

# Submission on notified proposal for plan change



## About preparing a submission on a proposed plan change

### You must use the prescribed form

- [Clause 6](#), Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) requires submissions to be on the prescribed form.
- The prescribed form is set out in [Form 5](#), Schedule 1 of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedure) Regulations 2003.
- This template is based on Form 5. While you do not have to use this template, your submission must be in accordance with Form 5.

### Your submission and contact details will be made publicly available

- In accordance with [clause 7](#) of Schedule 1 of the RMA, the Council will make a summary of your submission publicly available. The contact details you provide will also be made publicly available, because under [clause 8A](#) of Schedule 1 of the RMA any further submission supporting or opposing your submission must be forwarded to you by the submitter (as well as being sent to Council).
- [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.

### Reasons why a submission may be struck out

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

Submission on Proposed Plan Change 2 to the Operative Kapiti Coast District Plan 2021

### Submitter details

Full name of submitter: Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch

Contact person (name and designation, if applicable): David Gibson

Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the RMA):

[REDACTED]

Telephone: 021976498

Electronic address for service of submitter (i.e. email): nzisplanning.wgtn@gmail.com

**I would like my address for service to be my email** *[select box if applicable]*



**I have selected email as my address for service, and I would also like my postal address withheld from being publicly available** *[select box if applicable]*



**Scope of submission**

**The specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to are:**  
*[give details]*

Refer attachment.

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

## **Submission**

**My submission is:** *[include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended; and reasons for your views]*

Refer attachment.

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**I seek the following decision from the Kāpiti Coast District Council:** *[give precise details]*

Refer attachment.

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**Hearing Submissions [select appropriate box]**

I wish to be heard in support of my submission.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission.	<input type="checkbox"/>
If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If others make a similar submission, I will not consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.	<input type="checkbox"/>



Signature of Submitter  
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

27/09/2022

Date

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

**Trade Competition [select the appropriate wording]**

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by [clause 6\(4\)](#) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

I could ☐ / I could not ☒ gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

***If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission, please complete the following:***

I am ☐ / I am not ☐ directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that—

(a) adversely affects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Email your submission to [district.planning@kapiticoast.govt.nz](mailto: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

Submission No:

153

☐

## Kapiti Coast District Council District Plan, Plan Change 2 – multiple submission points table

Submitter Name: Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch

Please add a new row for every specific and unique point you would like to submit on.

Item	Specific provision / matter	Position	Reason for submission	Decisions requested / relief sought
4.17	GRZ-R6 (Measurement Criteria)	Oppose	The measurement criteria for a minor residential unit refers to including “covered yards” but excludes “covered outdoor living spaces”. We consider, this creates a contradiction that should be avoided or clarified.	When measuring gross floor area for the purposes of a minor residential unit, <del>include:</del> <del>a. covered yards and areas covered by a roof but not enclosed by walls</del> Exclude: a. decks and covered outdoor living spaces b. uncovered stairways; c. floor space in terraces (open or roofed), external balconies, breezeways or porches; d. car parking areas; and e. floor space of interior balconies and mezzanines not used by the public.
4.28	GRZ_Rx5 (Matters of Discretion)	Oppose	The matters of discretion includes “4. Cumulative Effects”. For a restricted discretionary activity, we consider that ‘cumulative effects’ is too broad ranging and thus give Council very broad scope to consider changes to any aspect of a proposal. Particularly for a rule that is considering bulk and location breaches for 1 – 3 units on a site. Such broad scope of discretion is not consistent with a restricted discretionary rule.	Matters of Discretion 1. The relevant matters contained in the Residential Design Guide in Appendix x1. 2. The matters contained in the Land Development Minimum Requirements. 3. Consideration of the effects of the standard not met. <del>4. Cumulative effects.</del> 5. The imposition of financial contributions in accordance with the Financial Contributions Chapter.
4.29	GRZ_Rx6 (Matters of Discretion)	Oppose	The matters of discretion includes “4. Building density, form and appearance; 5. Streetscape; 7. Reverse Sensitivity; 8. Transport effects and 11 Cumulative effects”. For a restricted discretionary activity, we consider that these issues are far too broad ranging and thus give Council very broad scope to consider changes to any aspect of a proposal. Particularly for a multi-unit development that complies with the bulk and location standards. Such broad scope of discretion is not consistent with a restricted discretionary rule.	Matters of Discretion 1. The matters contained in the Residential Design Guide in Appendix x1. 2. The matters contained in the Land Development Minimum Requirements. 3. Site layout. <del>4. Building density, form and appearance.</del> 5. Streetscape. 6. Landscaping. <del>7. Reverse sensitivity.</del>

Item	Specific provision / matter	Position	Reason for submission	Decisions requested / relief sought
			We also consider that retaining discretion over “8. Transport effects” is not consistent with the intentions of the NPS-UD 2020. Policy 11(b) of the NPS-UD 2020 strongly encourages Council’s to develop parking management plans, rather than assess off-site traffic and transport effects through resource consents.	<del>8. Transport effects.</del> 9. Where the site is located adjacent to a Place and Area of Significance to Māori identified in Schedule 9, effects on cultural values. 10. Where the site is located adjacent to a site containing a historic heritage feature, effects on historic heritage values. <del>11. Cumulative effects.</del> 12. The imposition of financial contributions in accordance with the Financial Contributions Chapter.
10.1	SUB-DW-Rx1 (standards)	Oppose	Standard 2 refers to enhancement planting to create attractive features. Such a subjective requirement is not appropriate as a standard that determines compliance with a rule.	2. Existing waterways and stormwater detention areas must be retained, <del>and be enhanced with plantings to create attractive features.</del>
10.2	SUB-DW-R23	Oppose	The non-complying activity status given to this rule presents a significant consenting barrier. As a matter of practice non-complying status should not be given to any rule lightly without significant justification as to why the activity should be discouraged. This extremely high status would seem disproportionate for a rule about subdivision not complying with servicing standards for water, sewage, stormwater or electricity and telecommunications.	Change the activity status of rule SUB-DW-R23 to have discretionary status.
10.4	SUB-RES-R25	Oppose	We consider this rule to be flawed on a number of levels. While we would wish to see a ‘boundary adjustment’ rule, the standards and qualifying criteria are both significantly limiting and subjective such that the rule would have very little practical use. Perhaps the rule is trying to cover too many possible options at once.	Amend the standards and terms as well as the qualifying criteria to be more clear.
10.5	SUB-RES-R26 (Standard 1)	Oppose	Standard 1 refers to each lot having legal and physical access to a road. It is not necessary to include this matter as a standard, as it is a mandatory legislative requirement under section 106 RMA for all subdivisions.	Delete Standard 1.
10.6	SUB-RES-Rx1 (Standards 3 & 5)	Oppose	Standard 3 refers to each lot having legal and physical access to a road. It is not necessary to include this matter as a standard, as it is a mandatory legislative requirement under section 106 RMA for all subdivisions.  Standard 5 requires compliance with SUB-RES_Table x1. However, the assessment of appropriate size and shape of a proposed lot is already addressed under Standards 1 & 2.	Delete Standard 3.  Delete Standard 5.
10.5 10.6	SUB-RES-R26 (Standard 5) SUB-RES-Rx1 (Standard 6)	Oppose	These standards require access and services to be compliant with the Council’s Land Development Minimum Requirements. Therefore making this external document a compliance standard. As such, we consider that this document (or at least the specific provisions) should	Delete Standard 5 of SUB-RES-R26.  Delete Standard 6 of SUB-RES-Rx1.







Item	Specific provision / matter	Position	Reason for submission	Decisions requested / relief sought

**From:** [NZIS Planning Wgtn](#)  
**To:** [Mailbox - District Planning](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on Plan Change 2  
**Date:** Tuesday, 27 September 2022 4:40:18 pm  
**Attachments:** [S+SNZ Submission-table KCDC PC2.pdf](#)  
[S+SNZ proposed-plan-change-2-submission-form-form-5.pdf](#)

---

Hi,

Please find attached our submission.