

Submission on notified proposal for plan change



About preparing a submission on a proposed plan change

You must use the prescribed form

- [Clause 6](#), Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) requires submissions to be on the prescribed form.
- The prescribed form is set out in [Form 5](#), Schedule 1 of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedure) Regulations 2003.
- This template is based on Form 5. While you do not have to use this template, your submission must be in accordance with Form 5.

Your submission and contact details will be made publicly available

- In accordance with [clause 7](#) of Schedule 1 of the RMA, the Council will make a summary of your submission publicly available. The contact details you provide will also be made publicly available, because under [clause 8A](#) of Schedule 1 of the RMA any further submission supporting or opposing your submission must be forwarded to you by the submitter (as well as being sent to Council).
- [Section 352](#) of the RMA allows you to choose your email to be your address for service. If you select this option, you can also request your postal address be withheld from being publicly available. To choose this option please tick the relevant boxes below.

Reasons why a submission may be struck out

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further
- it contains offensive language
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

To Kāpiti Coast District Council

Submission on Proposed Plan Change 4 (Private) to the Operative Kāpiti Coast District Plan 2021

Submitter details

Full name of submitter: Montcalm Family Trust

Contact person (name and designation, if applicable): Ellen Cohen, trustee

Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the RMA):

[Redacted]

Telephone: 021 363605

Electronic address for service of submitter (i.e. email): ellennz@me.com

I would like my address for service to be my email *[select box if applicable]*



I have selected email as my address for service, and I would also like my postal address withheld from being publicly available *[select box if applicable]*



Scope of submission

The specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to are:
[give details]

2.3.1 Rezoning

3.6.1 Earthworks

3.6.2 Stormwater

Piecemeal change of Lifestyle zone to Residential, limiting the change to 2 sections in the absence of changes to neighbouring properties.

Traffic impact on neighbouring streets

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Submission

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

I support the application in principle but oppose 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. The Council's own planning team recommended a full structure plan for Otaihanga, but that advice is being ignored. Any changes to the district, especially those with a large impact such as this application, should be reviewed in a planned manner and changes should not be allowed to progress topsy-turvy and because or when a developer chooses to do it.

Effects of the zoning change on our property:

1. If this application for a zoning change is approved, our property will be bounded on 3 sides by Residential zone. What are Council plans for our 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? Kapiti deserves a district-wide or at least area wide review and not this piecemeal application review because a wealthy developer requests it. 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 2 sections being sought to be developed by the applicant? Why does that same thinking not apply to the neighbouring properties?
2. We met with Council staff in May 2025 for a pre-application planning meeting where we were told that an application for subdivision of our 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 we did less than 3 months prior? Why is the loss of a greater sized area deemed to be an acceptable loss of a rural resource than our smaller section?
3. Regardless of the timeframe for any potential zoning changes to our property, we ask Council to ensure the sewage network and water intake is extended to our boundary from the proposed development to enable future public service connections to adjacent properties such as ours.

Potential long term effects on our property:

1. The stormwater drainage, including the overflow, for the proposed development is proposed to feed into the stream that flows through our property. We expect Council to ensure that the volume of this flow will be managed so that it does not increase the current manageable levels. If this is not done, there could be impact on our property, including an impact on our insurance premiums and levels. We expect Council to ensure that we are not negatively impacted by the proposed development in allowing a currently rural area to be covered in concrete, resulting in the drainage being substantially affected and requiring different management.
2. Given our current rural lifestyle zoning and expected future Residential zoning, we have concerns about multi-storey buildings being approved for construction along our boundary, with potentially only a 5-metre buffer. This is incongruous with our current Lifestyle zoning. Should our zoning change in the future then the existence of multi-story buildings within 5 metres of our boundary could affect potential development on our property. We expect Council to ensure that we are not unduly affected either in the short term or the longer term by the height of what is developed along our boundary and request that 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.
3. Given our current rural lifestyle zoning and expected future Residential zoning, we have additional concerns about the impact of the development of any outdoor space that is developed on the boundary with our property. We expect Council to ensure that we are not unduly affected either in the short term or the longer term by the outdoor space that may be developed on our boundary.
4. The recently revised ponding maps produced by the Council indicated a small potential ponding area on our property near the boundary with the proposed development. We expect Council to ensure that the proposed development does not worsen the potential flooding risk and that our property is not unduly affected by drainage or flooding risk due to the proposed development.
5. We have concerns over 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 our only road access. There is

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Short term effects on our property during the land works and construction process:

1. The trees, which sit on our boundary with 65 Ratanui Road and which 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 us for many years. We expect Council to ensure that these are removed early in the development process without any short term or long risk to our property as a result. This has potential to affect the aforementioned ponding issue, which we expect Council to ensure is prevented.
2. Our property lies in the direction of the prevailing wind of the proposed development. We expect Council to ensure that the developer takes all possible precautions to reduce the dust flow, including the erection of temporary barriers during the earthworks and construction processes. Should we consider the dust flow to be excessive, we request that the developer be required to fund the washing of our windows on a regular basis during the period of the earthworks and construction and the washing of our entire house at the completion of the earthworks.
3. We expect Council to 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.
4. Rabbits are a huge problem on our property and we expect their volumes to increase due to the displacement of rabbits from the property of the proposed development. We ask Council to require the developer to fund rabbit control/eradication on our and their property prior to and during the earthworks and construction processes. We are open to Summerset funding elimination by shooting or chemical means on our property for the duration of the development and request that this continue on our property for an agreed period of time post-construction.

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

1. Consider this application only in context of a fuller review of the immediate neighbourhood and not in isolation.
2. Require this development to provide at least one other entry/egress point.
3. Ensure that we are not negatively impacted by the proposed development in allowing a currently rural area to be covered in concrete, resulting in the drainage being substantially affected and requiring different management.
4. Ensure that we are not unduly affected either in the sort term or the longer term by the height of what is developed along our boundary and request that 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.
5. Ensure that we are not unduly affected either in the sort term or the longer term by the outdoor space that may be developed on our boundary
6. Ensure that the proposed development does not worsen the potential flooding risk and that our property is not unduly affected by drainage or flooding risk due to the proposed development.
7. Ensure that the dangerous trees are removed early in the development process without any short term or long risk or ponding issues to our property as a result.
8. 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. Require the developer to fund the washing of our windows on a regular basis during the period of the earthworks and construction and the washing of our entire house at the completion of the earthworks.
9. 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.
10. Require the developer to fund rabbit control/eradication on our and their property prior to and during and following the earthworks and construction processes.
11. Ensure the sewage network and water intake is extended to our boundary from the proposed development to enable future public service connections to adjacent properties such as ours.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Hearing Submissions [select appropriate box]

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| I wish to be heard in support of my submission. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| If others make a similar submission, I will not consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

30 June 2025

Signature of Submitter
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Date

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

Trade Competition [select the appropriate wording]

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by [clause 6\(4\)](#) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

I could ☐ / I could not ☒ gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission, please complete the following:

I am ☒ / I 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.

Email your submission to district.planning@kapiticoast.govt.nz or
post/deliver to:

Attn: District Planning Team
Kāpiti Coast District Council
175 Rimu Road
Paraparaumu 5032

For office use only
Submission No:

