



Further Submission - RMA Form 6

	Further Submitter Col	ntact Det	alis			
Full Name	Last Name First Name					
ruii ivame	White Louise					
Company/Organisation Name (if applicable)	Leith Consulting Ltd					
Contact Person	Louise White					
Email Address for Service	Louise.w@leithconsulting.co.nz					
Address	12 Ihakara Street, Paraparaumu					
Mail Address for Service (if different)	N/A					
Phone	Mobile	Home		Work		
	027 665 4592					
Attend	ance and wish to be h	eard at ti	he hearing:			
☐ I do not wish						
To be heard in support of my further submission (Please tick relevant box)						
✓ I will						
consider presenting a joint case with other submitters, who make a similar further submission, at a hearing. (Please tick relevant box)						
Relevance - you must select one box that applies to you:						
☐ I am a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest						
✓ I am a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has						
☐ I am the local authority for the relevant area						



Submitter Name/ Submission Number	Submission Point Number	Support or Oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Allow or disallow	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:	
Dyer, Mary (S001)	S001.01	Oppose in part	Submitter has requested that a percentage of new housing be single storey for people for which stairs would be a hazard.	I oppose this request as there are other methods for achieving accessibility for people within a home. This matter should be dealt with under the Building Code/Building Act regarding accessibility for those that are physically impaired. However, since the design guide has mentioned internal design for 'all ages and abilities' it should elaborate on how this should be achieved or delete this reference entirely.	Allow in part	Request that part of the submission seeking how the Design Guides will provide for "internal design that caters for people of all ages and abilities" be allowed as additional clarification or guidance should be provided to improve clarity and understanding on how this should be achieved (e.g chair lifts, stair design, etc)	
Infill Tapui Ltd (S028)	S028.03 and S028.04 and S028.07 and S028.19 and S028.24	Support	Support change of wording to refer to buildings of at least six stories as requested by submitter.	Aligns with the intent of our original submission and NPS-UD.	Allow	Whole submission points allowed and relief sought.	
Infill Tapui Ltd (S028)	S028.08	Support	Support submitters intent that number of residential units per site should not be the same as medium density provisions.	Support the intent of this submission and request that the Council consider allowing for more than 3 residential units per site as a permitted activity so that it supports a greater permitted baseline to that of the General Residential Zone (MDRS provisions)	Allow	Request that part of the submission requesting an increase to the number of residential units permitted per site within a residential precinct be allowed.	
Infill Tapui Ltd (S028)	S028.09	Support	Support submitters concern regarding recession plane requirements for six storey buildings if this is going to result in excessive front yard requirements.	Support the reasons behind this submission and that recession planes for taller buildings need to be modelled/fact checked so that excessive front yards are not established as an outcome as this is not a good use of space.	Allow	Allow part of the submission that questions the recession planes used for taller buildings and whether this would create perverse outcomes such as larger front yard setbacks that are not a good use of space.	
Infill Tapui Ltd (S028)	S028.10	Support	Support the intent of this submission that four stories should be amended to allow for at least six stories as per the relief sought in our original submission.	Submitters reasons align with the relief sought and intent of our original submission.	Allow	Allow part of this submission that requests buildings of more than 4 stories. Whether the starting point be six or seven stories should be determined by the Council.	
Infill Tapui Ltd (S028)	S028.39	Support	Support the intent of this submission and the relief sought as it aligns with our original submission regarding the use of 'noncomplying' activity statuses	Support the intent of this submission and the relief sought as it aligns with our original submission regarding the use of 'non-complying' activity statuses	Allow	Whole submission points and relief sought allowed.	
Infill Tapui Ltd (S028)	S028.46	Support	Support the intent of this submission and the relief sought as it aligns with our original submission regarding vehicle and pedestrian access.	Support the intent of this submission and the relief sought as it aligns with our original submission.	Allow	Allow submission point	
Infill Tapui Ltd (S028)	S028.52	Support	Support the intent and relief sought in this submission as it aligns with the reasons outlined in our original submission regarding reducing the allotment sizes for subdivision.	Support the intent and relief sought in this submission as it aligns with the reasons outlined in our original submission regarding reducing the allotment sizes for subdivision.	Allow	Allow submission point	
Infill Tapui Ltd (S028)	S028.56	Support	Support the intent of this submission that four stories should be amended to allow for at least six stories as per the relief sought in our original submission.	Submitters reasons align with the relief sought and intent of our original submission.	Allow	Allow part of this submission that requests buildings of more than 4 stories. Whether the starting point be six or seven stories should be determined by the Council.	
Transpower NZ Ltd (S076)	S076.16	Support	Support the reasoning and relief sought in this submission point.	Submitters reasons make it clear the qualifying matter areas may impact upon the ability to provide up to 3-storey dwellings in Kapiti and this should be reflected in the policies.	Allow	Allow submission point	



Submission Table						
Submitter Name/ Submission Number	Submission Point Number	Support or Oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Allow or disallow	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Land Matters Ltd (S107)	S107.01	Support	Support the submitters reasons regarding hazard areas and the relationship with land use and subdivision could be strengthened and clarified.	Improves plan applicability and provides greater certainty for subdividers.	Allow	Allow submission point and relief sought.
Land Matters Ltd (S107)	S107.02	Support	Agree with the submitter's point as it aligns with the intent of our original submission	Improves plan useability and the relief sought would avoid perverse outcomes.	Allow	Allow submission point and relief sought.
Land Matters Ltd (S107)	S107.03	Support	Agree with the submitter's point as it aligns with the intent of our original submission	Improves plan useability and the relief sought would avoid perverse outcomes.	Allow	Allow submission point and relief sought.
Land Matters Ltd (S107)	S107.04	Support	Agree with submitter's reasoning regarding notification.	Improves plan useability and the relief sought would avoid perverse outcomes and time delays.	Allow	Allow submission point and relief sought.
Land Matters Ltd (S107)	S107.06	Support	Agree with the submitter's point as it aligns with the intent of our original submission.	Improves plan useability and is good practice to use consistent terms/definitions.	Allow	Allow submission point and relief sought.
Land Matters Ltd (S107)	\$107.07	Support	Agree with the submitter's point regarding cohousing.	Support strengthening provisions regarding co-housing.	Allow	Allow submission point and relief sought.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S122)	S122.48	Support	Agree that buildings of up to 6 stories should be provided within the Local Centre Zone.	Aligns with the intent and relief sought in our original submission.	Allow	Allow submission in part.
Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch (S153)	S153.02	Support	Agree with submitter that 'cumulative effects' is too broad as an assessment matter for a restricted discretionary activity.	Aligns with the intent and relief sought in our original submission.	Allow	Allow submission point and relief sought.
Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch (S153)	S153.04	Support	Agree with submitter that the standard is too subjective and difficult to 'measure compliance against'.	Aligns with the intent and relief sought in our original submission regarding that rules and standards should be non subjective and measurable for improved District Plan usability, implementation and compliance monitoring.	Allow	Allow submission point and request that Council consider more measuring standards for planting if they wish to retain this provision.

From: Louise White

To: <u>Mailbox - District Planning</u>

Cc: mary.dyer3@outlook.com; ben.addington@infill.nz; environment.policy@transpower.co.nz;

milcah@landmatters.nz; developmentplanning@kaingaora.govt.nz; nzisplanning.wgtn@gmail.com

Subject: Leith Consulting Ltd Further Submission for Kapiti Coast District Plan - Plan Change 2 Intensification

Date: Thursday, 24 November 2022 4:34:41 pm

Attachments: Further Submission - Plan Change 2 - KCDC - Leith Consulting Ltd.pdf

Dear District Plan team,

Please find attached our further submission for plan change 2.

I have cc'd in the original submitters for whom I have supported or opposed their submission.

Thank you

Louise White | BREP(Hons)

Leith Consulting Ltd

Senior Resource & Environmental Planner

Waea Mahi | (04) 260 8888 Waea Pukoro | 027 665 4592 Paetukutuku | www.leithconsulting.co.nz

