

Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedure) Regulations  
2003

Form 5

Submission on notified proposal for plan change

*Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991*

To: Kāpiti Coast District Council

Name of submitter: Kāpiti Disability Advisory Group  
*[full name]*

**This is a submission on the following change proposed to the Operative Kapiti Coast District Plan 2021 (the proposal):** *[name of plan change]*

Proposed Plan Change 1A Accessible Carparking Requirements

---

**Trade Competition**

I could/could not\* gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

*[\*Select one]*

\*I am/am not\*\* directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that—

(a) adversely affects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

*[\*Delete entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission]*

*[\*\*Select one]*

**The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:** *[give details]*

TR – PARK P8

---

MUZ- P1

---

GIZ – P1

---

DEV1 – P14

---

DEV2 – P14

---

AP22

---

**My submission is:** *[include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended; and reasons for your views]*

We fully support the provision made in Point 1 of TR PARK P8, in particular clauses 1,2, and 4 because we feel it makes the provision of accessible car parks clear which benefits the disability community who have additional access needs that require accommodation such as reduced mobility, or use of mobility devices.

Clause 3 is vague and no explanation given for this clause either in the positive or negative. We seek assurance around what “effects” might mitigate any provision of accessible carparks. We are a little concerned that some builds might seek to use this provision to deny accessible carparks.

For Point 2: MUZ - P1 we support clause 2e in the specific provision made for accessible carparks and vehicle manoeuvring onsite because it recognises the additional access needs that require accommodation for the disability community in Kāpiti.

For Point 4: GIZ – P1 We support the provision of “sufficient onsite service areas” including accessible carparks to meet the additional access needs that require accommodation for the disability community within Kapiti.

For Point 5: DEV1 – P14 we support clause 2c however we think this point must be somehow be backed up or made clearer that accessible carparks are not easily deemed “inappropriate”. Our reason is that some builds may try to get around providing accessible carparks if they think they have a possible clause to access.

It is also a little concerning that accessible carparks are lumped in with loading vehicles. We think reference to the location of access and loading for service/delivery vehicles could be moved under clause 2d. The disability community has found that service/delivery vehicles are in fact one of the groups who use accessible parks in breach of the conditions of those parks. We think the division between these two distinct users should be made clearer in these regulations.

For Point 6 Dev 2 – P14 we support clause 2c in relation to accessible carparks. We feel reference to the location of access and loading for service/delivery vehicles should be separated out into a new clause – 2d for the same reasons given in Point 5.

APP22 – we consider the text box could include something along the lines of “all environments remain accessible for disabled users/disability community” or words to that effect to recognise that the disability community is as much a user as other groups specified (pedestrians and cyclists)

**I seek the following decision from the Kāpiti Coast District Council:** *[give precise details]*

We seek feedback on the suggestions made in the previous section. Specifically:

Point 1 of TR PARK P8, Clause 3 – an explanation for this clause and for that explanation to form

part of the regulations or have guidelines applying to it.

For Point 5: DEV1 – P14 clause 2c however we are wanting to know how this point will be backed up or made clearer that accessible carparks are not easily deemed “inappropriate”.

We want to know if our suggestion around the clause relating to the location of access and loading for service/delivery vehicles could be moved under clause 2d.

For Point 6 Dev 2 – P14 we want the clause around the location of access and loading for service/delivery vehicles put into a new clause – 2d.

APP22 – we want consider the text box could include something along the lines of “all environments remain accessible for disabled users/disability community” or words to that effect to recognise that the disability community is as much a user as other groups specified (pedestrians and cyclists)

---

### Hearing Submissions

I wish/~~do not wish~~\* to be heard in support of my submission. [\*Select one] – if necessary

If others make a similar submission, I will/~~will not~~\* consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing. [\*Select one]

Submitted electronically

---

Signature of submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)  
(A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means)

Date: 10 March 2022

### Contact Details

Electronic address for service of submitter: joannedacombe@gmail.com

Telephone: 0278101725

Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the Resource

Management Act 1991): 106 Alexander Road, Raumati Beach 5032

---

Contact person: Joanne Dacombe, Chairperson

[name and designation, if applicable]