

Appendix 3 - Table of recommendations on submissions and further submissions

Contents	
General	2
Providing for and approach to growth – Sections 9.6 and 9.15 of s42A report	2
Geotechnical and site development – Section 9.7	5
Water – Section 9.8	6
Wastewater – Section 9.8	6
Stormwater and flood risk – Section 9.9	6
Transportation – Section 9.10	9
Landscape, natural character, visual amenity and urban design – Section 9.11	13
Ecology – Section 9.12	17
Construction effects – Section 9.13	17
Planning and General – Section 9 14	20

Sub. Point / No.	Support / Oppose / Seek amendment	Decision Requested	Reasons	S42A recommendation
General				
S12.1	Support	Retain DEV3-P1(c)(a)	consistency with Policy CC.4, Policy CC.14, Policy 40A, Policy 40B, Policy 41, and Policy 42 of the RPS.	Accept
S12.2	Support	Retain DEV3-P1(c)(c)(i) and DEV3-P1(c)(c)(ii).	consistency with Policy FW.3 of the RPS.	Accept
S12.4	Support	Retain DEV-P2(4)(a)	consistency with Policy CC.4, Policy CC.14, Policy 40A, Policy 40B, Policy 41, and Policy 42 of the RPS.	Accept
S12.5	Support	Retain DEV3-P2(4)(c)(i) and DEV3-P2(4)(c)(ii).	consistency with Policy FW.3 of the RPS.	Accept
Providing for and approach to growth – Sections 9.6 and 9.15 of s42A report				
S2.1	Oppose / Seek amendment	Extend the proposed plan change to cover the entire end of Ratanui Road, instead of allowing piecemeal rezoning and leaving neighbouring properties adrift with the expanded harms of urban development and limited development rights of rural zoning.	The complexity and expensive cost of private plan changes place neighbouring owners at a disadvantage. Supports a Council-led comprehensive rezoning of wider Otaihanga area to ensure integrated and equitable planning outcomes.	Accept in part
S2.1	Oppose / Seek amendment	Extend the proposed plan change to cover the entire end of Ratanui Road, instead of allowing piecemeal rezoning and leaving neighbouring properties adrift with the expanded harms of urban development and limited development rights of rural zoning.	(a) The rezoning only includes certain properties on Ratanui Road. Piecemeal rezoning would undermine the strategic intent of the Kapiti's Growth Strategy and would prefer for all or none of the area to be rezoned. (b) The Council's Growth Strategy identifies Otaihanga as a medium density housing area in the near future. It would be much fairer to change the zoning for all properties in this area than to only rezone those in the private plan change. This is due to the complexity and costs of the private plan change process which neighbouring property owners do not have the expertise or finances to pursue individually.	Accept in part
S4.1	Oppose	Decline the application in all aspects	Paraparaumu and Waikanae have a larger share of retirement villages than other surrounding districts.	Reject
S4.1	Oppose	Decline the application in all aspects	(a) Medical care, high school and primary school education. (b) Social services and infrastructure including doctors, education and the lack of a hospital in Kapiti.	Reject
S10.1	Support in principle / oppose	Consider this application only in context of a fuller review of the immediate neighbourhood and not in isolation.	If Council accepts the application's statement that according to the KCDC 2022 Growth Strategy, this area is a medium priority greenfield growth area, then why is it limited to just the two sections being sought to be developed by the applicant? Why does that same thinking not apply to the neighbouring properties?	Accept in part

S10.1	Support in principle / oppose	Consider this application only in context of a fuller review of the immediate neighbourhood and not in isolation.	<p>(a) If this application for a zoning change is approved, the submitter's property will be bounded on three sides by Residential zone. What are Council plans for their remaining small pocket of lifestyle zoning? What is the timeframe for this to be also changed to Residential zoning? Why is this application for this solitary piece of land being heard in isolation and not as part of a wider review of zoning?</p> <p>(b) Kapiti deserves a district-wide or at least area wide review and not this piecemeal application review because a wealthy developer requests it.</p>	Accept in part
S14.1	Oppose	That Council does not approve the Proposed Plan Change.	<p>(a) The area is not required to be rezoned to General Residential Zone to support growth within the area.</p> <p>(b) The 2022 growth strategy only identifies the site as part of a much wider area as a medium priority. There are other high-priority areas not yet being developed. This raises two points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Is this land required to meet the current population growth or growth in the near future; and (ii) Should a rezoning be completed in an unsystematic fashion by private developers or as part of a considered area wide re-zoning exercise directed by the Kapiti Coast District Council. <p>(c) Council, by its own assessment and actions during PC2, has not determined this land is required for growth. The submission concludes that this demonstrates that there is currently sufficient General Residential zoned land or higher density zoned land around centres within the region to accommodate growth in the near future. Please see the submission for additional details and examples.</p> <p>(d) The assumptions, adequacy and conclusions of the Economic Assessment prepared by Property Economics, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The predicted growth rates and population scenarios used; (ii) the addition of an arbitrary 2-3% penetration rate for 65-74 year olds over and above the 23% penetration rate; (iii) the use of the 75% percentile values; (iv) long term demand for retirement villages versus short and medium term; (v) stated limitations on the availability of sites for retirement villages. 	Reject
S14.1	Oppose	That Council does not approve the Proposed Plan Change.	<p>(a) Rezoning of this land should be undertaken when it is actually needed and should be completed on an area wide basis by KCDC under a district plan review</p> <p>(b) That a private plan change of a development of this size relative to the adjacent land is not in the best interest of the community and instead any potential re zoning should be undertaken under a district plan review to ensure resources are adequately managed.</p> <p>(c) A council directed plan change of the area would provide a more suitable approach as this would also provide these effected properties the ability to act within the GRZ whereas the current proposal restricts</p>	Reject

			what owners can do on these properties while removing their benefit of the RLZ. The effects on these properties have not been addressed as part of the application.	
S15.1	Oppose	Decline the plan change or if not declined in full, retain the existing Rural Lifestyle zoning on 65 & 73 Ratanui Road.	<p>Growth sequencing and urban form:</p> <p>(a) The Site is identified in Te Tupu Pai (2022) as a “Medium-priority greenfield growth area.” Medium priority signals that higher-priority locations (closer to the Metro Centre, rapid-transit stops, and brownfields) should be developed first. This leapfrogs well-serviced land and undermines the District Plan’s compact urban form.</p> <p>(b) The Plan Change would set an adverse precedent for un-sequenced greenfields outside of the Council’s agreed staging framework.</p>	Reject
S15.1	Oppose	Decline the plan change or if not declined in full, retain the existing Rural Lifestyle zoning on 65 & 73 Ratanui Road.	<p>(a) The rural lifestyle living zone is designed in part to make use of land with lower productivity potential and to provide a remedy to reverse sensitivity. A piecemeal approach to such plonking residential development into this zone risks undermining these goals and creates a precedent for other such developments occurring in a chaotic manner.</p> <p>(b) The plan would in effect leave a portion of rural lifestyle zoned properties effectively surrounded by General Residential Zone. These properties should, if the plan change is accepted, be included in any rezoning to the General Residential Zone.</p> <p>(c) On Page 1 of the Welhom Developments Ltd (Welhom) submissions they describe the site as being a logical extension of the adjacent General Residential Zone. This is somewhat misleading. While a small portion of the site is adjacent to a General Residential Zone there is no direct transport (roading, cycle way, footpath, bridleway or other) connection between any area of General Residential Zones and the site.</p> <p>(d) Any residents in the site would need to travel through a portion of a Rural Lifestyle Zone upon leaving the site. Another way of saying this is there is no entrance to the site from the General Residential Zone.</p> <p>(e) A continuous belt of open spaces is an important part of the district plan, and this plan change creates a barrier to this.</p>	Reject
S15.4	Seek amendment	Alternatively, the Council rezone the land south of the site as well so as not to create an island of rural residential land south of the site.	Please see the reasons summarised under submission points S15.1-S15.3 above.	Accept in part
S15.5	Seek amendment	Alternatively, that the Council consider the rezoning of the entire area running from Paraparaumu North/Otaihanga near Otaraau Park or at least the area boarded by Ratanui and Otaihanga road so consideration and planning can be provided for infrastructure needs including transport, 3 waters, public parks etc	Please see the reasons summarised under submission points S15.1-S15.3 above.	Accept in part

S17.1	Oppose	Not to grant the 65-73 Ratanui Road Welhom-development Ltd. Plan (sic).	<p>(a) The Council, Greater Wellington, the developer and even the government is unable to provide the basic infrastructure for the extra population in the district.</p> <p>(b) Basic infrastructure like roading, electricity, water supply and wastewater has to be adjusted to cope with the extra population. However that is only a basic supply there is more which reaches the border of the council's ability.</p> <p>(c) The infrastructure for healthcare, education and food supply are other subjects which need to be taken care of before any more development can take place.</p> <p>(d) The stretched health providers are unable to take care of this influx arising from the development.</p> <p>(e) This is not related to the KCDC only, however the KCDC has an obligation to care for the local people who pay rates for the infrastructure and also pay taxes so all can access healthcare, transport, energy supply, food supply, education as is set in their policies.</p> <p>(f) More housing is not possible when these basic needs are not currently met.</p> <p>(g) The ratepayers should first be cared for before the next phase of population growth continues.</p>	Reject
-------	--------	---	---	--------

Geotechnical and site development – Section 9.7 of s42A report

S11.1	Seek amendment	That the large sand dune which straddles the northern boundary of the Site, and which wraps around the submitter's property boundary on the eastern side of the Site, is not removed, undercut, scraped, or otherwise developed so as to remove any sand whatsoever from the dune.	<p>This condition is supported by recommendations and statements made in the following report commissioned by the Applicant as follows:</p> <p>(a) Civil Engineering Infrastructure Assessment Report: The large sand dune is specifically referred to in Appendix H of the plan change request, which states (as section 2.2.): <i>"Some parts of the site may need to be set aside as undevelopable, unless the contributing constraints can be resolved. These include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The large hills at the north end of the Site, which straddle the boundary. It is unlikely to be physically feasible to remove these hills without the agreement from the neighbouring landowner"</i> <p>The submitter advises that they would provide consent to such removal.</p> <p>(b) The submitter's property at 54 Wood Leigh is the only residential property which straddles the large sand hill along the norther boundary of the site, with all other properties being rural.</p> <p>(c) The sand dune occupies some 400m² of a total of 1661m² and is a major feature on the property offering sweeping views of the surrounding rural and residential areas from the summit.</p> <p>Note that the submitter's conditional support for the private plan change request is in respect to Option 2 (and specifically the development of a retirement village), and in the alternative Option 3. The submitter does not support Option 1 because it is not the most effective method of meeting</p>	Accept in part
-------	----------------	--	---	----------------

			the objectives given it provides a level of risk that site-specific environmental, social and cultural values will not be addressed.	
Water – Section 9.8 of s42A report				
S15.2	Oppose	Defer any rezoning of the Site until an area wide (North of Paraparaumu to Otaihanga) infrastructure capacity study (3 waters, transport, public spaces) is completed and publicly consulted.	Although rainwater tanks are encouraged by KCDC, no rainwater-harvesting requirement is embedded in the Structure Plan, exposing the district's water supply to new peak demand. A comprehensive consideration of the entire block as delineated by Ratanui and Otaihanga Road becoming residential would allow for a future development to be taken into account.	Reject
Wastewater – Section 9.8 of s42A report				
S15.2	Oppose	Defer any rezoning of the Site until an area wide (North of Paraparaumu to Otaihanga) infrastructure capacity study (3 waters, transport, public spaces) is completed and publicly consulted.	Peak wastewater loads currently approach network capacity in Paraparaumu. The updated wastewater assessment (Appendix M) merely asserts that “no upgrades are identified” without demonstrating trunk-main or treatment-plant headroom ratings or confirming any developer funding agreement.	Reject
Stormwater and flood risk – Section 9.9 of s42A report				
S2.3	Oppose / Noted	Make any development rights that are pursuant to the proposed plan change contingent on such development respecting the environmental, property and safety rights on neighbouring properties, to strongly incentivise compliance with these duties which has been sorely lacking. See submission for details.	There is a shared creek and large pond with the site and the creek (which includes runoff from the nearby landfill) may be loaded by the development raising the level of the land. Concern whether the large pond would be flooded by the development raising ground levels, and leaving the submitter's site as the lowest point in heavy rain flooding event.	Reject
S4.1	Oppose	Decline the application in all aspects	(a) There should / will be ZERO exemption for waivers on the storm water retention policy as set by the current KCDC District plan. (b) Stormwater retention.	Reject
S6.1	Support in principle (pending resolution of the outlined issues)	(a) What protection from water runoff or drainage will be put in place to protect 81 Ratanui Road? (b) The waterway on 73 Ratanui is described as mostly dry and of little use. It should be noted that during winter/spring, the stream floods, as does the pond due to the volume of water. Will this waterway/stream be replaced by an alternate facility? (c) Notes an intent to create a wetland area to act as a storm water retention area. Given the reliance of our stormwater disposal on the waterway outlined above on 73 Ratanui, and the encroachment of the drain from our pond across to this waterway, will it be possible to connect that drain to the intended wet land	Concerns and questions regarding the Assessment of Environmental Effects include:	Accept in part

		drainage area noted in the Plan. A lack of drainage from our pond will create a stagnant body of water that will create an unsightly and unhealthy water feature.		
S6.2	Support in principle (pending resolution of the outlined issues)	Support in principles, subject to resolution of issues.	<p>(a) Clarification on the existing stormwater arrangement for 81 Ratanui Road which relies on infrastructure located on 73 Ratanui Road.</p> <p>(b) The submitter's property was created via a previous subdivision of 73 Ratanui Road in 2014, however despite the resource consent requiring a drainage plan and the creation of easements, the drainage plan shows only grey water. No stormwater plan is shown. Therefore, the current stormwater from the submitter's property is disposed via a pipe to a pond on 73 Ratanui Road and is reliant on 73 Ratanui Road for stormwater disposal.</p> <p>(c) The costs on the submitter if the existing stormwater system will be affected by works on 73 Ratanui Road.</p> <p>(d) What is the process and who is the liable party to remediate the stormwater situation if easements are required to continue the existing stormwater drainage arrangements? What is the process for connection to stormwater water on Ratanui Road is easements or continuity of the current arrangements cannot be achieved?</p>	Accept in part
S14.1	Oppose	That Council does not approve the Proposed Plan Change.	<p>(a) The area downstream of the proposed development is tidal with a low gradient stream that is prone to flooding in large rainfall events. While attenuation systems may be appropriate for infill developments a large-scale intensive development as proposed will only offset a peak flow from the event and likely prolong the flooding or intensify it due to increased runoff which cannot be mitigated through attenuation systems. As such on site storage and offset with controlled flows is likely a more appropriate solution.</p> <p>(b) The proposal design indicated E1 soak pits for the individual units. These E1 solutions are typically outdated and not accepted under resource consents by many councils across the country with best practice being design for a nested storm events in accordance with the Auckland GD07 document. This higher level of design particularly around stormwater should be imposed on development of this scale to ensure any adverse effects are suitably mitigated.</p>	Reject
S15.2	Oppose	Defer any rezoning of the Site until an area wide (North of Paraparaumu to Otaihanga) infrastructure capacity study (3 waters, transport, public spaces) is completed and publicly consulted.	<p>(a) The Site contains a "highly modified" stream and 14 small NPS-FM wetlands (621 m² total). Intensification will vastly increase runoff and risk downstream ponding.</p> <p>(b) The Geotechnical report notes shallow groundwater (2 m bgl), rendering on-lot soakpits unreliable outside the driest months.</p> <p>(c) No firm commitments have been made for downstream stormwater upgrades or flood-storage compensation to protect existing subdivisions and neighbouring properties – KCDC's modelling identifies multiple flood hazard overlays across the Site.</p>	Reject

S16.1	Seek amendment	Approval of the plan change subject to suitable conditions to protect neighbours in terms of adequate planting to provide visual screening and those affected downstream by the outflow of additional storm water into the shared open drain which already cannot cope with the existing stormwater load.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) No attention is ever given to the downstream effects of additional storm water flows into an already under capacity drainage channel. (b) The proposed development indicates storm water on site will be dealt with through a number of soak pits together with detention ponds and ultimately discharging to the Council's existing open drain (heading initially south), which ultimately connects to the Mazengarb Stream. (c) As with other developments, consultant calculations always show neutrality in terms of the effects of the storm water upon the drainage channel. (d) The culverts that connect the Mazengarb Stream to the Oxbow are undersized resulting at times in higher water levels backing upstream from the culverts, which in turn raises the water table. (e) The Mazengarb Stream has in recent years become tidal through the submitter's joint properties (16,18,20 Otaihanga Road). (f) The river level has risen in recent years due to the failure to dredge the excess gravels in the river. (g) Sea level rise is increasing due to climate change. (h) The Mazengarb Stream eventually passes through the submitter's properties at 16,18 and 20 Otaihanga Road. Now every time it rains the stream already fills close to the top of its banks. (i) During a 20year flood a few years ago, the stream over flowed and covered our access bridge as well as flooding the surrounding paddocks. The submitter's bottom paddock is now almost permanently flooded, when it rains. Trees we planted 25 years ago have died due to their roots becoming waterlogged. (j) The water table has consistently risen over the more than 27 years the submitter has been at 16 Otaihanga Road. (k) Adjacent developmental effects upon adjoining properties. (l) The adjacent development on Kotuku Park, partly built in a ponding area, excavated 1-1.5m of peat and raised the ground level around 3m above the submitter's bottom paddock, (hence reducing the size of the ponding area and adding to an already rising water table). (m) Kotuku Park's water table has progressively raised giving rise to surface flooding in some areas. (n) Anecdotally areas of Kotuku Park have seen rising water tables coupled with surface water as a regular occurrence, during rainfall. (o) that this proposed development cannot be considered in isolation, but must consider the wider effects upon the storm water drainage system as a whole especially downstream of the proposed site. 	Accept in part
FS2	Support		<i>Original submission S16 describes the potential effects of additional stormwater on properties through which the Mazengarb Stream passes. In</i>	Accept in part

			<p><i>particular, the properties at 16, 18 and 20 Otaihanga Road.</i></p> <p><i>I live at 20 Otaihanga Road. I strongly endorse and support all the points made in the original submission.</i></p>	
Transportation – Section 9.10 of s42A report				
S1.1	Oppose	Decline the proposed private plan change request.	Traffic and transportation capacity and safety, and the risk of accidents on Ratanui Road that would increase as a result of building a retirement village. Ratanui Road already experiences a lot of traffic in the mornings and when college starts and, in the afternoons, when college ends.	Reject
S2.2	Oppose / Seek amendment	That the Council explicitly affirm and guarantee to protect the existing user rights of neighbouring rural properties, including but not limited to those described in the submission. See submission for details.	<p>There are several existing rural activities and uses on their property that they seek the Council to explicitly note and protect these from the neighbouring urban development. The specific uses and activities (in summary) relate to:</p> <p>(a) Roothing and traffic safety from increased traffic on the basis that Ratanui Road is used by many as a rural road, including use by horses.</p>	Accept in part
S3.1	Not specifically stated, but rejection is the decision requested.	Reject the application for the stated reasons.	<p>(a) Pedestrian safety and mobility access for the proposed retirement village on Ratanui Road (crossing a 60 km/hr road without appropriate traffic controls) and the lack of sufficient footpath and footpath width. There are no provisions or references as to how residents will safely cross a 60km/h road from the entrance/exit of the property without traffic lights being installed on Ratanui Road. There's no mention of any traffic lights or a roundabout being built with the developer.</p> <p>(b) Noise pollution from traffic lights and roundabouts especially for the commercial trucks using the throughfare from Paraparaumu to Waikanae expressway, the dump, green waste and other businesses.</p> <p>(c) The assessment in the application includes a vehicles per day figure taken in 2023, and that this figure does not take into account the additional further developments in the area that have since been approved with work under way - the 2000+ extra vehicle movements per day expected from the Mansell estate being built a few 100 metres up the road, and the recent subdivisions of a few Otaihanga properties. This makes it a little difficult to agree with the statement "it's been concluded that a new T-intersection with a right turn bay on Ratanui Road will accommodate traffic"</p> <p>(d) The developer should contribute at least 50% of the cost of any roading and footpath upgrades that would otherwise fall onto ratepayers.</p>	Reject
S4.1	Oppose	Decline the application in all aspects	The Traffic flow and congestion created 65 Meters from a Pre-school and attraction may be dangerous. This includes construction traffic with a minimum of 8,000 loads of fill / soil alone (55,000 M ³).	Reject
S5.1	Not stated.	Not stated.	Parking on Ratanui Road, and whether adequate on-site parking for staff and visitors will be provided. The road is very congested with Little School and heavy traffic.	Accept

S7.1	Support in principle / Seek amendment	<p>The plan change be updated with appropriate traffic and pedestrian safety and public transport upgrades.</p> <p>It is requested that the plan change be amended to:</p> <p>(a) Upgrade Ratanui Road with kerbs, footpaths, lighting and stormwater management found in General Residential Zones that provide safety to pedestrians and cyclists;</p> <p>(b) 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; and</p> <p>(c) Incorporate future public transport into the plan as intensification occurs throughout Otaihanga.</p>	<p>(a) Ratanui Road is already heavily used, and the development will push it well beyond its’ intended capacity as a ‘Local Community Connector’ Route.</p> <p>(b) The cumulative impact with the Otaihanga Mansell Family Development (253 dwellings) has not been properly assessed.</p> <p>The amendments are requested as:</p> <p>(i) Ratanui Road is nearing capacity limits (approaching 8,000 vpd);</p> <p>(ii) Background growth of 30% plus additional traffic from the development will exceed road capacity;</p> <p>(iii) The single vehicle access point for entering and existing the retirement village creates congestion and general risk with no alternative access for emergencies during maintenance;</p> <p>(iv) New intersection 85m from Little Farm Preschool and Nursery creates conflicting traffic movements;</p> <p>(v) Increased traffic volumes compromise pedestrian and cyclist safety on Ratanui Road, creating an unacceptable safety risk to children and recreational pedestrians;</p> <p>(vi) The construction traffic impacts over a multi-year construction period is not adequately assessed for community safety;</p> <p>(vii) Emergency vehicle access compromised by single entry point serving up to 300 homes and a care centre;</p> <p>(viii) There are no public transport options to and from Otaihanga, the incoming Mansell Family Development and along Ratanui Road itself.</p> <p>(e) The nearest bus stop is beyond convenient walking distance for those with mobility issues.</p>	Accept in part
S8.2	Oppose	Require a full structural plan for the Otaihanga area before any further rezoning is approved.	<p>Since building the submitter’s home, a major subdivision (the Mansell Family Development) has already been approved on nearby land, this will be bringing up to 253 new homes and their associated vehicles into the area.</p> <p>Ratanui Road already experiences congestion during peak hours, with traffic frequently backing up from the roundabout. The addition of hundreds more residents, staff, and visitors from the proposed Summerset development will only worsen congestion.</p>	Accept in part
S9.1	Oppose	That the rezoning proposal be declined.	<p>The traffic impacts on Ratanui Road between Otaihanga and Mazengarb Road, including:</p> <p>(a) The traffic impact on Ratanui Rd both to residents and motorists. The risk of harm to residents and motorists is likely to increase should the proposal be accepted and resource consent consequentially granted. What is absolutely certain is that motorist frustration will increase.</p> <p>(b) Should the Council approve the rezoning request, and it move to the resource consent process, the Council’s control over infrastructure will primarily be around pipes and roads.</p>	Reject

			<p>(c) The statement in Clause 2.2.5 of the document supporting the rezoning request in respect of Ratanui Road that there is “...mainly locally generated traffic movements, and with traffic travelling at moderate speeds” is incorrect because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) This appears to be more based on speed limits than anything else; (ii) Much traffic comes from and to the direction of Waikanae and it provides a short cut for those travelling to and from much of Paraparaumu, including Paraparaumu College – this is most evident at peak times when people travel to work or to Paraparaumu as is reflected by long quest. (iii) The long ques will be made worse as the “Mansell family’ land development already underway in Otaihanga progresses further. <p>(d) Based in the submitter’s road use experience, if KCDC accepts this rezoning application and that if it then enables a successful resource consent application, then the inevitable outcome would be to potentially make Ratanui Rd dangerous, at least at certain times for residents of the road. Further, it will increase the frustrations and increased risks for Otaihanga and other commuters. It also poses risks of harm when motorists drop off and collect children at the early childcare centre across the road.</p> <p>(e) While technically the rezoning proposal is only for two properties, it will affect all Otaihanga residents and motorists from outside Otaihanga who use Ratanui Rd.</p> <p>(f) Road safety concerns might be alleviated by the provision of regular public buses along Otaihanga and Ratanui Roads, and that this would require some road widening and/or refinements in order to enable sufficient bus stops.</p>	
S10.5	Seek amendment	Require this development to provide at least one other entry/egress point.	The impact of the number of residents this application will have on the roads in the immediate area: Ratanui Road, Otaihanga Road and Mazengarb Road, which is the submitter’s only road access.	Accept in part
S13.1	Support in part / Seek amendment	That Council approve the Private Plan Change Request on behalf of Welhom Developments Ltd but subject to the transport effects fitting the created transport plan for the Otaihanga local roading network as referred to in submission point S13.2 below.	The community needs a plan for the Otaihanga local roading network that addresses the transport effects from current and potential future developments as Otaihanga is migrated from a semi-rural community to an urban community.	Accept in part
S13.2	Seek amendment	That Council create a transport plan for the Otaihanga local roading network and, in particular, Ratanui Road and Otaihanga Road. Community involvement in this process would be appreciated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) There is capacity on Ratanui Road and the wider roading network to accommodate traffic volume increases associated with either development scenario.” (b) There are three significant developments in the immediate area comprising the 18-hectare Mansell Family site, the 12.65 hectare site in this submission (sic), and the 8.15 hectare site (for sale) that adjoins the land in this submission (sic). 	Accept in part

			<p>(c) The transport effects from the development of each of the abovementioned sites is being treated in isolation, and that this is an entirely unsatisfactory situation.</p> <p>(d) The transport plan (referred to in submission point S13.1 above) needs to include a range of road enhancements, including but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Reduce the speed limit to 50kph for the entire length of Ratanui Road and Otaihanga Road. (ii) Install “no stopping” yellow lines on Ratanui Road outside the pre-school/nursery and the proposed junction to the new retirement village. It should be a requirement that pick up and drop off should occur within the boundaries of those businesses. (iii) Address the ongoing, perpetual, very poor condition of the road surface over the railway level crossing on Otaihanga Road. (iv) Install a traffic light controlled pedestrian crossing where the cycle way along the Expressway crosses Otaihanga Road. (v) Change the name of the stretch of Otaihanga Road from the junction with Ratanui Road to Old SH1 to be 'Ratanui Road'. (vi) Replace the junction at Ratanui Road and Otaihanga Road with a roundabout. (vii) Construct properly formed pavements and cycleways along the entire lengths of Ratanui Road and Otaihanga Road. (viii) Address the very narrow pavement where Ratanui Road joins Mazengarb Road. The pavement here is so narrow that a wheelie bin completely blocks the pavement such that pedestrians are forced to step into the road. (ix) Make provision now for a future bus service along Ratanui Road by planning where the bus stops will be such that bays can be designed to allow traffic to flow safely passed a stopped bus. (x) Reopen the access from Otaihanga Road to the Expressway going south towards Wellington. This was the main access point for contractors when the Expressway was being built. 	
S14.1	Oppose	That Council does not approve the Proposed Plan Change.	The appropriateness of the site for this type of development as public transport services are limited in the rural area and there are no essential services within close proximity which may isolate the residents. In contrast the sites listed in the submission are closer to these services and would be more appropriate for this type of development.	Reject
S15.2	Oppose	Defer any rezoning of the Site until an area wide (North of Paraparaumu to Otaihanga) infrastructure capacity study (3 waters, transport, public spaces) is completed and publicly consulted.	Ratanui Road east of Mazengarb Road has only a narrow carriageway, gravel shared path on the north side and a partial footpath on the south. The proposed new T-intersection and right-turn bay will be adjacent to a speed-limit change point and an existing preschool – increasing crash risk without a funded upgrade package (kerbs, footpaths, crossings, cycle lanes, roundabout). Without a confirmed funding source and timing for upgraded pedestrian/cyclist infrastructure, rezoning will degrade safety for vulnerable	Reject

			road users and lock in a car-dependent location. The Submission acknowledge residents of the proposed zone are unlikely to use public transport	
S17.2	Oppose	Not to grant the 65-73 Ratanui Road Welhom-development Ltd. Plan (sic).	Ratanui Road is unable to cope with the influx of the 100s of cars.	Reject
S18.1	Not specifically stated – Submitter ‘does not have any issues with the change in zone’	That the development be made better by development finance from the Welhom Developments Ltd and Mansell Family Subdivision being used to make Ratanui Road safer.	Ratanui Road is already a busy and narrow road. When cars are parked on the roadside, to pass them the submitter must go over the centre line into the other lane. In parts the road is only 9 metres wide.	Accept in part
S18.3	Not specifically stated Submitter ‘does not have any issues with the change in zone’	The development be made better by a bus service being planned for Ratanui Road and Otaihanga Road areas as there could be 400 people in Summerset Village plus staff and perhaps a similar number in the Mansell Subdivision.	Not specifically stated.	Accept in part
Landscape, natural character, visual amenity and urban design – Section 9.11 of s42A report				
S1.1	Oppose	Decline the proposed private plan change request.	(a) Ratanui Road is the beginning of the semi-rural area of Otaihanga, which has significant natural beauty and an established semi-rural character. The submission considers that building a retirement village on such a large plot of land would destroy this. (b) Kapiti has enough retirement villages already and it will soon lose what little remains of the sleepy semi urban/rural charm it once had.	Reject
S2.1	Oppose / Seek amendment	Extend the proposed plan change to cover the entire end of Ratanui Road, instead of allowing piecemeal rezoning and leaving neighbouring properties adrift with the expanded harms of urban development and limited development rights of rural zoning.	The loss of rural character of the area, and that neighbouring properties will retain their rural zoning which prevents them from attaining any of the benefits of this change such as the ability to develop their own properties.	Reject
S6.1	Support in principle (pending resolution of the outlined issues)	More detail is requested on the intent to use alternative fencing to wooden batten construction and planting to aid visual sightings and the boundary.	(a) Concerns and questions regarding the Assessment of Environmental Effects include: (i) Private viewpoint assessment (page 20): KCDC asked Welhom Ltd to provide images taken from within the properties to confirm the visual and environmental assessments, but to date the submitter has not been engaged by the applicant regarding entering the submitter’s property to take these pictures. (ii) It is assumed Welhom Ltd has not taken images from within 65/73 Ratanui Road across the submitter’s property to simulate this requirement. (iii) Questions how the adverse effects rating of ‘Low’ has been applied to 81 Ratanui Road – what does ‘Low’ mean; what is the process to change this; what is the effect or outcome if this rating was increased to Medium or High.	Accept in part

S7.2	Support in principle / Seek amendment	<p>The plan change be updated with landscape screening and building height controls to protect neighbour access to privacy and sunlight.</p> <p>It is requested that the plan change be amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) 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; (b) Extend the vegetated buffers on the Summerset Retirement Village side, as shown in yellow in the image on page 3 of the submission (see submission for details); (c) 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); (d) 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 in the image on page 3 of the submission (see submission for details); (e) 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; and (f) To ensure only single level buildings within 100 metres of the shared southern border. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The submitter's property will experience moderate/ high impacts due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Complete loss of rural outlook; (ii) 1,850% density increase (moving from currently 12 permissible dwellings to approximately 300+ dwellings and a care centre) is massive, not just "higher density"; (iii) 11m buildings vs current 8m creates prominent visual intrusion; (iv) Open views with little screening is acknowledged in the assessment; and (v) North-facing property loses primary outlook direction. (b) The existing "Low-Moderate" rating for the Proposed Plan Change appears to minimize impacts by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Comparing to "wider receiving environment" rather than immediate context; (ii) Assuming mitigation will work without guarantees that mitigation will work; and (iii) Focusing on "not uncharacteristic" rather than magnitude of change. (c) The assessment contradicts its own finding as it acknowledges "open views" and "little boundary vegetation" yet rates the impacts as manageable. (d) The scale of change is underestimated. The 1,850% density increase represents a fundamental character transformation. (e) The building height increase from 8m to 11m will create prominent visual intrusion in north-facing views. (f) The photos in the submission show the current rural outlook that will be impacted from various locations within the submitter's property and residential unit. 	Accept in part
S8.1	Oppose	Retain the current Rural Lifestyle zoning to preserve the character, environmental values, and infrastructure capacity of the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The proposed plan change of a large-scale retirement village will fundamentally alter the rural feel of Ratanui Road and surrounding properties. (b) The proposal introduces high-density housing and increased building height, which is incompatible with the existing character and landscape. 	Reject
S8.1	Oppose	Retain the current Rural Lifestyle zoning to preserve the character, environmental values, and infrastructure capacity of the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The submitter purposefully purchased 91 Ratanui Road to build their forever home for their young family, specifically because of the area's rural zoning and the minimum 4000sqm lot sizes, which promised privacy, space, and a peaceful environment. (b) The proposed development contradicts what the submitter and others in the area were told when the submitter bought here — that the land would remain low-density and rural in nature. . 	Reject

			(c) The land around the submitter's property — and particularly the areas near numbers 65 and 73 — includes established mature trees that are home to a wide range of native birds, including kererū, tūī, ruru (morepork), quail, and fantails. These birds are an everyday part of life for their children, and their habitats are at risk of being lost or irreparably damaged by large-scale earthworks and construction.	
S8.3	Oppose and seek amendment	<p>If the development is to proceed, the submission requests the following changes to mitigate the impact on neighbouring properties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) That no buildings be permitted within a minimum setback distance of 10 metres from existing rural boundaries, particularly for 91 Ratanui Road, to preserve privacy and reduce visual impact. (b) That only single-storey homes be permitted along the boundary of existing rural properties to minimise loss of outlook, light, and character. (c) That the density be reduced to a maximum of 150 dwellings. (d) That privacy planting of ideally 2 metres, maximum of 6 metres in height be installed by the developer along affected boundaries — at their cost — prior to construction, to soften visual impacts and maintain the semi-rural feel. Any higher than 6m affect the long-lasting sun on the submitter's property. <p>That these conditions be made enforceable through the consent process or development agreement.</p>	<p>See reasons set out under submission points S8.1 and S8.2 above. In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The submitter moved to Ratanui Road because of its rural, peaceful character — a place where they could raise their children close to nature, in a community with shared values. This proposal represents a dramatic and unjustified shift away from that vision. (b) The submitter cares deeply about the future of the local community and urges the Council to carefully consider the long-term consequences of this proposed plan change. (c) Once large open spaces in Kapiti are subdivided and sold off to the highest bidder, the community will never get that land back. These spaces are not just empty land — they are vital to the identity, wellbeing, and sustainability of our district. (d) The Council should prioritise the protection of open space for current and future generations, and take a cautious, community-focused approach when assessing this proposal. 	Accept in part
S10.6	Seek amendment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Ensure that the submitter is not unduly affected either in the short term or the longer term by the height of what is developed along their boundary and that the Council demands that height restrictions are imposed on the perimeter of the development and an appropriate landscape buffer is put in place on our boundary post-construction. (b) Council to ensure that the submitter is not unduly affected either in the short term or the longer term by the outdoor space that may be developed on the boundary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Given the submitter's current rural lifestyle zoning and expected future Residential zoning, concerns about multi- storey buildings being approved for construction along the boundary, with potentially only a 5-metre buffer. This is incongruous with the submitter's current Lifestyle zoning. (b) Should the zoning of the submitter's property change in the future then the existence of multi- story buildings within five metres of the boundary could affect potential development on the submitter's property. (c) Given current rural lifestyle zoning of the submitter's property and expected future Residential zoning, the impact of the development of any outdoor space that is developed on the boundary. 	Accept in part

S11.2	Seek amendment	That the large sand dune which straddles the northern boundary of the Site, and which wraps around the submitter's property boundary on the eastern side of the Site, is planted with indigenous species which are typical of this coastal environment.	The Archaeological Assessment Report (Appendix F) states that it is considered likely that unrecorded subsurface archaeological sites relating to Māori occupation and settlement will be exposed during development specially along the northern boundary of the property at 65 Ratanui Road which contains slopes of more highly elevated dunes.	Accept in part
S11.2	Seek amendment	That the large sand dune which straddles the northern boundary of the Site, and which wraps around the submitter's property boundary on the eastern side of the Site, is planted with indigenous species which are typical of this coastal environment.	<p>This condition is supported by recommendations and statements made in the following report commissioned by the Applicant as follows:</p> <p>(a) Landscape Effects Assessment Report:</p> <p>The large sand dune is specifically referred to in Appendix D of the plan change request, which states (as section 7.0):</p> <p><i>"It is recommended that a Landscape Plan should include the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Street tree, structure and amenity planting, including proposed vegetated buffer and appropriate landscape buffers along the northern, eastern and partial southern boundaries of the Site should be implemented to soften the rural lifestyle/general residential interface as well and providing adequate and appropriate screening for existing neighbouring residential dwellings.</i> <i>Planting species, species mixes, and planting arrangement should reflect the location of the Site;</i> <i>Indigenous species which are typical of the coastal area"</i> 	Accept in part
S11.3	Oppose Option 1 / Support Option 2 or 3 with conditions	Reject Option 1; approve Option 2 or 3 subject to incorporation of dune protection measures as described in S11.1 and S11.2.	Supports rezoning under Option 2 (retirement village) or Option 3 only if dune protection is incorporated. Does not support Option 1.	Accept in part
S14.1	Oppose	That Council does not approve the Proposed Plan Change.	The intensification of the buildings that will be of 10m in height present a significant visual impact on both the adjacent properties and the public spaces.	Reject
S15.3	Oppose	Defer any rezoning of the Site until a comprehensive landscape, visual, ecological and cultural impact framework has been adopted by Council and a robust Structure Plan prepared with effective buffers, ecological offsets and stormwater treatment.	<p>(a) The landscape assessment acknowledges that rezoning from Rural Lifestyle to suburban residential incurs at least a Low–Moderate adverse effect on rural character. The assessment provided did not access or seek to access the affected properties when undertaking its assessment shelter belts identified are deciduous old and some may be removed.</p> <p>(b) The impact on site 8 27a Ratanui Road is incomplete, the well mature tree mentioned in the landscape and visual assessment are predominantly deciduous in nature, old and planned for removal.</p> <p>(c) The proposed 2–3-storey walls and roof-heights up to 10 m will loom over remaining lifestyle blocks.</p>	Reject

			(d) The small vegetated buffer strips proposed along some of the edges cannot fully mitigate the sense of enclosure and loss of openness valued by adjoining residents. The proposal should be amended to require a landscaped and planted buffer along the entire perimeter of the site.	
S15.6	Seek amendment	Alternatively, if the plan is adopted amendments are made to ensure adequate screening on all boundaries.	Please see the reasons summarised under submission points S15.1-S15.3 above.	Accept in part
S18.2	Not specifically stated Submitter 'does not have any issues with the change in zone'	That the development be made better by completing landscaping to keep the rural appearance at the entrance of the retirement village.	To keep the rural appearance at the entrance of the retirement village.	Accept in part
Ecology – Section 9.12 of s42A report				
S8.1	Oppose	Retain the current Rural Lifestyle zoning to preserve the character, environmental values, and infrastructure capacity of the area.	(d) The land around the submitter's property — and particularly the areas near numbers 65 and 73 — includes established mature trees that are home to a wide range of native birds, including kererū, tūī, ruru (morepork), quail, and fantails. These birds are an everyday part of life for their children, and their habitats are at risk of being lost or irreparably damaged by large-scale earthworks and construction.	Accept in part
S12.3	Seek amendment	Amend DEV3-P1(c)(c)(iii) as follows: “offset areas are established and managed to ensure <u>at least a net gain in indigenous biodiversity outcomes</u> positive environmental gain ”	consistency with Policy FW.3 of the RPS. To align biodiversity offsetting terminology with the RPS and ensure consistency with Policy 24A of RPS Change 1.	Accept
S12.6	Seek amendment	Amend DEV3-P2(4)(c)(iii) as follows: “offset areas are established and managed to ensure <u>at least a net gain in indigenous biodiversity outcomes</u> positive environmental gain ”	consistency with Policy FW.3 of the RPS. To align biodiversity offsetting terminology with the RPS and ensure consistency with Policy 24A of RPS Change 1.	Accept
Construction effects – Section 9.13 of s42A report				
S2.3	Oppose / Noted	Make any development rights that are pursuant to the proposed plan change contingent on such development respecting the environmental, property and safety rights on neighbouring properties, to strongly incentivise compliance with these duties which has been sorely lacking.	Previous experience with these properties involved construction badly affecting neighbouring properties with impunity as the council was powerless or unmotivated to prevent construction from having serious environmental and health effects on neighbouring properties. The private plan change is to clearly stipulate the responsibility of the owner to prevent any such harms happening to neighbours, and make development rights contingent on this.	Reject
S6.1	Support in principle (pending resolution of the outlined issues)	Support in principles, subject to resolution of issues. In summary, the key issues and questions include: (a) Will the rezoning allow residential distance	Concerns and questions regarding the Assessment of Environmental Effects include:	Accept in part

		<p>from the boundary of 81 Ratanui Road.</p> <p>(b) Fencing and retaining wall requirements to ensure 81 Ratanui Road is not adversely affected.</p> <p>(c) Will the footpath on the eastern side of Ratanui Road be extended and will kerb and channel be installed ad current runoff from Ratanui Road causes flooding and ingress of rubbish onto 81 Ratanui Road.</p> <p>(d) What are the authorised days and hours of construction activities, what are the acceptable noise levels, and what is the process if noise levels are breached.</p> <p>(e) Given that 80% of the submitter's boundary will be affected by the development, how was the rating of Low applied with respect to adverse effects? What does 'Low' mean, and how could this be changed?</p> <p>(f) Would the private plan change void the requirement to comply with the minimum 10,000m² lot size for subdivision?</p> <p>(g) Will there be any multi storey dwellings or facilities constructed adjacent to 81 Ratanui Road.</p> <p>(h) Seek confirmation that no trees or plantings within the boundary of 81 Ratanui Road will be damaged during earthworks and construction (including roots), and confirming what the remediation/reparation process is if damage occurs.</p> <p>(i) See confirmation that earthworks will not undermine existing boundary fences.</p> <p>(j) The submitter will not accept any insurance liability for damage to facilities or dwellings built near the existing trees.</p> <p>(k) Seek confirmation that the removal of large pine and gum trees adjacent to the southern boundary of the submitter's property will not cause damage to the fencing, driveway and newly planted trees.</p> <p>(l) What protection from water runoff or drainage will be put in place to protect 81 Ratanui Road?</p> <p>(m) More detail is requested on the intent to use alternative fencing to wooden batten construction and planting to aid visual sightings</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		and the boundary.		
S6.2	Support in principle (pending resolution of the outlined issues)	Support in principles, subject to resolution of issues. In summary, the key issues and questions include: (a) The grey water system exceeds the boundary of 81 Ratanui Road by 2 metres in this area. It is marked but the submitter would like to be assured it will not be damaged during any construction. If this system requires remediation to be within the boundary of 81 Ratanui, it is the submitter's expectation is this will be done by Welhom Ltd or the current owner of 65/73 Ratanui Road.	This is a cost imposed by the approval of the previous subdivision rather than a decision by the owners of 81 Ratanui Road, and states that this requirement should have been declared to Summerset during the sale of 73 Ratanui Road.	Accept in part
S6.4	Support in principle (pending resolution of the outlined issues)	Support in principles, subject to resolution of issues. In summary, the key issue is pre-construction consultation with adjacent property owners' requirements.	There is a lack of clarity around the consultation processes, boundary setbacks, fencing and retaining wall requirements, extending the footpath on the western side of Ratanui Road, installation of kerb and channel on the road to address flooding, hours and days of construction activity, noise levels and the process for when noise levels or hours worked are breached. impact of earthworks on the submitter's property.	Accept in part
S10.2	Seek amendment	Regardless of the timeframe for any potential zoning changes to their property, that the Council extends the sewage network and water intake to the submitter's boundary from the proposed development.	To enable future public service connections to adjacent properties such as the submitter's property.	Accept in part
S10.3	Seek amendment	(a) Ensure that the developer takes all possible precautions to reduce the dust flow during construction, including the erection of temporary barriers during the earthworks and construction processes. (b) Should the submitter consider the dust flow to be excessive, the developer be required to fund the washing of the submitter's windows on a regular basis during the period of the earthworks and construction and the washing of the submitter's entire house at the completion of the earthworks. (c) Ensure that an appropriate hedge, earth bund or fence is put in place to lessen the impact of noise, sand and dust during the earthworks and construction phases. (d) Require the developer to fund rabbit control/eradication on the submitter's and the applicant's property prior to and during and following the earthworks and construction processes.	(a) The submitter's property lies in the direction of the prevailing wind of the proposed development. That the Council ensures that the developer takes all possible precautions to reduce the dust flow, including the erection of temporary barriers during the earthworks and construction processes. That the Council ensures that an appropriate hedge, earth bund or fence is put in place to lessen the impact of noise, sand and dust during the earthworks and construction phases. (b) The trees on the boundary with the submitter's property belong to 65 Ratanui Road, have never been cared for and have been allowed to grow in an uncontrolled manner and have posed a danger to the submitter for many years. The removal of the trees has potential to affect the aforementioned ponding issue, which the submitter expects Council to ensure is prevented. (c) Rabbits are a huge problem on the submitter's property and their volumes are expected to increase due to the displacement of rabbits from the property of the proposed development. The submitter is open to Summerset funding elimination by shooting or chemical means on the submitter's property for the duration of the development and request that this continues for an agreed period of time post-construction.	Accept in part

		(e) That the Council ensures that trees which sit on the boundary with 65 Ratanui Road are removed early in the development process without any short term or long risk to the submitter's property as a result.		
S16.2	Seek amendment	<p>That the following conditions to prevent pneumatic piling are applied:</p> <p>(a) No pneumatic piling is to be allowed, only bored piling, to limit damage to adjoining properties.</p> <p>(b) Windblown sand from stripping and the proposed 55,000 cubic metres cut and fill operations be effectively controlled and any related conditions rigorously enforced.</p> <p>(c) Suitable screening planting is required to all boundaries with adjoining properties.</p> <p>(d) Road and other hard surfaces are constructed of permeable materials.</p> <p>(e) Suitable filtering systems are employed to contain road contaminants from entering the open drainage system.</p> <p>(f) Consideration should be given to design for climate and site and long-term sustainability.</p>	Contaminated road drainage is presumed to go direct to the open drain.	Accept in part
FS2	Support		<p><i>Original submission S16 describes the potential effects of additional stormwater on properties through which the Mazengarb Stream passes. In particular, the properties at 16, 18 and 20 Otaihanga Road.</i></p> <p><i>I live at 20 Otaihanga Road. I strongly endorse and support all the points made in the original submission.</i></p>	Accept in part
Planning and General – Section 9 14 of s42A report				
S1.1	Oppose	Decline the proposed private plan change request.	<p>(a) Almost no one in the surrounding area would support a village being built.</p> <p>(a) The desires of the people in the immediate impacted area are the only relevant factor. The Council should listen to the views of those people whose properties are in the area and should prioritise those voices over the corporation that has bought the land.</p>	Reject
S1.1	Oppose	Decline the proposed private plan change request.	Kapiti has enough retirement villages already and it will soon lose what little remains of the sleepy semi urban/rural charm it once had.	Reject
S2.1	Oppose / Seek amendment	Extend the proposed plan change to cover the entire end of Ratanui Road, instead of allowing piecemeal rezoning and leaving neighbouring properties adrift with the expanded harms of urban development and limited development rights of	<p>(a) The loss of rural character of the area, and that neighbouring properties will retain their rural zoning which prevents them from attaining any of the benefits of this change such as the ability to develop their own properties.</p> <p>(b) Future property buyers may be misled by the rural zoning, as most</p>	Reject

		rural zoning.	nearby properties are lifestyle blocks that people purchase seeking a rural area, and the prospect of massive future nearby development is something these people deserve to be aware of. This is especially true in light of the nearby large-scale 'Mansell Development' that was also approved under a fast-tracked private plan change, despite local opposition and even circumventing the Council's authority.	
S2.2	Oppose / Seek amendment	That the Council explicitly affirm and guarantee to protect the existing user rights of neighbouring rural properties, including but not limited to those described in the submission. See submission for details.	<p>There are several existing rural activities and uses on their property that they seek the Council to explicitly note and protect these from the neighbouring urban development. The specific uses and activities (in summary) relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Noise and odour from the keeping of livestock, poultry and other animals which new neighbours should not have the right to object to. (b) Keeping animals safe from neighbouring animals, people, vehicles and other hazards. (c) The use of loud outdoor equipment to maintain the property. (d) Pest control, including shooting rabbits and possums in order to maintain the property and keep the submitter's animals safe. The ability to continue this activity without neighbours objecting may be constrained. (e) The ongoing storage of silage and other materials that may create unpleasant smells or pose fire risk. (f) The many large trees on the property boundary may be loaded/drowned by the development raising the level of the land, leaving the submitter's property as the lowest point. The submitter accepts no insurance liability or responsibility if structures and fences built within reach of these trees. 	Accept in part
S4.1	Oppose	Decline the application in all aspects	A clear RMA policy conflict with the plan change.	Reject
S6.1	Support in principle (pending resolution of the outlined issues)	<p>Support in principles, subject to resolution of issues. In summary, the key issues and questions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Will the rezoning allow residential distance from the boundary of 81 Ratanui Road. (b) Would the private plan change void the requirement to comply with the minimum 10,000m² lot size for subdivision? (c) Will there be any multi storey dwellings or facilities constructed adjacent to 81 Ratanui Road. 	The plan change request has a significant optimism bias towards achieving its desired KCDC decision. Many issues are minimised or presented in a manner that negates their potential impact and importance.	Accept in part
S6.2	Support in principle (pending resolution of the outlined issues)	<p>Support in principles, subject to resolution of issues. In summary, the key issues and questions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The grey water system exceeds the boundary of 81 Ratanui Road by 2 metres in this area. It 	Existing user rights should apply to this requirement.	Accept in part

		is marked but the submitter would like to be assured it will not be damaged during any construction. If this system requires remediation to be within the boundary of 81 Ratanui, it is the submitter's expectation is this will be done by Welhom Ltd or the current owner of 65/73 Ratanui Road.		
S6.3	Support in principle (pending resolution of the outlined issues)	<p>Support in principles, subject to resolution of issues.</p> <p>In summary, the key issues and questions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Current storm water drainage from 81 Ratanui Road drains into the pond on the southern boundary with 73 Ratanui Road, which then drains into the pond on 81 Ratanui Road, then via a pipe from the NW corner of 81 across the paddock to the open drain on 73 Ratanui Road. Indications are that the pond on our southern boundary will be filled in for dwellings which adversely affects our storm water. (b) What solutions can be found for maintaining current storm water drainage? (c) We believe existing user rights apply to the current storm water disposal system. (d) Did the current owner of 65-73 Ratanui declare this as an existing arrangement? It is not mentioned in the Plan Change request. 	<p>(a) Assurance that the existing use rights for rural land activities at 81 Ratanui Road would be preserved, in particular the continuance of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The use of the land and operating equipment (ride on mowers, chainsaws, weed eaters, log splitters, wood chippers, stump grinders and other petrol driven tools); (ii) Burning green waste (as per Council's fire guidelines). <p>(b) Would noise restrictions of the zoning change would affect their ability to carry out these rural activities.</p>	Accept in part
S6.4	Support in principle (pending resolution of the outlined issues)	<p>Support in principles, subject to resolution of issues.</p> <p>In summary, the key issue is pre-construction consultation with adjacent property owners' requirements.</p>	Does the proposed plan change effectively void earlier subdivision conditions for 65 Ratanui Road, requiring an average lot size of 10,000m ² , and has any formal waiver been granted.	Accept in part
S10.1	Support in principle / oppose	Consider this application only in context of a fuller review of the immediate neighbourhood and not in isolation.	<p>(a) The application is supported in principle but opposes the manner in which it is being allowed to progress. Not enough consideration, analysis or planning has been undertaken to examine the effects on the neighbouring district as a whole or on us as a bordering neighbour.</p> <p>(b) The submitter met with Council staff in May 2025 for a pre-application planning meeting where they were told that an application for subdivision of their property would be refused due to the loss of the rural land resource. Why is this application by Welholm that relates to a bordering property get a different response than they did less than three months prior? Why is the loss of a greater sized area deemed to be an acceptable loss of a rural resource than their smaller section?</p>	Accept in part

S12.7	Not stated	Not specifically stated.	Greater Wellington appreciates the efforts to ensure that future development of the site prioritises the use of nature-based solutions to provide for climate change mitigation, adaptation, and resilience. The proposed provisions require the construction of onsite inland wetlands to provide flood storage capability for events up to a 1% AEP event and ensure a net-positive environmental gain. Greater Wellington considers the intent of those provisions is consistent with Policy CC.4, Policy CC.14, Policy 40A, Policy 40B, Policy 41, and Policy 42 of the RPS and Policy 24A of RPS Change 1.	Accept in part
S12.8	Not stated	Not specifically stated.	Greater Wellington notes the efforts to give effect to the Te Mana o te Wai hierarchy of obligations through the proposed provisions. The proposed provisions set out that the primary function of offset areas will be to create natural inland wetlands and the secondary function will be to provide flood storage and stormwater treatment functions. Greater Wellington considers the intent of those provisions is consistent with Policy FW.3 of the RPS.	Accept in part
S14.1	Oppose	That Council does not approve the Proposed Plan Change.	The submitter disagrees with all of the reasons presented in the plan change request for the rezoning.	Reject
S14.1	Oppose	That Council does not approve the Proposed Plan Change.	There is significant potential for reverse sensitivity issues for the adjoining properties that will remain as RLZ in adjoining a GRZ. These properties have been purchased adjoining RLZ and while eventual development should be expected the isolated nature of this plan change by a private applicant does not suitably address the potential for these effects.	Reject
S15.1	Oppose	Decline the plan change or if not declined in full, retain the existing Rural Lifestyle zoning on 65 & 73 Ratanui Road.	<p>Loss of Rural Resource</p> <p>(a) While the NPS-HPL may not technically apply to Rural Lifestyle zoned land, the Site nevertheless comprises 12.65 ha of free-draining dunes that—if rezoned—can never again contribute to even low-intensity grazing, carbon sequestration, or local food security.</p> <p>Legal and Policy Inconsistencies</p> <p>(a) Part 2 RMA, Section 6(a) (protecting natural character of wetlands and streams) and Section 7(c) (maintenance of amenity values) are not “provided for” because wetland loss, stream modification, and amenity degradation are inevitable.</p> <p>(b) NPS-UD Policy 8 requires the Council to be responsive to out-of-sequence rezoning only “even if” beneficial, but only where unconstrained by other matters. Here infrastructure and ecological constraints militate against it.</p> <p>(c) Regional Policy Statement - PC 1 UD Policy 55(c)4 requires that additional greenfields demonstrate necessity and be sequenced. It is neither after higher priority areas, nor justified by lack of brownfield options.</p>	Reject

S15.7	Seek amendment	Require a covenant on the site preventing occupants or owners of the site from complaining or taking action about activity in the surrounding zone that are natural aspects of living in a rural lifestyle zone.	Please see the reasons summarised under submission points S15.1-S15.3 above.	Accept in part
S17.2	Oppose	Not to grant the 65-73 Ratanui Road Welhom-development Ltd. Plan (sic).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The current development of houses are only very dense housing which does not help with the spirit and infrastructure of the Kapiti Coast. (b) Houses are too close to each other plus Ratanui Road is unable to cope with the influx of the 100s of cars. (c) The electricity, water, waste and general services of council and government alike. Make sure these things are organised before granting more dense housing and lower rates as there are many houses empty (some on purpose due to investment) 	Reject