

PC50 Residential Focus Group – Meeting 5 Notes



10 SEP 2020, 7-9PM – ROTARY LOUNGE, UPPER HUTT LIBRARY

Introduction

Officers began the session by explaining that this would be the last session before draft Outcomes and Methods were released which is currently scheduled for the end of September. The next focus group session would likely be towards the end of the year, and would be moving away from the high level considerations to the more detailed considerations to inform the drafting of rules.

Officers enquired as to whether any members were able to undertake the task which had been assigned since the last meeting. This involved walking a number of identified routes within possible intensification areas, which measured 500m from the nearest railway station and edge of CBD. Members were asked to contemplate the following factors when undertaking the walk.

- How easy would this be for most people?
- Who would struggle to achieve this?
- Does time of day affect its 'walkability'?
- Living at these locations, would you be inclined to walk to the train or CBD? When would you drive?
- Can you observe anything on the route that may make walking difficult (eg, steep grade, high traffic, etc)
- When completed, do you think the distance should be more or less?

Three members confirmed that they walked a total of eight separate routes. They provided the following feedback shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Walkability test findings

Route	Comment
18 Prouse Grove to Silverstream Station	Prouse Grove to Silverstream Station was a generally easy walk but there is an incline at Prouse Grove which could be dangerous with frost, and a lack of street lighting around Prouse Grove. Route took less than 10 minutes and allowed for the walker to stop at Silverstream shops.
30A Field Street to Silverstream Station	Field Street to Silverstream Station had only a slight gradient and footpaths are not available on both sides of the roads. Route took less than 10 minutes and allowed for the walker to stop at Silverstream shops. Member noted that they were more inclined to go shopping as it was easier to pop in, rather than having to search for a park during peak travel time.
Wallaceville Walking Routes	Easy and flat, could take a wheelchair. Under 10 minutes but not sure on the street lighting situation
22 Logan Street to Upper Hutt Station	Easy walk which could be done with a wheelchair, and has good road crossings
10 Hazel Street to 19 Logan Street	Easy walk and well lit at night
20 Kashmir Avenue to 967 Fergusson Drive	Kashmir Avenue has a steep gradient at the Fergusson Drive intersection; not suitable for wheelchairs
9 Gallipoli Road to Heretaunga Station	Busy with parking by the roadside and traffic movements. Flat and easy to walk. No toilets at station could be an issue.
412 Fergusson Drive to Heretaunga Station	Busy with parking by the roadside and traffic movements. Flat and easy to walk. No toilets at station could be an issue.

Officers thanked the members for their work in doing these walks, and asked if there were any specific issues which would prevent them wanting to undertake these walks. Members mentioned that the street lighting was a key consideration, as some people do not feel safe walking along dark roads with lack of clear sight. The state of the footpaths in some areas also made walking routes more dangerous at night and should be considered. When asked about the walk time they experienced, members stated that the ideal travel time should be between 10-15 minutes. They noted that anything greater could be difficult to manage as people are also more likely to be carrying other things as part of their commute.

When asked if there were any other matters, members reiterated the barrier slope can have when considering age, accessibility, and seasonal variance that could promote frosts, for example.

Officers noted that while the NPS-UD directs intensification in these areas, the regulation also stresses that a 'well-functioning urban environment' should also be achieved.

Officers explained the draft intensification design principles had been drafted as an assessment tool to ensure that these good built form outcomes could be achieved. Officers described how these principles are building on the findings of the residential character assessment and seek to align with the definition of a well-functioning urban environment. Officers mentioned how the use of a height gradient system in intensification areas could be introduced to essentially establish buffer zones around the higher-storeyed development, gradating off to low-density living.

Officers asked if the group had any feedback on the principles. The following points were raised:

- Members asked how the land would be acquired to undertake this development. Officers explained that it would not be Council buying the land, but developers would likely be required to buy multiple lots and amalgamate them in order to allow for the requirements of higher storey developments, whilst considering the cost-effectiveness of this approach.
- Members enquired as to how developers had been involved in this process so far, with Officers responding that evidence gathered through the 2019 Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment has been important in developing the approach, but consultation received through public consultation, and responses received through the Technical Working Group, have also been useful evidence. Officers noted that they expected developers to participate in the forthcoming public engagement on outcomes and methods.
- The effect on climate change, the historic environment and cultural consideration within the principles was also enquired about. Officers responded by stating that the historical context was considered within the Residential Character Assessment, which helped inform the principles. The effects of climate change are difficult to consider, but there are some aspects, such as the proximity to sustainable transport and water sensitive urban design, which do consider climate change effects. It was stressed that it was difficult to quantify and measure costs and benefits, but opportunities existed to have greater control on the built form of buildings. Cultural aspects are also difficult to consider through the principles and were currently not strongly emphasised.

Task explanation:

The group were split into two groups where they were asked to annotate maps which displayed the proposed intensification areas around public transport nodes based and CBD. The idea was to understand which areas the Members considered suitable or unsuitable for intensification over and above those already identified and their reasoning behind this. Once this task was completed, the groups reformed to share their findings.

Post-task discussion:

Each intensification node was discussed in turn, and the findings are presented below in Table 2.

Table 2- Exercise Findings

Node	Group Comments
Silverstream	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The St Patricks block is a logical area to extend intensification to and with an underpass would provide good connections to Silverstream. Although the northern end of the St Patricks estate could be a long walk to the station • Intensification in Silverstream itself could be difficult as it is low lying, and there are impediments in the form of the village shops, school, fire station some steeper sections towards the hills. • Pinehaven Stream flooding could be an impediment. • Members wanted to keep the entrance to Upper Hutt appealing, with an avenue of trees.
Heretaunga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Palmer Crescent could be a good area to exemplify high density. However steep sections south of Heretaunga Square not as viable. • Areas within the former CIT site could be suitable for high density housing, as well as vacant NZDF land. • Could join this area with Trentham as there are a lot of older houses on bigger sections, could be good for viability to amalgamate and intensify.
Trentham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next to the rail corridor should be extended and good chance for developing, flat, old houses big sections (Islington to Liverpool). Easy walking to station. • Army should be able to go to 5-6 storeys. • From Liverpool onwards has potential for development, extending and connecting intensification areas (to Wallaceville).
Wallaceville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to connect Wallaceville node with Trentham (through Wallaceville Estate) • Maclean Street / Murray Street block to Martins Street and possibly to Fergusson Drive is 40s and 50s style housing that would be an ideal place to intensify to high density living. • All of the block from Seddon Street to Lane Street is very suitable for high density housing.
CBD South	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added in Maidstone School and Clyma Park within the intensification area, with the potential to develop Clyma Park whilst retaining the community gardens. • Melrose Street and surrounds could be high density.
CBD North	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots of potential for high density housing between Exchange and Henry streets.