

Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submission on notified proposed plan change



About preparing a further submission on a proposed plan change

You must use the prescribed form

- [Clause 8](#), Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) requires further submissions to be on the prescribed form.
- The prescribed form is set out in [Form 6](#), Schedule 1 of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedure) Regulations 2003.
- This template is based on Form 6. While you do not have to use this template, your submission must be in accordance with Form 6.

Certain persons may make further submissions

- Under clause 8, Schedule 1 of the RMA the following persons may make a further submission, in the prescribed form, on a proposed plan to the relevant local authority:
 - any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest
 - any person that has an interest in the proposed policy statement or plan greater than the interest that the general public has
 - the local authority itself.
- You will need to explain why you meet one of these categories (space is provided in the form for this below).

Your further submission and contact details will be made publicly available

- [Section 352](#) of the RMA allows you to choose your email to be your address for service. If you select this option, you can also request your postal address be withheld from being publicly available. To choose this option please tick the relevant boxes below.

Note to person making the submission

- A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority (Kāpiti Coast District Council).

Reasons why a further submission may be struck out

Please note that your further submission (or part of your further submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the further submission (or part of the further submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further
- it contains offensive language
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

To Kāpiti Coast District Council

Further Submission in Support of (or Opposition to) a Submission on Proposed Plan Change to the Operative Kāpiti Coast District Plan 2021

Plan Change Number: Proposed Plan Change 2

Plan Change Name: Intensification

Further submitter details

Full name of person making further submission: Deidre McDonald	
Contact person (name and designation, if applicable): N/A	
Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the RMA): N/A	
Telephone: N/A	
Electronic address for service of person making further submission (i.e. email): dee.mcdonald11@gmail.com	
I would like my address for service to be my email <i>[select box if applicable]</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
I have selected email as my address for service, and I would also like my postal address withheld from being publicly available <i>[select box if applicable]</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

State whether you are *[select appropriate box]*

a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>In this case, also please specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category</i> Ratepayer and resident of Otaki.	
a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>In this case, also please explain the grounds for saying that you come within this category</i>	
the local authority for the relevant area.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Scope of further submission

I support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> oppose <input type="checkbox"/> the submission of: <i>[select the appropriate wording]</i>
Original Submitter's Name and Address for Service: See attached word document for the full details of the submissions we support and the reasons why.
Submission number of original submission:

Particular parts of the submission I support (or oppose) are:

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal. While it is not a requirement, it would be helpful if you could state the submission point number as listed in the summary of decisions requested document.

See attached word document.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

The reasons for my support (or opposition) are:

[give reasons]

See attached word document.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

I seek that [select appropriate box]

The whole ☐ or part ☐ of the original submission be allowed ☐ disallowed ☐

[describe precisely which part below]

See the attached document.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Hearing Submissions [select appropriate box]

I wish to be heard in support of my further submission. ☐

I do not wish to be heard in support of my further submission. ☒

If you wish to be heard, please tick one of the following

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing. ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will not consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing. ☐

24/11/2022

Signature of person making a further submission
(or person authorised to sign on behalf
of person making further submission)

Date

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

Email your further submission to district.planning@kapiticoast.govt.nz or
post/deliver to:

Attn: District Planning Team
Kāpiti Coast District Council
175 Rimu Road
Paraparaumu 5032

For office use only

Further submission No:
S244.FS.1

Given the constraints of the form, our submissions are **attached** in a separate word document.

We **support** the following submissions (details and reasons below) and by implication we oppose various other submissions that have been made by property developers and those with vested financial interests to the contrary.

We cannot gain a trade advantage through making these submissions.

Toka Tū Ake EQC (\$101) for their concern about the natural hazards to which the Kapiti Coast is subject. In particular, we support their submission that qualifying matters should be relied on to 'avoid residential intensification in flood hazard and fault avoidance zones' in the proposed plan change (intensification).

Land Matters (\$107) for:

- their concern about the lack of clarity about what constitutes 'Existing Hazard Qualifying Matters (including flood hazard and liquefaction hazard) for landowners. The matters are fundamental and material to subdivision rules and should be made express.
- their concern that the KCDC is accepting access roads and right of ways to serve more than six allotments of land, instead of legally vesting new roads and the associated infrastructure. There needs to be an overall and transparent plan for the Kapiti Coast before committing to intensification of housing. This is already being experienced in a piecemeal manner, as can be seen with the case of the Rangiora Road developments. With that in mind, there is a lack of open spaces in Otaki, and this need should be pre-empted through good town planning and an overall design that is future-proofed for development.

Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira (\$161) for:

- their opposition to amending objective D0.03 Development Management. We agree that planning for development in the absence of securing infrastructure, including three waters infrastructure, would be likely to fall short of the needs of the community once the development has taken place.
- their opposition of Clause 6 which 'waters down the inherent cultural and indigenous components' of special values within communities (particularly the special cultural character of Ōtaki).
- their concern that KCDC should be more active in reducing climate emissions, as opposed to a more passive supporting role.
- their concern about new objective D0-0x3 Residential Intensification Precincts because the aspirations of Tangata Whenua, including the importance of sites of significance, should be at the forefront of these proposals for intensification. The KCDC is obligated to uphold Te Tiriti o Waitangi, including actively protecting cultural amenity values (see their submission on D0-011 Character and Amenity).
- the submission that encourages papakāinga objectives being enabled in residential areas.
- their concern that 'residential intensification will 'only' give consideration to the effects of subdivision and development on character and amenity values. We are concerned some of these

values have embedded cultural components and are part of sites and areas of significance and culturally sensitive areas.’ (p 7 of the submission. See Policy UFD-P3 Managing Intensification)

- raising the fundamental point that suitable infrastructure is not a qualifying matter, but it should be. Particularly for Otaki, which has a diesel-powered train service that runs twice a day to Wellington, roads that are narrow (especially the local shopping centre in Mill Road), and no traffic lights except for the SH1 area. Allowing or encouraging high density housing in such an area would seem to run counter to climate change obligations, where most residents are reliant on their vehicles.

Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira & Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S210) for:

- their submission on the lack of meaningful engagement with Mana Whenua and the seeming disregard for Te Tiriti o Waitangi in this consultation process. We are particularly concerned, as are these submitters, that the PPC2 decision-making ‘and the intensification provisions also prejudice and jeopardise the outcomes of Treaty of Waitangi Settlements’ (p 2 of the Submission). Again, we see this potential Treaty breach as constitutional matter that requires urgent legal attention.
- their concern about the lack of existing or planned infrastructure, and agree with the following statements:
 - ‘If done poorly, housing and intensification can have enduring negative impacts on the relationship of iwi with our lands and waters...Proceeding with intensification before these steps are taken is irresponsible and neglectful of our taonga’ (p. 3 of the Submissions).
- Their submission about the papakāinga provisions. We agree that these provisions should make space for papakāinga housing in local and mixed used areas, including near the amenities of townships and schools for older people to be part of the community.

Ātiawa ki whakarongotai (S100) for their request for a ‘mana enhancing’ Treaty partnership with KCDC and their concern that there is no ‘life sustaining infrastructure’ in place to support this proposal. This needs to include consideration of physical health care, mental health services and extra policing support for this new and growing community.

Ngā hapū o Ōtaki (s203) for **each** of their fifteen submission points, in particular the following:

- We strongly support these submissions and have a particular concern which is the lack of partnering with Tangata Whenua by KCDC. This in our submission is a fundamental constitutional flaw in the process and must be corrected before the Council can legitimately proceed with its proposal.
- We agree with their recommendation that KCDC seeks legal advice with respect to their obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi.
- We strongly support the submission that infrastructure should be a qualifying matter for Ōtaki, and that more scope should be afforded the qualifying matters with respect to mana whenua.
- Their submission that the takiwā areas should be extended to areas of wider cultural significance.
- That intensification be limited to single story dwellings while points 1 & 2 in their submission occur. This process should be paused until KCDC works with Mana Whenua.

- The importance of mahinga kai and the vitality that productive whenua brings to a community.
- Their submission that there is 'no robust growth model for Ōtaki' and that this is problematic for the current proposal to intensify housing.
- Their submission that Ōtaki is a special community and their opposition to the designation of Ōtaki as a 'future Urban Zone' (p 7).

Finally, we note the paucity of submissions from Ōtaki in this matter. We are therefore concerned at a lack of visibility/notification from KCDC, and there is a real risk that without further consideration of proper process here that this community will not have been afforded the opportunity to be fully heard. We would therefore encourage the Council to consider taking additional steps such as those taken by other councils in Aotearoa New Zealand in similar situations. (See, for example, this news article: <https://www.teaomaori.news/tapsell-concerned-kainga-ora-suggests-high-rises-rotorua-suburbs>)

From: [Dee McDonald](#)
To: [Mailbox - District Planning](#)
Subject: Submission on PPC2 - Further Submissions Attached
Date: Thursday, 24 November 2022 4:20:01 pm
Attachments: [Sumbissions on PP2_Further Submissions_McDonald.docx](#)
[Further submission on notified proposed plan change_24.11.22.pdf](#)

Please find attached submissions on the proposed plan change 2 (intensification)

Kind regards

Dee McDonald