


For office use only
Further Submission No: S054.FS.1


To : **Kapiti Coast District Council**

Name of person making further submission: **Malu Jonas**

This is a further submission in support of **My original Submission S054.01, S054.05, S054.08** on the proposed PC2. **This is largely OPPOSING PC2, or requesting significant amendments.**

I have read the summaries of all the submitters regarding PC2, and find there are a number of whom whose submissions also refer to my concerns. I will make references to *some* of these other submissions in each of the sections below.

It will be clear where I **SUPPORT** or **OPPOSE** other submissions below.

I also submit further evidence in the Link below that there are **Health and Safety concerns regarding any intensification of housing in Waikanae East** backed up by FENZ concerns, and a lack of a local emergency plan having been analysed and tabled for Waikanae East <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/479317/minister-says-fenz-work-to-complete-local-risk-assessment-plans-very-slow>

Regarding S054.01

1.

Existing Unsafe Traffic Congestion and bottle necks in Waikanae East make further housing intensification unsafe until school zoning has been changed / improved

The unsafe traffic conditions (particularly if there were to be a fire or medical emergency during the frequent high congestion times) are caused by Waikanae School being zoned to cater for Waikanae Beach students too, and only one entry/exit point existing, which is frequently blocked by frequent road closures at the railway crossing.

- **SUPPORT S118.01** who also refers to Waikanae schools already being full and the need for KCDC to *actively lobby the Ministry of Education for an extra school in Waikanae*

- **SUPPORT S215.01** who is also concerned about traffic congestion up to 200m away from Waikanae School in Waikanae East.
- I would add that **Utauta St, Hira St, and the southern half of Seddon St, Winara Ave, and Elizabeth St are even more congested** than Te Maku Grove. This does not just apply to parking. It applies to any traffic movement at all during ‘busy’ times.
- **Seddon St and Winara Ave are also the two main routes northward** further along Waikanae East. Development is already occurring in the northern areas of Waikanae East. The main routes there are fed exclusively by Winara Ave and Seddon St before Huia St starts.
- **Elizabeth St** is our *only biking or driving* entrance to all of Waikanae East from the Kapiti Coast. It is highly congested frequently due to being blocked by frequent trains to Waikanae Station.
- **My original submission suggested various possible solutions for this**
- **SUPPORT S112.01 and S112.02 Ministry of Education** (which is also clearly concerned about the lack of *social infrastructure* and *adequate educational facilities* needed to cater for large increases in population.

2.

Waikanae North is a better area to re-zone for increased intensification first, to help reduce existing infrastructure pressures

- **SUPPORT S012.01, S024.01, S043.01, S068.01, S068.02, S142.01** who are all **Waikanae North** landowners, who are keen

for their land to be **Re-zoned to allow for greater intensification** (including the building of a 3rd primary school for Waikanae).

I strongly **SUPPORT the re-zoning of Waikanae North first**

A. to allow for much greater housing intensification, well planned

B. the building of another primary school to cater for Waikanae Beach and Waikanae North students and **thus reducing emissions of some Waikanae parents**

C. make Waikanae East safer, and more able to cope with possible intensification in the future (after the 3rd school is built)

D. reduce emissions further due to excellent bike lane connectivity between Waikanae North and Waikanae Central/ Railway Station

E. when the railway line is further electrified to Otaki, an extra station could be built at Waikanae North/Pekapeka with an overbridge across the road to facilitate access

F. this land is sand/peat based. It is not high class agricultural soil.

.....

3.

Due to the lack of adequate existing East-West infrastructure that crosses the Main Trunk Line, emergency services will already likely encounter life-threatening congestion in the southern half of Waikanae East often.

- The extensive retirement complex Winara Village has its main entrance just south of Waikanae School on Winara Ave. If there were a major fire in its residential and hospital wings at the ‘wrong’ time, a major loss of life could occur.

- Elizabeth St and the entrances to Elizabeth St from *every* direction involve backed up traffic **many times a day**. It would be impossible for emergency vehicles to get through in current conditions at the ‘wrong time’, even before major intensification.
- **SUPPORT S089** by FENZ, which has already submitted many Amendments and Additions based on existing and potential concerns, although these are as yet non-specific to Waikanae East. I refer to the following points/wording of FENZ’s submission in particular:
 - **S089.01** *“where these can be sufficiently serviced”*
MDRS&NPS-UD DO-03
 - **S089.02** *“provides for the safety of people and communities”*
MDRS&NPS-UD DO-0x1
 - **S089.03** *“can be sustained within, and make efficient use of public services and infrastructure”*
MDRS&NPS-UD UFD-P1
 - **S089.17** *“Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure”*
MDRS&NPS-UD MCZ
 - **S089.45** *“Legal and physical access to a legal road”*
SUB-RES-R25

Furthermore, I support FENZ’s suggested additions and amendments in S089.16, S089.20, S089.21, S089.43, S089.46, S089.48, S089.50

.....

4.

OPPOSE S047.01 and S087.01 who show no understanding or concern for the local existing health and safety conditions in Waikanae East.

Both these submissions assume that because roads exist in Waikanae East that they are usable at all times and able to accommodate considerable population increase.

They are right, that their land could offer great opportunities for new housing development, but this should only occur *after* the East-West connectivity issues between Waikanae East and the rest of the Kapiti Coast have been vastly improved.

I suggest that the re-zoning of S047.01 and S087.01 be delayed until after Waikanae North has been re-zoned and developed, and a new school built in Waikanae North.

.....

5.

Policy Input from primary carers of primary-school-age and pre-school children.....

I have a further point to make regarding parental travel to and from Waikanae School in private vehicles, over the railway line to the rest of Kapiti Coast.

The connectivity issues in Waikanae East that will make further intensification untenable / even more unsafe *are not singular* to Waikanae East, although I believe the geographical layout of the Kapiti Coast exacerbates them on that side of Waikanae. All local schools

experience a measure of traffic congestion before and after school, that is not in question.

It appears that the majority of councillors and staff who have suggested PC2:

1. No longer take their children to and from after-school activities, or have never done so
2. Are not involved in the daily routines of having 2 or more children aged under 14 in a suburban environment
3. Live in a village environment where 'all' their social and educational activities are within walking distance
4. Do not need to transport their own groceries on a regular basis from a supermarket while having children in tow

I sound facetious. I do not mean to be. You do realise, that many of the cars that congest Elizabeth St, all its entrances, and all the streets listed above near Waikanae School, are involved in '**multiple tasks**' ?

The parents and grandparents, maybe older siblings, other relatives or nannies too, are often collecting their child/ren from Waikanae School and the two pre-schools in Waikanae East, before heading straight to the following:

- various sports practices
- music/dance/language lessons
- medical or dental appointments
- haircuts
- buying necessary clothing etc
- a petrol station or charging station
- the supermarket
- the beach

- other care arrangements
- maybe a parent's work etc on the other side of the railway tracks
?

They are not necessarily just 'going home'. The person coming to pick up the young children from Waikanae East could:

- * have come straight from work
- * be bringing children to grandparents/carers so that they can go straight back to work
- * just be trying to provide a varied educational life for their children
- * **be fulfilling 4-5 different tasks in that one journey with multiple stops**
- * be including buying a week's groceries for the family

Try all that with a few preschoolers in tow, in the limited time available before dinner time, on current public transport(I challenge you).

Multi-modal public transport still has to 'work' for those with:

- * multiple children
- * pre-schoolers
- * disabled children
- * appointments going in different directions to time-specific events such as classes, practices, rehearsals, performances
- * a need for in-person social connectivity
- * little family support (eg. Some sole parents)

Most of the residents in Waikanae East are currently not commuting to Wellington regularly. They have much greater need for efficient and safe East-West connectivity.

The transport connectivity needs for families with school age children (unless one lives within Paekakariki where many activities are ‘within the village’) are not a ‘one size fits all’ situation.

Even a weekly grocery shop involves many kgs of food/goods. Drones are not yet delivering weekly supplies, and ‘ordering online’ still requires someone to deliver it via the single road.

.....

Regarding S054.03

6.

My original submission **S054.01** suggests many possible solutions eg. **overbridges, an overpass, an underpass, gondolas.** Any of these would make Waikanae East more accessible to current (as well as future) populations.

It is clear that many other submissions also share my concerns that critical infrastructure needs to be developed in general before intensification proceeds on the Kapiti Coast.

I suggest the following Amendment:

That Infrastructure be made a Qualifying Matter, as has been the case in Johnsonville and Auckland.

S161.30 and S210.16 also have submitted that Infrastructure be made a Qualifying Matter.

- **I SUPPORT** emphasis on DO-03:
 1. Urban areas which *maximise the efficient use of energy and infrastructure*

- **I SUPPORT S100.02 Te Atiawa ki Whakarongotai and S210.03 A.R.T.:**
 - *“it is critical that the provision of infrastructure is proactively managed to support development in conjunction with or in advance of housing development”*
 - *“ there is insufficient evidence to support the statement that there is adequate infrastructure or that Kapiti will need the level of intensification proposed”*

- **I SUPPORT S161.04, S161.12, S161.20, S161.21, S161.25**

Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngati Toa Rangatira regarding their concerns that infrastructure issues are not being adequately addressed in PC2.

- **I SUPPORT S170.01, S170.02 Kapiti Cycling Action** who emphasize:
 - The need for modern day safe cycling facilities

- The need to explicitly provide them *ahead* of when the development occurs
 - The need for E-bike lock-up facilities
 - **I SUPPORT S016.09** who emphasizes the need for micro-mobility device / cycle parking infrastructure
-
- **I SUPPORT S180.03** regarding the need to develop a detailed Plan (including Infrastructure needs) *before* intensification begins
-
- **I SUPPORT S217.01** who expresses concerns that our infrastructure will *not* be able to cope with a 6-fold increase in population
-
- **I SUPPORT S203.38 Nga Hapu o Otaki** who state that *too much growth without adequate provision for transport and infrastructure is irresponsible, and a neglectful of their taonga*
 - **S203.07**
 - In **S203.06**, they note that *the proposed intensification in PC2 goes far beyond what is required*
 - Furthermore, in **S203.09**, they state that *“provision of infrastructure is not guaranteed in the District Plan nor is it in the power of the Council to ensure it is created in time”*
-
- In **S203.11**, **Nga Hapu o Otaki** point out that intensification is meant to be occurring *“particularly where these are well connected to transport, infrastructure, commercial activities and community services”*. I submit that Waikanae East is *not* well connected to any of these things.

- In **S203.14**, they state *“it doesn’t make sense to put additional stress on this already ‘not well planned’ area”*. This equally applies to Waikanae East.
-

7.

Need for Planned Approach rather than Piecemeal Development scattered throughout existing residential areas

SUPPORT in part

- What is proposed by PC2 prioritises cheaper more plentiful housing and increased use of a north-south railway line. Great ! Great that is, if you are fit, mobile, childless, and work in Wellington or along the main trunk line corridor.

SUPPORT in part

- PC2 is trying to promote more active modes of transport (although lack of overbridges, gondolas, charging stations, bike-lockup areas, and connectivity of bike lanes make this questionable in practice at this stage)

Many of the submitters below have made good suggestions or expressed deep concerns about what has been suggested in PC2, even whilst recognizing the need for more, and more affordable, housing.

- **I SUPPORT S039.02** who suggests that intensive development **should radiate out gradually from town centres and along**

main arterial routes (*infrastructure allowing*) rather than occurring piecemeal dotted throughout the suburbs. Then, as further needs for more housing occur, there should be planned areas of development that are compact rather than scattered indiscriminately.

- **I SUPPORT S135.01** who supports limiting intensification of housing in existing residential areas *unless the developer can prove there will be no negative impacts on surrounding buildings*
- **SUPPORT S154.01, S137.01, S150, S151, S154, S185.02 , S185.04, S117 in part** who want 3 storey buildings to only occur in newly developed areas, because of negative effects on existing residential buildings
- **I SUPPORT S149** who states there are many sites for development which do NOT impact negatively on existing dwellings. **It seems absolutely logical that these sites be used for high-rise buildings first.**

.....

8.

Extra Re-Zoning suggested to Accommodate more Housing in new Areas or areas not yet suggested by PC2

PC2 has not looked at the provision of current safe cycle ways carefully enough to recommend logical re-zoning / greater intensification.

There are a number of submissions to PC2 that have been made to increase density of housing, **in areas that will not adversely affect their neighbouring properties so much as in areas where the sections are already smaller.**

I ask KCDC look at some of these requests (below) to re-zone properties that already have good cycleway access, to facilitate active modes of transport.

I SUPPORT S183 , S184 , S142 , S091 , S093 , S157 , S189 , S043 , S013, S205, S206.01, S206.03, S208.01, S216, S023.01, S023.02 who all can see that their properties are better suited to development, due to already being well connected with cycle lanes etc.

.....

9.

Lack of Reliable, Regular, Rapid Train Services to and from the Kapiti Coast makes ‘rapid transit’ an inappropriate term for our district, making the proposed intensification zones in PC2 farcical

- **Any regularly scheduled train journey under 45 minutes in duration (eg. Pukerua Bay-Wellington) in the Wellington region is ‘rapid’.** I am astounded that the Johnsonville area has somehow been deemed inappropriate for major intensification, yet the Kapiti Coast, so much further away from Wellington CBD, with an unreliable rail service is grappling with PC2.

- **The Kapiti Coast does not yet have a reliable railway track between Pukerua Bay and Paekakariki in particular.**
- **I have lived on the Kapiti Coast for over 30 years. Every year, there is an ‘excuse’ as to why the trains are cancelled, delayed, replaced, over and over again, north of Plimmerton.** There are countless times where I have been transferred to lumbering buses at Plimmerton, for the final half of the train journey to the Kapiti Coast.
- **It takes well over an hour to get to Wellington from Waikanae by train (on a good day !), not counting multi-modal journeys to and from the railway station at either end. Nothing rapid about that.**
- Other submitters are also concerned about this.
- **I SUPPORT S217.01** who states our public transport via rail is so often closed by slips, maintenance issues, heat etc, that it *cannot be described as ‘rapid’ nor reliable* to cater for the current population, let alone the projected population
- **I SUPPORT S192.01** who expresses doubt that Waikanae can even be classified as a ‘rapid transit stop’, due to the excessive time it takes to reach Wellington CBD by train from Waikanae. Personally, I know that the majority of delays are caused by rail infrastructure issues south of Paekakariki, so I think this applies to the whole Kapiti Coast, but of course it applies more, the further north one is, from Wellington.

.....

10.

I **OPPOSE** the major (over)intensification proposed by S122, and S028.

Neither of these submitters show any understanding for the local infrastructure limitations in Waikanae East, nor do they show any consideration for the likely negative environmental effects and mental health effects of cramming many people together as closely as possible.

This also applies to other areas of the Kapiti Coast. We are not Surfers Paradise, The Mount, or Cancun. We do not need to be that urban, to house our people better.

- **I understand Kainga Ora S122 wants to cater for as many people as possible, but they are pushing that agenda too far**
- **The *hauora* (well-being) of the many people they wish to house will be negatively affected by too many people being crammed close together.**
- **S028 Infill Tapui Ltd. are a bunch of people who wish to gain financially hugely from developing their central Paraparaumu and Otaki land ‘to the max’ with little regard for the citizens who already reside (or will reside) there. That is their sole motivation. They don’t care for the well-being (*hauora*) of the inhabitants. They just want to maximise their profits.**

.....

11.

Mental Health concerns from proposed over-Intensification in S028 and S122 as well as some aspects of PC2

- The *mental health* of people in highly urbanised areas is not enhanced by losing contact with nature. The Kapiti Coast is not a highly urbanised area, nor does it need to be in most of its jurisdiction, to the extent proposed by PC2, and especially not proposed by S122, S028.
- The *mental health* of people will deteriorate in housing such as that proposed by S122 and S028. **In the case of S122 Kainga Ora, I am shocked that they seem to have so little understanding for the mental health, cultural and spiritual needs of their vulnerable people.**
- Considering that many of Kainga Ora's clients are tangata whenua, **I would think it is even more imperative, that the mental health needs of the most vulnerable are better catered for.**
- There are several submitters who have expressed concerns about the negative impacts on mental health of existing and future citizens of the Kapiti Coast, if PC2 continues without better thoughtful planning.
- These include many groups representing **Tangata Whenua S100, S161, S203, S210** (see 10. below), whose concerns and amendments I **SUPPORT**.

- **The mental health of homeless and badly housed people is very important, as is the mental health of people currently living on the Kapiti Coast.** Neither group should take precedence. **ALL** people need access to housing, services, social connections, and places to spiritually replenish.
- I also **SUPPORT S212.01** in her concerns about the negative impacts on mental health by the removal of existing trees and I **SUPPORT S016.13** in his requests that landscaping and trees are valued more in PC2, including a 6m backyard set-back
- I **SUPPORT S135.01** and **S185.03** in their concerns about *negative mental health effects on existing residents who lose all their sun and /or privacy* by piecemeal high rise construction on neighbouring properties
- I **SUPPORT S071.01** as she clearly outlines the benefits she is providing several people she supports, by having a calming peaceful, natural environment surrounding her property. I could say the same about my own property, and the people I support there.
- We do not need to ruin all that the Kapiti Coast stands for, with such Cookie-Cutter **highly urban proposals as S028 and S122, which I vehemently **OPPOSE**.**
- The planting of little grasses here and there or the occasional flax bush is not adequate to enhance people's mental health. **We will see negative impacts in our mental health statistics, by**

removing the well recognized holistic benefits of natural environments on people's wellbeing.

- I **OPPOSE** S153.04 which is trying to get rid of the requirement to have even small amounts of vegetation near newly built high rise buildings ! I **OPPOSE** their amendment regarding **SUB-DW-Rx1**
- **PC2** treats vegetation as a mere down-graded 'amenity value', showing no cultural or health understanding for the need for nature near people's homes.
- It seems absolute tunnel-vision madness, to prioritise housing to such an extent, as to get rid of the very environmental qualities that enhance wellbeing (eg. Proximity to mature trees, mixed vegetation, view shafts to hills, sunlight) in the process.

.....

12.

Specific Environmental Concerns of Tangata

Whenua in response to major intensification proposed in PC2

- I **SUPPORT** S161.06 Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngati Toa Rangatira, in their unequivocal statement that in Te Ao Maori, *environmental values are cultural values, and other cultural values are meaningless without Environmental Wellbeing.* S161.13, S161.22, S161.23, A161.24, S161.26, S161.30 all refer to the importance of safeguarding cultural/environmental qualities.

- **I SUPPORT other tangata whenua** submitters eg. **S100, S203, S210.11, S210.13** who also voice similar concerns.
- **S203.10 in particular, Nga Hapu o Otaki,** are concerned that PC2 *removes their ability to be kaitiaki of their taonga*
- **I SUPPORT S198.01** who also expresses concerns that the proposed PC2 development is too intense, and trampling over rights of mana whenua
- It is particularly concerning that **tangata whenua are already a group who are badly represented in housing, health and mental health statistics. Not recognizing their cultural and mental health needs by cramming them into crowded urbanized environments is highly unlikely to improve their mental health outcomes.**
- Many people (including tangata whenua) need to rest their eyes on much greenery in hills, nearby foliage and trees, or over water, **to restore spiritual and mental equilibrium. These are cultural values as well as spiritual and health values. I am shocked at the KCDC's lack of holistic understanding of Wellbeing, by proposing such narrow-minded focus in PC2.**

.....

13.

Tiny Homes and other more creative housing solutions

Many submitters have written in support of provisions for Papa Kainga. I have no issue with Papa Kainga at all.

My submission in this Further Submission pertains to Tiny Houses.

I see no mention of these in PC2 as viable additions to our housing stock. They should be ! **Other submitters also wish to see a greater encouragement and support of Tiny Homes as valid affordable housing solutions.**

I am saddened and shocked that KCDC seems to be just opting for a highly urbanized approach, when there are other possible solutions that can be added.

I SUPPORT S016.18, S009.03, S011.03 in their emphasis on Tiny Homes as part of our housing crisis solution.

.....

Regarding S054.04

14.

Marae Takiwi

I SUPPORT S210.07 A.R.T's submission wanting more robust protection and further reaching parameters for Marae Takiwi specifications.

.....

Regarding S054.05

15.

Provision of Community Gardens, Local Food Resilience

I SUPPORT S016.08 who is also concerned that KCDC is not prioritizing sustainable and resilient local food resilience enough.

This is an area I feel most strongly about. We need to safeguard our local productive food growing resources, including:

- mature food producing trees on private property
- food producing trees on public/shared property
- resourcing local food growing initiatives that serve the community at lower cost, and lower transport cost

These are initiatives that lower fuel emissions from transporting food from further afar !

Some food producing trees take many (or at least some) to bear large quantities of food. These trees are local taonga, and need to be protected in a future-focused more resilient community.

We need to prioritise local food production resources.

This means:

- Protecting their sources of sunlight and water
- Feeding their soils

- valuing highly productive soil by not covering it with concrete or asphalt

There is no point providing cheaper housing if we are destroying our local food production resources in the process.

We are not lowering fuel emissions by importing food from other regions that we can better grow locally.

We need to think holistically about sustainability, emission reduction, and future-focused communities !

It is absolute madness to chop down existing food producing trees, and replace them with little grasses or shrubs (if at all).

It is absolute madness to reduce our local community's ability to grow food locally by robbing productive food growing areas of their sunlight by building high-rise buildings immediately adjacent to them.

It is completely short-sighted to treat fertile productive soil like a meaningless resource the equivalent of sand or gravel. It is not !

Productive soil is a taonga that needs to be protected and nurtured.

I seek an Amendment that protects local food resilience resources as a Qualifying Matter.

.....

Regarding S054.06

16.

Protection for, and encouragement of, local Solar Power infrastructure

High-rise buildings rob other areas of sun. That is unavoidable.

PC2 states that emissions reduction is one of its aims.

This means that the protection of sustainable energy sources must also meet PC2's aims.

Solar Power has barely been mentioned in submissions or in PC2. This is very short sighted. It is clear that EVs will still part of our transport infrastructure, electric powered trains, and e-Bikes, e-Scooters and Mobility Scooters increasingly recommended modes of individual transport.

I **OPPOSE** **S153.13** which wants residential section width for intensive development to be further *reduced to an even narrower circular diameter*. This is even more likely to rob neighbouring properties of sun, and prevent neighbouring solar power generating systems from operating optimally.

I seek an Amendment that protects existing Solar Power production infrastructure, and actively encourages further solar power generating infrastructure in all new builds.

.....
Regarding S054.08

17.

Mature Tree protection and related Environmental / Climate Change issues

Firstly, I want to personally state how disappointed I am that Emissions Mitigation is not being valued by KCDC as well as Emissions Reduction.

I seek an Amendment in PC2 that values Emissions Mitigation in the form of mature existing vegetation (both exotic and native) as well as Emissions Reduction.

I seek an Amendment that requires the proposed removal of trees with trunk diameter of more than 25cm to be regarded as a Notifiable Matter.

While I totally support Emissions Reduction, this should not come at the expense of / instead of Emissions Mitigation, **especially regarding existing mature vegetation.**

Areas like much of suburban Waikanae east of the new expressway , were they to lose the majority of their mature trees (which they would, under current PC2 provisions), would end up emitting MORE Net Carbon than less. Crazy !

The current Carbon Sequestration of our many mature trees is significant in suburban Waikanae, and not just ‘in the Garden Precinct’.

I am shocked that the KCDC is not valuing Net Carbon values in its calculations and policies. **This is completely contrary to what PC2 is about.**

This is absolute Climate Change madness ! We need our existing mature vegetation to do many things, including help offset our emissions, past and present.

It is also NOT helping prevent Climate Change to build **hot urban islands devoid of mature vegetation.**

Where there is only 'lawn' or paddock and small shrubs....that is different....but mature trees ? They are taonga.

It is NOT helping prevent Climate Change by chopping down many cubic metres of CO2 absorbing vegetation, and planting a few grasses instead.

Mature trees have existed for decades or centuries already. That gift of shade, cooler temperatures, CO2 off-setting, and cultural/spiritual well-being cannot be replaced by a few shrubs.

I SUPPORT the Cancer Society submissions S073.03, S073.04, S073.05, S073.06, S073.08 regarding

- * the protection of existing mature trees
- * the need for canopy mapping of local areas BEFORE trees are cut down for more intensified housing
- * the need to plant trees asap in lower socio-economic areas
- * the value of large deciduous trees in our residential areas

It is deeply ironic that the Cancer Society is emphasizing the need to plant deciduous trees, when there are few (if any) provisions in PC2

to protect existing ones, even ones of large stature and local significance.

It is also deeply ironic that **the KCDC (in PC2) is discounting and minimizing the value of existing trees as an expendable ‘amenity value’**, vulnerable to being felled asap by developers trying to maximise housing unit quantity (not quality) and profits.

In Europe, mature trees are valued. Why not here ?

Our native birds love many of them for their seeds and flowers, sheltered nesting and chick-rearing perches, territorial perches.

PC2 shows little (if any) ecological awareness. Even GWRC is concerned about PC2.

I SUPPORT S097 Greater Wellington Regional Council in its submissions in particular:

S097.08, S097.09

“consider the impacts of climate change now and into the future”

I support their proposed changes regarding policies: CC.4, CC14, CC.7, CC.12, FW.5

These policies are concerning the following issues:

- water storage/recycling/capture on buildings
- sustainable energy generation (solar/wind) on buildings
- water tanks for grey water/ garden watering
- future effects of temperature changes

- future effects of rainfall changes
- urban greening
- developing resilient urban areas
- using and protecting nature based solutions

GWRC wants PC2 to strengthen requirements to provide for greater resilience in urban developments.

I quote:

Climate resilience is a matter within the scope of PC2 under Section 80E(2)(a) because Climate Change is a District Matter.

I SUPPORT GWRC's Amendment.

I SUPPORT S097.10. This is regarding existing nature-based solutions.

Waikanae's mature trees are an example of existing nature-based solution.

- Nature-based solutions need to be mapped
- They already exist, and support solutions for climate change
- District Plans should **avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing nature based solution**

I SUPPORT GWRC's submission regarding Policy CC.12 in Proposed RPS Change 1

I SUPPORT S093.01, S093.03, S093.04, S093.05 from GWRC regarding:

- Minimizing impact on the natural environment
- Recognizing the value of natural habitats

- Requiring sustainable stormwater design
- Requiring new developments to ensure adequate water supply

I SUPPORT the Amendments that GWRC is suggesting regarding the above topics

.....

I wish to speak to this Further Submission, as well as my Original Submission, in Person.

Malu Jonas

027 845 3094

12 Te Maku Grove, Waikanae 5036

From: [Malu Jonas](mailto:jonasmalu9@gmail.com) jonasmalu9@gmail.com
To: [Mailbox - District Planning](#)
Subject: Further Submission on PC2
Date: Thursday, 24 November 2022 3:49:45 pm
Attachments: [Further Submission KCDC PC2.docx](#)

From Malu Jonas
12 Te Maku Grove, Waikanae 5036

027 845 3094

I wish to speak in person on behalf of this Further Submission in conjunction with my original Submission