Submission on notified proposal for plan change

Kāpiti Coast DISTRICT COUNCIL
Me Huri Whakamuri, Ka Titiro Whakamua

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 4 (Private) to the District Plan - Welhom Developments Ltd

Submitter details

Full name of submitter: Derek Robert Foo and Helen Patricia Foo
Contact person (name and designation, if applicable): Derek Foo
Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the RMA): [redacted]

Telephone: 027 489 7572	
Electronic address for service of submitter (i.e. email): derfoo@gmail.com	
I would like my address for service to be my email	✓
I have selected email as my address for service, and I would also like my postal address withheld from being publicly available	✓

Scope of Submission

The specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to are:
Proposed Plan Change 4 (Private) to the District Plan - Welhom Developments Ltd

Submission

My submission is:

We support the proposed zoning change in principle, as we recognise the need for housing supply growth and regional economic development.

However, our support is conditional on the following matters being addressed:

1. Appropriate traffic and pedestrian safety and public transport upgrades
2. Landscape screening and building height controls to protect neighbour access to privacy and sunlight
3. A construction management plan to minimise the impact to neighbouring properties and local community

If these conditions are not met, we believe the zoning change will lead to adverse effects that are not adequately mitigated.

The reasons for the above conditions are below:

1. Appropriate traffic and pedestrian safety and public transport upgrades

Ratanui Road is already heavily used, and the development will push it well beyond its intended capacity as a 'Local Community Connector' route. Also, we believe the cumulative impact with the Otaihanga Mansell Family Development (253 dwellings) has not been properly assessed.

It is requested to amend the Proposed Plan Change 4 (Private) to the District Plan – Welhom Developments Ltd to:

- Upgrade Ratanui Road with kerbs, footpaths, lighting and stormwater management found in General Residential Zones that provide safety to pedestrians and cyclists
- Set the speed limit along the full length of Ratanui Road to 50kph. Or alternatively, have the increase to 60kph northeast of Killalea Place where the current "50km speed limit ahead" signs are situated. This mitigates vehicles increasing their speed as they are approaching the Killalea intersection
- Incorporate future public transport into the plan as intensification occurs throughout Otaihanga

The following points have been identified which support these amendments:

- Ratanui Road nearing capacity limits (6,000-7,000 vpd approaching 8,000 vpd threshold)
- Background growth of 30% plus additional traffic from the development will exceed road capacity

- Single vehicle access point for entering and exiting the retirement village creates road congestion and general risk with no alternative entry/exit points during emergencies or maintenance
- New intersection 85m from Little Farm Preschool and Nursery creates conflicting traffic movements during preschool drop-off/pickup
- Increased traffic volumes compromise pedestrian and cyclist safety who currently must use an unkerbed, gravel footpath largely at the same level as Ratanui Road. There are unacceptable risks to the safety of children who cycle and walk to the local preschools and Paraparaumu College and recreational pedestrians using the footpath
- Construction traffic impacts over a multi-year construction period is not adequately assessed for community safety
- Emergency vehicle access compromised by single entry point serving up to 300 homes and a care centre– this will possibly be the only Summerset Retirement Village in New Zealand with a single-entry point
- There are no public transport options to and from Otaihanga, the incoming Mansell Family Development and along Ratanui Road itself. Specifically for this Proposed Plan Change, the nearest bus stop is beyond convenient walking distance for those with mobility issues

2. Landscape screening and building height controls to protect neighbour access to privacy and sunlight

Our property currently enjoys a private rural outlook which is a core reason for choosing this location to raise our family. Investment has been made to establish native planting to encourage native birds, skinks and other wildlife. While the submission states the property will only experience low-moderate impact we believe this is incorrect and the Proposed Plan Change will need to be updated to address this moderate/moderate-high impact.

It is requested to amend the Proposed Plan Change 4 (Private) to the District Plan – Welhom Developments Ltd to:

- Specify a minimum 5 metre width for the vegetated buffer on the shared southern boundary, on the Summerset Retirement Village side, in keeping to the rural character
- Extend the vegetated buffers on the Summerset Retirement Village side, as shown in yellow in the image below, in keeping to the rural character

- Use only native shrubs and trees that are endemic to the Kāpiti region (note that Karo as mentioned in the ‘Ecological Assessment’ document is considered a weed in the Kāpiti region)
- Plant 3 established plants (not seedlings) per square metre, at the outset of earthworks commencing, for all vegetation buffers as shown in the ‘Landscape Effects Assessment’ document plus the yellow boundaries outlined above

- Ensure vegetation buffers are irrigated for the first two years after planting to ensure successful establishment
- To maintain native trees to have a maximum height of 6 metres to ensure access to sun is maintained
- To ensure only single level buildings within 100 metres of the shared southern border

The following points have been identified which support these amendments:

- Our property will experience moderate/moderate-high impacts due to
  - Complete loss of rural outlook - not just "change from pastoral"
  - 1,850% density increase (moving from currently 12 permissible dwellings to approximately 300+ dwellings and a care centre) is massive, not just "higher density"
  - 11m buildings vs current 8m creates prominent visual intrusion
  - Open views with little screening acknowledged in assessment
  - North-facing property loses primary outlook direction
- The existing "Low-Moderate" rating for the Proposed Plan Change appears to minimise impacts by:
  - Comparing to "wider receiving environment" rather than immediate context
  - Assuming mitigation will work without guarantees that mitigation will work
  - Focusing on "not uncharacteristic" rather than magnitude of change
- Assessment contradicts its own findings - acknowledges "open views" and "little boundary vegetation" (Appendix D, Section 4.1.1 and Table 1) yet rates impacts as manageable.
- Scale of change underestimated - 1,850% increase in density (from 12 to 300+ dwellings and care centre) represents fundamental character transformation
- Building height increase of 37.5% (8m to 11m) will create prominent visual intrusion in north-facing views

The following photos have been included in the submission to show current rural outlook that will be impacted:

Figure 1: View from living area (development will be from first fence line)

Figure 2: View from primary bedroom (development will be from first fence line)

Figure 3: View from lawn (development will be from first fence line)

Figure 4: West view from property (development will be from white windbreak)

3. A construction management plan to minimise the impact to neighbouring properties and local community

Construction management plans are standard practice for developments of this scale and are required to preserve neighbour and community amenity without adverse impacts on property and lifestyle enjoyment.

It is requested to amend the Proposed Plan Change 4 (Private) to the District Plan – Welhom Developments Ltd to specify a construction management plan to:

- Restrict working hours with no weekend work during the construction of the retirement village
- Prioritise vegetated buffers to minimise the construction impact
- Ensure appropriate mitigation of stormwater spilling to neighbouring properties during and after the construction of the retirement village
- Ensure any vehicles involved in the construction are not parked on the Ratanui Road berm at any stage during the construction of the retirement village
- Ensure no piling of dirt or storing of construction material and vehicles is done within 50m of our shared boundary.
- Ensure no changes are made to the contours of our shared boundary to mitigate potential flooding or ponding on our section

The following points have been identified which support these amendments:

- From the Geotechnical Assessment: "Aeolian (windblown) sand deposits overlying alluvial material" & "Fine sand with varying quantities of silt". With wind being a factor sand/silt being blown off site will need to be mitigated
- “Considerable earthworks will be required, including cut and fill design" to manage the undulating site. As per Section 4.2 Earthworks of the Geotechnical Assessment
- "Groundwater levels between 2.1m and 5m below ground level" (Executive Summary of the Geotechnical Assessment) create stormwater and liquefaction complications which will need to be mitigated without impact to neighbouring properties

I seek the following decision from the Kāpiti Coast District Council
The plan change to be updated with the following: 1. Appropriate traffic and pedestrian safety and public transport upgrades 2. Landscape screening and building height controls to protect neighbour access to privacy and sunlight 3. A construction management plan to minimising the impact to neighbouring properties and local community

Hearing Submissions [select appropriate box]

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

22/06/2025

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

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 not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

☐

For office use only
Submission No: S7