
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 2

INTENSIFICATION PLANNING INSTRUMENT (IPI)

To: Kāpiti Coast District Council

Name of submitter: Infill Tapui Limited

We do wish to be heard in support of our submission.

Date: 13 September 2022

Electronic address for
service of submitter: ben.addington@infill.nz

Telephone: 0223088508

Contact person: Ben Addington

INTRODUCTION.

1. This submission fundamentally supports the IPI but requests some specific amendments to better implement the NPS-UD.
2. These amendments are also consistent with international and national policy direction that seeks to achieve SDG 11 by making cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable.
3. It is imperative that the District Plan enables high density development across the urban area to reduce the demand for car dependent suburban sprawl and the associated environmental degradation that accompanies it.
4. Research confirms that high density development can:
 - a. Improve affordability
 - b. Increase productivity.
 - c. Concentrate knowledge.
 - d. Foster innovation.
 - e. Lower crime and improve safety.
 - f. Preserve open spaces.
 - g. Reduce pollution.
 - h. Encourage physical activity.
 - i. Promote social connectedness and vitality.
5. The specific amendments requested are detailed further below but are intended to achieve the following outcomes:
 - a. Increase maximum permitted building height to seven stories.
 - b. Restricted discretionary activities for buildings over the maximum permitted height.
 - c. Non-notification for restricted discretionary activities,
 - d. Reduction of the minimum vacant residential lot size to 300m² / 12m circle shape factor.
 - e. Downgrading subdivision that does not comply with the standards to a discretionary activity.
 - f. Removal of the LDMR to allow a more robust review of this document.
 - g. An expansion of the geographic extent of the Residential Intensification Precinct to 1.2km walkable catchments.
 - h. Diversity in housing typologies and incorporation of Māori design principles to the Residential Design Guide.
 - i. Retention of publicly owned open space land in Waikanae and Ōtaki.

SUBMISSION.

OBJECTIVES.

6. Amendments to Objectives DO-03 and DO-011 are supported.
7. Objectives DO-0x1 and DO-0x2 are supported.
8. Objective DO-0x3 and amendments to Objective DO-016 are opposed. References of 'buildings up to 6-storeys' and 'buildings up to 4-storeys' should be replaced with 'buildings of at least six stories' to be consistent with the NPS-UD.

URBAN FORM AND DEVELOPMENT.

9. Policy UFD-Px is opposed. References of 'buildings up to 6-storeys' and 'buildings up to 4-storeys' should be replaced with 'buildings of at least six stories'.
10. Amendments to policies UFD-P1, UFD-P2, UFD-P3, UFD-P4, and UFD-P11 are supported.

GENERAL RESIDENTIAL ZONE.

11. Policies GRZ-Px1, GRZ-Px2, GRZ-Px3, GRZ-Px4, and GRZ-Px5 are supported.
12. Policy GRZ-Px6 is opposed. References of 'buildings up to 6-storeys' and 'buildings up to 4-storeys' should be replaced with 'buildings of at least six stories'.

GRZ-RX2

13. Standards 1 and 2 are opposed.
14. There should be no limit on the number of residential units per site in the Residential Intensification Precinct.
15. Four stories are only one storey above the MDRS and the cost to build four storeys over three storeys is potentially significant because the following additional building code requirements apply:
 - a. Lifts are required.
 - b. Fire resistance ratings apply.
 - c. A wind report and fire engineer are needed.
 - d. Specific engineering design for light timber framing is required.
 - e. Structural steel framing is possibly required.
 - f. Cross laminated timber is recommended.
16. Six storeys (approximately 18 metres) are the minimum building height required to be enabled by Policy 3(b) and (c) in the NPS-UD but the building code requirements remain similar up to seven storeys (21 metres).
17. The maximum permitted height for buildings in the Residential Intensification Precinct should be 21 metres (seven stories).

18. Applying the height in relation to boundary and setback standards within the Residential Intensification Precinct will result in perverse outcomes. For example:
- a. The current height in relation boundary standard would require a six-storey building to have a front yard that is over 20 metres. Excessive front yards are an inefficient use of land and do not provide a good street frontage.
 - b. The current boundary setback standards will lead to 2m 'gaps' between buildings on adjacent properties. Such gaps are an inefficient use of land and do not provide any usable outdoor space, sunlight, or privacy.
19. The following building setbacks are more appropriate in the Residential Intensification Precinct to replace the height in relation to boundary and setback rules for a permitted activity¹:
- a. Up to four stories: 6m between non-habitable rooms, 9m between habitable rooms and non-habitable rooms, 12m between habitable rooms
 - b. Between five and eight storeys: 13m between habitable rooms and non-habitable rooms, 18m between habitable rooms
 - c. Nine stories and more: 12m between non-habitable rooms, 18m between habitable rooms and non-habitable rooms, 24m between habitable rooms

GRZ-RX5

20. This rule is supported.

GRZ-RX6 AND GRZ-RX7

21. Rules GRZ-Rx6 and GRZ-Rx7 are opposed.
22. It is suggested that Rules GRZ-Rx6 and GRZ-7 could be combined into one rule as follows (matters of discretion to remain unchanged):
- New buildings and structures, and any minor works, additions or alterations to any building or structure, that will result in more than 3 residential units per site.*
23. This rule should be precluded from public and limited notification.
24. Allowing density to trigger a notification assessment is inconsistent with Objectives DO-03 and DO-Ox3 as well as policies GRZ-Px1, GRZ-Px5 and amended UFD-P4.

¹ From <https://mediumdensity.nz/>

METROPOLITAN CENTRE ZONE.

25. Policy MCZ-P8 is opposed. References of 'buildings up to 12-storeys' should be replaced with 'buildings of at least twelve stories'.

MCZ-R5

26. Standard 2 is opposed.
27. Residential units should be required to have a minimum size. This should be 30m² for studios and 45m² for one or more bedrooms.

MCZ-R7

28. The standards for this rule are opposed.
29. The maximum permitted building height should be 36m (approximately 12 stories). This is consistent with Policy MCZ-P8.
30. Standard 2 should be removed. It unreasonably restricts development at the edge of the zone and is therefore inconsistent with the NPS-UD.
31. The building setbacks I have recommend for Rule GRZ-Rx2 should be used to maintain amenity values,

MCZ-R13

32. Public and limited notification should be precluded. Allowing height to trigger notification is inconsistent with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.
33. Standard 2 is opposed.
34. Buildings over 36m in height (approximately 12 stories) should be a restricted discretionary activity.

TOWN CENTRE ZONE.

35. Policy TCZ-P6 is opposed. References of 'buildings up to 6-storeys' should be replaced with 'buildings of at least six stories'.

TCZ-R6

36. Standard 1 is opposed.
37. The maximum permitted building height should be 21m (approximately 7 stories). This is consistent with the NPS-UD.
38. Standard 2 is opposed. The building setbacks I have recommended for Rule GRZ-Rx2 should be used to maintain amenity values.

TCZ-R11

39. Public and limited notification should be precluded. Allowing height to trigger notification is inconsistent with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.
40. Standard 2 is opposed.
41. Buildings over 21m in height (approximately 7 stories) should be a restricted discretionary activity.

LOCAL CENTRE ZONE.

42. Policy LCZ-P6 is opposed. References of 'buildings up to 6-storeys' and 'buildings up to 4-storeys' should be replaced with 'buildings of at least six stories'.

LCZ-R6

43. Standard 1 is opposed. The maximum permitted building height should be 21m (approximately 7 stories).
44. Standard 2 is opposed. The building setbacks I have recommended for Rule GRZ-Rx2 should be used to maintain amenity values.

LCZ-R12

45. Public and limited notification should be precluded. Allowing height to trigger notification is inconsistent with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.
46. Standards 2 and 3 are opposed. Buildings over 21m in height (approximately 7 stories) should be a restricted discretionary activity.

MIXED USE ZONE.

47. Policy MUZ-P7 is opposed. References of 'buildings up to 6-storeys' and 'buildings up to 3-storeys' should be replaced with 'buildings of at least six stories'.

MUZ-R6

48. The Paraparaumu North Gateway Precinct should not be excluded from this rule. With the impending revocation of former State Highway 1 this area is no longer a 'gateway' to Paraparaumu and is business land under the NPS-UD.
49. Standard 1 is opposed. The maximum permitted building height should be 21m (approximately 7 stories).
50. Standard 2 is opposed. The building setbacks I have recommended for Rule GRZ-Rx2 should be used to maintain amenity values.

MUZ-R9

51. This rule is opposed and should be removed in favour of Rule MUZ-R6. This is consistent with Objective 3 and Policy 2 of the NPS-UD.

MUZ-R11

52. This rule is opposed.
53. This rule should be removed. This is consistent with Objective 3 and Policy 2 of the NPS-UD.

MUZ-R13

54. Public and limited notification should be precluded. Allowing height to trigger notification is inconsistent with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.
55. Standard 1 is opposed. Buildings over 21m in height (approximately 7 stories) should be a restricted discretionary activity.

SUBDIVISION.**SUB-DW-RX1**

56. This rule should not be dependent on compliance with standards for Rule SUB-RES-Rx1 but apply to all urban subdivision.
57. Standard 2 is opposed. Enhancing existing waterways and stormwater detention areas with plantings to create attractive features as part of managing stormwater for a subdivision is unreasonable. The esplanade provisions address this matter.
58. Matter of control 3 is opposed. This should be broadened to include control over Low Impact Design and Integrated Catchment Management, not just swales.
59. Public and limited notification should be precluded because this rule relates only to the provision of infrastructure for a subdivision.

SUB-DW-R23

60. This rule is opposed.
61. Infrastructure is always required for subdivision and there is no justification for this being a non-complying activity because:
 - a. Subdivision infrastructure is anticipated within the policy framework and should not need to pass the 'gateway tests' of s104D.
 - b. There are minimum engineering requirements for infrastructure.
 - c. Subdivision infrastructure is not an unexpected activity in the urban environment that requires a precautionary approach to managing effects.
62. A discretionary activity is more appropriate.
63. Public and limited notification should be precluded because this rule relates only to the provision of infrastructure for a subdivision.

SUB-RES-P1

64. This policy is opposed. It is not appropriate for a policy to refer to other (undefined) objectives and policies.

SUB-RES-RX1

65. The controlled activity status and preclusion of public and limited notification for this rule is supported.
66. Standard 3 is opposed. It duplicates Section 106 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and is not required.
67. Standard 4 is opposed. This should only apply to vacant lot subdivision and be moved to a new Standard 2c.
68. Standard 5 is opposed. This should only apply to vacant lot subdivision and replace Standard 2a.
69. Standards 7 and 8 are opposed. These standards should be removed because:
 - a. There is no requirement for vehicle parking for three or less residential units and therefore no requirement for vehicular access.
 - b. Pedestrian and cycling accesses only do not need to be limited to 6 lots.
 - c. It is unclear if this rule applies when a land use consent has been granted (or is being sought in conjunction with a subdivision consent) for more than 6 residential units on a site.
 - d. Standard 6 already requires access to be in accordance with engineering requirements.
 - e. The building code access requirements also apply to development.
70. Standard 9 should apply to all residential subdivision, not just Te Horo Beach.

SUB-RES-R27

71. This rule is opposed and should be removed and replaced by a restricted discretionary activity for subdivision that is not a controlled activity.
72. The only Standard not in Rule SUB-RES-Rx1 is 6, relating to block length for lots less than 3,000m².
73. If this rule remains, then public and limited notification should be precluded.

SUB-RES-R30

74. This rule, and in particular Standards 2-4, is opposed.
75. This rule should be a restricted discretionary activity with the matters of discretion limited to those within Rule SUB-RES-R27.
76. Standards 3 and 4 restrict intensification and unreasonably cascade vacant lot subdivision to the non-complying activity class based on density.
77. Public and limited notification should be precluded.

SUB-RES-R32

78. This rule is opposed.
79. The MDRS provides a national direction for land use intensification, and this removes justification for non-complying activity subdivision because:
- a. Increased density through subdivision is anticipated within the policy framework and should not need to pass the 'gateway tests' of s104D.
 - b. Qualifying matters and other rules already constrain development where it may be inappropriate to subdivide.
 - c. Subdivision is not an unexpected activity in the urban environment that requires a precautionary approach to managing effects.
80. A discretionary activity is more appropriate for subdivision that is not a restricted discretionary activity.

SUB-RES-TABLE X1

81. The minimum vacant lot area of 450m² and 18 metre diameter circle shape factor are opposed.
82. The minimum vacant lot area should be 300m² (inclusive of access).
83. The shape factor should be a 12-metre diameter circle.
84. These changes are consistent with the amendment to Objectives DO-03 and DO-Ox3 as well as policies GRZ-Px1 and GRZ-Px5.
85. These changes are also consistent with amendments to Policy UFD-P4 which seeks to encourage a variety of densities and removes reference to 'traditional low density residential subdivision'.
86. A minimum vacant lot area of 300m² and 12 metre diameter shape factor are consistent with operative provisions for intensification (i.e. Focused Infill Precinct) and should be retained for the existing urban environment.
87. This density is consistent with operative and proposed vacant lot areas and shape factors in District Plans for other tier 1 local authorities.

LAND DEVELOPMENT MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.

88. All references to the LDMR are opposed.
89. The LDMR replaces material incorporated by reference and notice should have been given under Section 34(2)(c) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
90. Reference to the LDMR was not included in the draft consultation for this plan change. There has not been a reasonable opportunity to comment on the LDMR and its inclusion in the District Plan should be deferred to enable this.
91. The LDMR is not required to give effect to the IPI.
92. Notwithstanding the above we provide the following comments on the parts of the LDMR that we have had time to review:

- a. The LDMR has been released at a time of significant regulatory uncertainty. It is important for this document to be forward, and not backwards, looking. Council should also have considered the following when setting engineering requirements:
 - i. Infrastructure Funding and Financing Act 2020 and Rautaki Hanganga o Aotearoa: New Zealand Infrastructure Strategy.
 - ii. Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019 and Urutau, ka taurikura: Kia tū pakari a Aotearoa i ngā huringa āhuarangi: Adapt and thrive: Building a climate-resilient New Zealand – New Zealand's first national adaptation plan.
 - iii. The Construction Sector Accord.
 - iv. Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region.
 - v. Taumata Arowai—the Water Services Regulator 2020 and the Water Services Entities Bill (three waters reform).
 - vi. The Randerson Review and Resource Management System Reform proposals.
 - vii. Road to Zero: Te Ara ki te ora (aka Vision Zero)
- b. Table 3.2 of NZS4404:2010 is opposed. Table 3.2 is not consistent with the One Network Framework and does not embed the Safe System approach required to achieve Vision Zero.
- c. The restriction of rights of way to 6 lots is opposed.
- d. Cross lease updates and upgrades should be specifically excluded from compliance with the LDMR if the existing infrastructure is proven to be in sound condition (e.g. through CCTV) and is within the respective boundary (or can be protected by an appropriate easement).
- e. The waste services design documents referenced within the LDMR were not available for review as part of Plan Change 2 and the contact details for the Sustainability and Resilience Team from which to obtain them was not provided.
- f. References to Wellington Datum 1953 should be replaced with NZVD2016.

DISTRICT PLAN MAPS.

93. The extent of the Coastal Environment should be reduced to the Coastal Qualifying Matters Precinct. This is consistent with the NZCPS.
94. The General Residential Zone should be renamed Medium Density Residential to avoid confusion with having the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) apply to the General Residential Zone.
95. The geographic extent of the Residential Intensification Precincts is opposed.

96. Precinct B does not provide the intensification required to adequately implement the NPS-UD and the rationale for the 14 metre (4-storey) height limit is not justified.
97. Precinct A should replace the proposed Precinct B to create a single Residential Intensification Precinct, and this should be extended as follows:
 - a. 1.2km from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including Ōtaki Railway Station), the edge of city centre zones and the edge of metropolitan centre zones.
 - b. 400m from neighbourhood centre zones, local centre zones, and town centre zones (or equivalent).
98. The 1.2km distance is consistent with the 15-minute city concept and there is significant support for this approach to be considered best practice. More information about this can be found at the following links:
 - a. <https://www.15minutecity.com/>
 - b. <https://quarterhourparadise.nz/>
 - c. <https://www.cnu.org/publicsquare/2021/02/08/defining-15-minute-city>
 - d. <https://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/pages/public-sector/articles/urban-future-with-a-purpose/15-minute-city.html>
 - e. <https://commonedge.org/the-surprising-stickiness-of-the-15-minute-city/>
 - f. <https://obelaward.org/the-15-minute-city/>
 - g. <https://www.wsp.com/en-nz/insights/the-20-min-city-in-aotearoa>
99. The 15-minute city concept was raised in two submissions on draft PC2, and the Council response stated that the 800m walkable catchment is supported by Ministry for the Environment guidance. The following can be noted from this guidance:
 - a. It is up to tier 1 local authorities to decide appropriate metrics or attributes for walkable catchments.
 - b. The 400m and 800m walkable catchments are taken from the third edition of the Urban Design Toolkit that was last updated in 2009, it is not current best practice.
 - c. Auckland Transport research from 2018 supports 1000 metres for town centres and rapid transit stops.
 - d. 800m is considered the absolute minimum from transit stops and for all tier 1 local authorities it is suggested that this be extended further.
 - e. 400-600 metre ped sheds 'may' be appropriate for tier 2 and 3 local authorities (noting that the Kāpiti Coast District Council is a tier 1 local authority).
100. The Ministry for the Environment guidance clearly supports walkable catchments for tier 1 local authorities that are greater than the 200m, 400m and 800m proposed for the Residential Intensification Precinct.

DEFINITIONS.

101. The definition for qualifying matter area is opposed. Residual flood hazards should not be a qualifying matter.

RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDE.

102. The dual typologies of 'terraced housing' and 'apartments or walk-ups' are opposed. These binary typologies are prescriptive. The full range of missing middle housing should be clearly articulated to ensure that housing variety and choice is promoted.
103. The design principles are supported because they are linked to the regional urban design principles as follows:
- a. Provide for Variety and Choice [V]: Choice,
 - b. Integrate with Public Realm and Surroundings [I]: Context and Connections
 - c. Provide for Appropriate Built Form and Design [A]: Character and Creativity
 - d. Create a Comfortable and Safe Environment [S]: Custodianship and Collaboration
104. A section on the Te Aranga Māori Design Principles should be added.

REZONING.

105. The rezoning of 1-3 Karu Crescent, Waikanae and 17 Jean Hing Place, Ōtaki from Open Space to General Residential is opposed.
106. Publicly owned open space land should retained for future generations.
107. Open spaces provide significant opportunities for enhancing community wellbeing by:
- a. Encouraging active lifestyles and reducing stress.
 - b. Attracting residents and businesses, creating job opportunities.
 - c. Making the urban area more resilient to climate change.
 - d. Increasing community engagement and reducing crime.
 - e. Cleaning the air and improving public health.

From: [Ben Addington](#)
To: [Mailbox - District Planning](#)
Cc: [Reuben Ferguson](#)
Subject: RE: Proposed Plan Change 2 to the Operative Kapiti Coast District Plan 2021
Date: Tuesday, 13 September 2022 10:17:43 am
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[Submission on PC2.pdf](#)

Kia ora

Tirohia koa taku tukunga e piri ana.

Please find my submission attached.

BEN ADDINGTON
CO-FOUNDER & URBAN PLANNER

Int.NZPI, MEngNZ, AS+SNZ

P 0223088508

E ben.addington@infill.nz

Infill

Please note that I am a volunteer firefighter and sometimes miss meetings because I am helping with an emergency.

From: Abbey Morris <Abbey.Morris@kapiticoast.govt.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 17 August 2022 4:51 pm
To: Ben Addington <ben.addington@infill.nz>
Subject: Proposed Plan Change 2 to the Operative Kapiti Coast District Plan 2021

Kia ora Ben Addington

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

We are getting in touch with you because you provided feedback on draft Plan Change 2 earlier this year. The Council received feedback from over 200 people and organisations. All feedback, including yours, was given consideration as part of the development of the Plan Change.

If you would like to see a response to your feedback on the draft Plan Change, please refer to line 12 in the table contained in [Appendix B](#) of the Council's Section 32 Evaluation Report for the Plan Change.

Making a submission on Proposed Plan Change 2

Please note:

- council cannot “carry through” feedback you have previously given on the draft Plan Change 2
- if you wish to provide feedback on Proposed Plan Change 2, you must prepare a new submission and submit it to Council.

Submissions on Proposed Plan Change 2 close at 5pm, Thursday 15 September.

You can make a submission at [Have Your Say](#).

Alternatively, you can make a submission by either:

- Completing the electronic [Proposed Plan Change 2 Submission Form \(Form 5\)](#), and emailing it to district.planning@kapiticoast.govt.nz.
- Picking up a hard copy of the submission form at our Service Centre, writing your submission on it (adding extra pages as needed), and posting to Kāpiti Coast District Council, 175 Rimu Road, Paraparaumu 5032.

Accessing Proposed Plan Change 2

You can read about Plan Change 2, the public notice and related information online at kapiticoast.govt.nz/district-plan.

You can download the notification documents for Proposed Plan Change 2 from our [Documents](#) section on our website. We've also prepared an [e-Plan](#) version of Proposed Plan Change 2.

Please note:

- The official version of Plan Change 2 is the [Proposed Plan Change 2 – Intensification \(Intensification Planning Instrument\)](#) document.
- While the ePlan version of Plan Change 2 has been prepared with skill and care, if there are any discrepancies then the PDF document will prevail over the ePlan.

Friend of Submitter

Making a submission isn't something everyone does every day, so the Ministry for the Environment has provided funding to appoint an independent 'Friend of Submitter', to help you take part in the Intensification Planning Instrument (IPI) process.

Hannah McCashin from Incite has been appointed to this role. Hannah is a qualified planner who is fully independent from Council and has had no involvement in developing Plan Change 2.

The Friend of Submitter is available to advise people who don't already have professional assistance on the process for lodging submissions. They can help with how you might present your views in a submission, and the steps you'll need to take after lodging your submission. The Friend of Submitter can't provide advice on the merits of the IPI or write your submission for you.

Hannah's contact details are:

Hannah McCashin

Email: hannah@incite.co.nz

Phone: 022 0675 911

Note: Hannah's working hours are Monday – Thursday 9am-5pm.

There is no cost for this service.

Next steps

Public notification of Plan Change 2 on 18 August starts the formal consultation and decision-making process outlined under Part 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991. This process is referred to as the *Intensification Streamlined Planning Process*, and includes the following steps:

Step	Description
Step 1: public submissions on the plan change	Any person can make a submission to the

Submissions close 5pm, Thursday 15 September.	Council on the plan change. The process for making a submission is outlined below.
Step 2: summary of submissions.	The Council prepares a summary of the decisions sought by submitters, and publicly notifies this summary.
Step 3: further submissions.	People have the opportunity to make further submissions on the decisions sought by submitters in step 1, based on the summary provided in step 2.
Step 4: hearing by an Independent Hearings Panel (IHP).	An Independent Hearings Panel conducts a hearing on the Plan Change. Submitters who wish to be heard can speak at this hearing.
Step 5: Independent Hearings Panel makes recommendations.	The Independent Hearings Panel makes recommendations to the Council on the provisions of the Plan Change and the matters raised by submitters.
Step 6: Council decision on Independent Hearings Panel recommendations. This step must be completed by 20 August 2023.	The Council must decide whether to accept or reject the recommendations made by the Independent Hearings Panel on the Plan Change, and publicly notify its decision.
Step 7 (if Council <i>accepts</i> IHP recommendations): Plan change becomes operative.	If the Council accepts the recommendations of the Independent Hearings Panel, then the Plan Change (as altered by the recommendations) becomes operative. This means the plan change process is completed.
Step 7 (if Council <i>rejects</i> IHP recommendations): Minister for the Environment makes a final decision.	If the Council rejects any of the recommendations made by the Independent Hearings Panel, the rejected recommendations are sent to the Minister for the Environment, who makes the decision. Once the Minister notifies their decision then the Plan Change (as altered by the recommendations that are accepted by the Minister) becomes operative. This means the plan change process is completed.

It is likely that the first three steps will be completed this year, with the remaining steps occurring in 2023.

If you have any questions about the District Plan or proposed Plan Change 2, please contact us by phone on 0800 486 486 or by email at district.planning@kapiticoast.govt.nz

Ngā mihi,

District Planning Team

Kāpiti Coast District Council

www.kapiticoast.govt.nz

The material in this email is confidential to the individual or entity named above, and may be protected by legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient please do not copy, use or disclose any information included in this communication without Kāpiti Coast District Council's prior permission.