bad resource management practice to do the opposite – i.e. apply MDRS in an area within the coastal environment which has been provisionally identified as subject to significant flooding hazards. And then have to change it later on.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The operative flood hazard provisions contained within the District Plan are considered an appropriate means of addressing potential coastal inundation hazards until such time as the management of coastal hazards is addressed through a future plan change. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a reasonable correlation between the areas in the urban environment identified as susceptible to coastal inundation in the Jacobs' assessment, and the flood hazard areas in the operative District Plan.</li> <li>New buildings in a flood hazard area are required to have their building floor level located above the 1% AEP flood level. Breaching this standard requires resource consent. The determination of this level through the building or resource consent process is based on the best available information (which may include site-specific hydraulic modelling that would take into account the currently known effects of sea level rise).</li> <li>Any earthworks required to achieve this is subject to standards, and breaching these standards requires resource consent.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
200.	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	General Public	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Jacobs 2 report is not sufficient to establish a qualifying matter under clauses 3.32 and 3.33 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>The Jacobs 2 report is not sufficient to meet the site specific analysis and evaluation requirements under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>The most appropriate approach to identify and manage coastal hazards is through a Coastal Hazards chapter in the District Plan. Coastal hazards zones and controls should be determined through a future coastal hazards plan change.</li> <li>It is inevitable that a future coastal hazards planning process will result in identification of coastal hazard areas that are not congruent with the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and it would therefore be more efficient</li> </ul>	Refer to submission 196.



Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>to leave the location of these areas to a future plan change.</p> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the coastal qualifying areas based on the Jacobs 2 report be removed from draft PC2 before it is notified.</li> <li>That so far as the Council considers that CQMPs are necessary to meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement Urban Development, that such areas be based solely on Coastal Environment shown in the maps of the Operative District Plan.</li> <li>That before it is notified, PC2 be amended to include a clear statement that the Plan Change 2 does not address the identification or management of coastal hazards and that this will be a matter for a subsequent Plan Change.</li> <li>That if the Proposed PC2 includes any CQMPs, that it indicates clearly that the CQMPs do not represent known coastal hazard areas and indicate that the boundaries of the CQMPs will eventually be amended to reflect the outcome of the future Plan Change dealing with Coastal Hazard Management.</li> <li>That all references to Jacobs 2 in PC2 are removed.</li> </ul>	
201.	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	General Public	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Jacobs 2 report is not sufficient to establish a qualifying matter under clauses 3.32 and 3.33 of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>The Jacobs 2 report is not sufficient to meet the site specific analysis and evaluation requirements under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>The most appropriate approach to identify and manage coastal hazards is through a Coastal Hazards chapter in the District Plan. Coastal hazards zones and controls should be determined through a future coastal hazards plan change.</li> <li>It is inevitable that a future coastal hazards planning process will result in identification of coastal hazard areas that are not congruent with the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and it would therefore be more efficient to leave the location of these areas to a future plan change.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the coastal qualifying areas based on the Jacobs 2 report be removed from draft PC2 before it is notified.</li> <li>That so far as the Council considers that CQMPs are necessary to meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement Urban Development, that such areas</li> </ul>	Refer to submission 196.

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>be based solely on Coastal Environment shown in the maps of the Operative District Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That before it is notified, PC2 be amended to include a clear statement that the Plan Change 2 does not address the identification or management of coastal hazards and that this will be a matter for a subsequent Plan Change.</li> <li>• That if the Proposed PC2 includes any CQMPs, that it indicates clearly that the CQMPs do not represent known coastal hazard areas and indicate that the boundaries of the CQMPs will eventually be amended to reflect the outcome of the future Plan Change dealing with Coastal Hazard Management.</li> <li>• That all references to Jacobs 2 in PC2 are removed.</li> </ul>	
202.	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Waikanae Beach Residents Society Incorporated (WBRSI)	Waikanae	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WBRSI remains concerned that intensification is planned for an area that has long been identified as part of the Coastal Environment as is subject to inundation. PC2 seems to have cherry picked one item from c24 NZCPS 2010 (erosion) and does not deal with the other items covered within c24 (tsunami, flooding, liquefaction, inundation).</li> <li>• Note that KCDC has used the Jacobs report for justification of hazard decisions. We understand that the report may have limitations in its assumptions, due to the scenarios used. We consider that any decisions should be delayed until the current evidence base is consulted on, confirmed and agreed to.</li> <li>• It is clear from the evidence that KCDC is acting prematurely by not excluding certain beach areas in Kāpiti from the MDRS as it has not gone through the necessary procedures to meet the requirements of the NZCPS.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tsunami, flooding, liquefaction and inundation have been considered in the preparation of PC2.</li> <li>• Regarding tsunami hazard, the District Plan does not identify tsunami hazard areas. The Council publishes tsunami evacuation maps, however these are prepared for the purposes of evacuation management, not development control. This is consistent with the operative District Plan, which provides that the primary method of hazard management for tsunami will be evacuation measures, and that the District Plan will not include regulatory controls on development in relation to tsunami risk (see policy NH-EQ-P18). As noted in the Natural Hazards chapter of the District Plan, the methods considered most appropriate for reducing the impact of this hazard are early warning systems, civil defence plans, and emergency response procedures. PC2 does not seek to change this approach.</li> <li>• Regarding liquefaction, management of building design in relation to liquefaction is proposed to be removed from the District Plan by PC1B, as this matter is managed under the Building Act 2004 and the Building Code.</li> <li>• Regarding flooding and inundation the operative flood hazard provisions contained within the District Plan are considered an appropriate means of addressing potential inundation hazard until such time as the management of coastal hazards is addressed through a future plan change. This is because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There is a reasonable correlation between the areas in the urban environment identified as susceptible to coastal inundation in the Jacobs' assessment, and the flood hazard category areas in the operative District Plan.</li> <li>○ Where flood hazard provisions in the operative District Plan are triggered, their consideration</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<p>through the resource consent process is to be based on the best available information, including site-specific hydraulic modelling that would consider the effects of sea level rise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is noted that the Council is undertaking a separate community planning and plan change process to improve the degree to which the District Plan gives effect to the NZCPS. It is expected that the precinct, and the provisions associated with it, will be reviewed as part of this process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
203.	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	General Public	Not Specific	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the qualifying matters as they seem appropriate for the area.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
204.	Kārewarewa Wāhi Tapu	Landlink Ltd.	Waikanae Beach	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wahi tapu overlays proposed in and around Barret Drive appear to have been included without due consultation with the affected landowners and the wider community. This mirrors the controversial process which unfolded when Coastal Erosion overlays were imposed in the Proposed District Plan of 2012.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feedback has been sought from landowners on the proposal to schedule the area as a wāhi tapu within the District Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
205.	Kārewarewa Wāhi Tapu	Landowner	Waikanae Beach	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support subject to clarification on who will own the site, what use the land will be put to protect the site, and who will manage the site.</li> <li>The KCDC's intent is supported, but if left with no management system in place, the worst outcome would be an overgrown fire hazard in a well-populated area.</li> <li>Unreasonable to expect ratepayers to approve the departure from the proposed District Plan without first offering a solution(s) for its use and ensure use will be well-managed with appropriate safety measures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PC2 does not require or propose any change in land ownership in relation to the proposed wāhi tapu site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
206.	Kārewarewa Wāhi Tapu	Landowner	Waikanae Beach	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support in part the proposed zoning of Wahanga Tahī. It is reasonable to remove the undeveloped land owned by WLC from its current General Residential Zoning since no residential use is in evidence. It is unreasonable to include the KCDC Reserve Triangle and the thin strip along the reserve joining the triangle to 1 Marewa Place in the Wahanga Tahī zone.</li> <li>Oppose the proposed zoning of Wahanga Rua. The proposed Wahanga Rua land is irretrievably devoted to use as 'general residential' land and this should be accepted as the status quo, since the land is currently successfully and permanently being used this way.</li> <li>The current residential zoning has sufficed for 25 years of development and during this time no kōiwi have been discovered.</li> <li>Owners should be compensated for any deviation or deprivation of value caused by the restriction of permitted uses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While it may be possible to rezone the land proposed as <i>wāhanga tahī</i>, such a rezoning is not required in order to recognise the site as a wāhi tapu.</li> <li>Based on the evidence, it is considered reasonable to include the portion of reserve within the <i>wāhanga tahī</i> wāhi tapu area.</li> <li>Part of the purpose of the provisions is to protect kōiwi from disturbance. Based on the evidence, kōiwi have been disturbed by development within the area in the last 25 years.</li> <li>Based on the evidence, it is considered reasonable to apply the <i>wāhanga rua</i> provisions to the developed area of the urupā. These provisions allow existing residential activities to continue to occur, and place reasonable standards on further disturbance of the land in order to reduce the risk of disturbing kōiwi.</li> <li>It is recognised that the <i>wāhanga rua</i> provisions may inconvenience landowners, however these are</li> </ul>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
						<p>considered necessary in order for Council to meet its obligations to recognise and provide for the relationship of Te Ātiawa with their wāhi tapu.</p> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
207.	Kārewarewa Wāhi Tapu	Landowner	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SASM-R3 Fencing – Existing fencing and protective works (e.g. a ha-ha) along site boundaries are, say, 25 years old and may need replacement to maintain the amenity of the neighbourhood. <b>Relief sought by the submitter:</b> Remove ‘fencing’ and replace with these words: “Fencing including replacement of existing fencing; and maintenance, repair, restoration or replacement of existing protective works.”</li> <li>SASM-R11/SASM-R3 Planting and removal of trees – Submitter’s site was developed on or about 1997, and no kōiwi were found then. But in addition, garden designers inappropriately planted three forest giant trees on the site, one of which (a puka) is now threatening house maintenance. <b>Relief sought by submitter:</b> Remove “planting and removal of trees” in SASM-R11. Replace SASM-R3 “tree planting and removal” with “removal and replacement of trees planted at or after the date of construction of the on-site building...”</li> <li>SASM-R11 Network infrastructure – In Wahanga Rua, network infrastructure should be a permitted activity for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Kāpiti Region has had network underground cables since the 1990’s at least.</li> <li>b) Chorus has already installed, at government order, underground network fibre all over the district.</li> <li>c) Digital network access has become a basic human right for all society living in this modern world, now and in times ahead. This phenomenon was not part of the prior centuries of the Urupa and their historical unknowingness of a digital basis for all successful society should not dominate, predominate, or intrinsically prevent or distort this basic need of today’s society and future generations.</li> <li>d) Network infrastructure as a permitted use is fulfilling the command of Development Management, Objective 1: ‘Delivering urban areas which maximise the efficient end use of energy and integration with infrastructure.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under SASM-R3, fencing would include the replacement of existing fencing, subject to the standards outlined in the rule. The change requested is not considered necessary.</li> <li>Tree planting and removal is only constrained by the standards of SASM-R3 to the extent that it involves land disturbance. It is considered relevant to maintain the provision for tree planting and removal within SASM-R3 and SASM-R11, as both activities involve land disturbance that might affect kōiwi.</li> <li>It is considered necessary to maintain the provision for roads and network infrastructure as a restricted discretionary activity under SASM-R11, as both activities are likely to involve considerable land disturbance.</li> <li>The provision for human burials outlined in SASM-R2 does not apply to the proposed <i>wāhanga tahi</i> wāhi tapu site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<p>The words “network infrastructure” should be moved to ‘permitted activity’ and ‘digital structures’ defined as taller than a standard fence-height could be added as a discretionary activity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SASM-P1 Waahi Tapu <b>Relief sought by submitter:</b> Add a new item – “In the event of a suburb-wide power outage the rules pertaining to the restoration of this essential utility, electric power, will take precedence over Waahi Tapu and become a permitted use.”</li> <li>SASM-R2 Human Burials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) It is not clear whether the term ‘human burials’ applies to 6 Barrett Drive.</li> <li>b) ‘Human burials’ does not cover whether a public cemetery is a permitted use. A public cemetery should be listed as a discretionary use.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
208.	Kārewarewa Wāhi Tapu	Landowner	Waikanae Beach	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was unaware of the urupā.</li> <li>In short, the submitter has every sympathy with the intent of the Plan Change to protect the historic area.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
209.	Kārewarewa Wāhi Tapu	Waikanae Land Company Limited (WLC)	Waikanae Beach	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal to list WLC’s land as waahi tapu within PC2 is inappropriate and should be withdrawn.</li> <li>WLC considers that the submission timeframe is unreasonably selective in respect of potential submitters, and accordingly prejudicial to any open consultation process. More time is considered necessary for affected landowners to fully consider the potential implications and provide feedback to KCDC.</li> <li>WLC considers that the listing of a new waahi tapu goes beyond the intent of Policy 3 in the NPS-UD and related RMA changes enabling the IPI.</li> <li>WCL would like the Council to note a range of matters, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since 2000, WLC has carried out extensive historical and archaeological research regarding its land, including three separate ground penetrating radar surveys which do not support the contention that its land is the Kārewarewa urupa.</li> <li>At least half of the total listed area has previously been subdivided by WLC and sold as private residential housing comprising some 39 homes with all underground services and street formations having been installed and completed by WLC pursuant to subdivision consents without locating any human remains.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feedback was sought directly from all affected landowners on the proposal to add Kārewarewa Urupā to Schedule 9 of the District Plan.</li> <li>It is considered that there is certain and sufficient information to provide for the scheduling of Kārewarewa urupā as a wāhi tapu within the District Plan.</li> <li>Incorporating the MDRS into the District Plan would increase the level of development that could occur on the urupā as a permitted activity. Adding Kārewarewa urupā to Schedule 9 of the District Plan is a qualifying matter that is considered necessary in order to support incorporating the MDRS into the District Plan.</li> <li>Recognising and providing for Kārewarewa urupā is a matter of national importance under s6 of the RMA, and including the urupā within the District Plan is consistent with the Council’s functions under s74 and s31 of the RMA.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A recognised authority on Kāpiti Coast place names stated in 1966 that the exact location of Kārewarewa urupā is not known;</li> <li>○ WLC was not given the opportunity to present the archaeological and historical analysis to the Waitangi Tribunal.</li> <li>○ A number of points of dispute are currently with the Environment Court for determination.</li> <li>• KCDC has had information to hand on the issues related to the site since at least 2000. KCDC did not include any waahi tapu listing of the WLC land in the district plan review in 2012, nor did it ever discuss this with WLC as a possibility.</li> <li>• There are two matters related to the site that are currently before the Environment Court: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ An appeal against a decision by Heritage New Zealand to decline an archaeological authority in (September 2021);</li> <li>○ A direct referral of a subdivision consent application for the site (April 2022).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• KCDC is proposing rules that will be significantly and unreasonably restrictive and would most likely result in WLC's land being unable to be developed and used for its historical residential zoned purpose.</li> <li>• WLC has consistent and proactively sought to engage with mana whenua (Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai) to resolve longstanding uncertainties with the site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KCDC immediately withdraws the proposed listing of WLC's and surrounding land as waahi tapu from the draft PC2 and awaits the outcome of the Environment Court hearings; and then engages directly with WLC and the other affected landowners on this matter before proceeding further.</li> </ul>	
210.	Kārewarewa Wāhi Tapu	Landowner	Waikanae Beach	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support KCDC's proposal for Wahanga Tahi and Wahanga Rua, but are concerned about the future management of the land. The area was well maintained for several years, but lately has reverted to long grass and scrub which presents a fire hazard.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relief sought by submitter:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan of management for the site should be developed to ensure that the desired outcome of the plan change is met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is acknowledged that management of the land is a concern, however maintenance of existing vegetation on the land is a responsibility of the landowner, regardless of whether the land is identified in the District Plan as a wāhi tapu site.</li> <li>• Maintenance of existing vegetation on the site is permitted under the <i>wāhanga tahi</i> provisions, so long as it does not involve land disturbance.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
211.	Kārewarewa Wāhi Tapu	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Waikanae Beach	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support inclusion of the new wāhi tapu sites to the District Plan.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
212.	Kārewarewa Wāhi Tapu	Waimanu Lagoon Focus Group (WLFG)	Waikanae Beach	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The north-east corner of the Waimanu Reserve is a triangle that is included in the map of the proposed Wahanga Tahī zone. This is in fact an area currently zoned in the Operative District Plan as "Natural Open Space Zone", and it is currently 'developed' land. Same for the parcel of land at 1 Marewa Place (Lot 17 DP 72800) which is included in the land designated in the Management Plan as part of the Waimanu Lagoons Reserve (Property Number 2,845) and the strip shown behind numbers 3 to 13 Marewa Place.</li> <li>Schedule 9 of the District Plan describes Wahanga Tahī as "largely unoccupied/undeveloped". It is the view of the WLFG that this description suits the bulk of the larger area shown in red on the Wahanga Tahī map however the north-east triangular area and the property at 1 Marewa Place and the associated connecting way does not.</li> <li>The certificate of title for Waimanu Reserve includes the triangle, the section at 1 Marewa Place and the connecting way and is therefore not owned by WLC. The Property Maps in the current KCDC website show parcel boundaries as follows (see attachments): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Property Number 2,845 is the Waimanu Lagoon Reserve and includes the triangle at the north-east end, and is developed.</li> <li>b. Property Number 2,726 is for the 'undeveloped area' off Tamati Place.</li> </ul> </li> <li>There are other concerns. This submission is a placeholder in the event more details are required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the evidence, it is considered appropriate to include the parts of the reserve identified in the <i>wāhanga tahī</i> area as these areas are largely undeveloped.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
213.	Kārewarewa Wāhi Tapu	Landowner	Waikanae Beach	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have several questions regarding proposed changes to their property and whether this would be impacted by PC2.</li> <li>Concerns regarding a decrease in house values as a result of PC2. Suggested compensation for those homeowners.</li> <li>Would like information about what will happen with the covenants on the land at Wahanga Tahī. Notes that the area is scruffy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provisions of PC2 do not change existing covenants over land.</li> <li>It is recognised that the <i>wāhanga rua</i> provisions may inconvenience landowners, however these are considered necessary in order for Council to meet its obligations to recognise and provide for the relationship of Te Ātiawa with their wāhi tapu.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
214.	Papakāinga	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Not Specific	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waka Kotahi supports the KCDC District Plan providing for the aspirations of mana whenua and enabling them to develop their land in a manner that is consistent with tikanga and enhances their relationship with their ancestral whenua.</li> <li>In particular, Waka Kotahi supports the reduction of barriers to the development of papakāinga on ancestral land for tangata whenua, the enabling of non-residential activities as part of an integrated development and the focus on adverse effects that are external to the papakāinga development.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>

Ref.	Topic	Submitter	Location	Support, oppose or support in part	Summary of feedback	Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Also supported is the Policy directing that KCDC will partner with tangata whenua in the development of a papakāinga design guide.</li> </ul>	
215.	Papakāinga	General Public	Not Specific	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Papakāinga development should not be incorporated in the update to the District Plan.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
216.	Papakāinga	General Public	Not Specific	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Be specific about what areas are identified as ancestral land for papakāinga.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the papakāinga provisions is to enable tangata whenua greater flexibility to determine the location of papakāinga in relation to their ancestral land. This recognises that the location and extent of ancestral land is a matter for tangata whenua to determine, based on whakapapa connections to the land.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
217.	Papakāinga	General Public	Not Specific	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support enabling provisions for papakāinga housing.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
218.	Papakāinga	General Public	Not Specific	Unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to see the notion of papakāinga development extended so that any family group could develop a multi-family complex. It better supports the young and elderly, saves duplication of resources, and develops closer communities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The papakāinga provisions are specifically for the use and benefit of tangata whenua, as they are designed to provide for the relationship of tangata whenua and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands.</li> <li>However the provisions of PC2 (in particular, incorporating the MDRS into the District Plan) will enable family groups to develop multi-family living arrangements within the General Residential Zone. PC2 contains a range of provisions that would support multi-family living, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ability to develop up to 3 dwellings per site as a permitted activity.</li> <li>The ability to group outdoor living space together communally.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
219.	Papakāinga	General Public	Not Specific	Support in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Papakāinga areas need to be developed to support the iwi and whanau as long as their density largely matches standard residential requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development bulk and location standards for papakāinga are linked to the standards of the zone within which they are located.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submission is noted, no changes made.</b></p>
220.	Papakāinga	General Public	Not Specific	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the inclusion of papakāinga provisions.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>
221.	Papakāinga	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Not Specific	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the consideration of Papakāinga in the draft Plan Change two.</li> </ul>	<b>Submission is noted.</b>