

2 NOVEMBER 2021, 6-9PM – ROTARY LOUNGE, UPPER HUTT LIBRARY

Introduction

Officers welcomed members and provided an update on the project timeline for Plan Change 50. Officers explained that this would be the final PC50 Rural Focus Group session. Officers also provided an overview of how the recently released RMA Amendment Bill would impact on the proposed residential aspect of PC50.

Public Consultation Review

Officer provided an overview of the recent public consultation which was undertaken. This included details on the format of the consultation and the level of response received.

Officers then progressed to providing an overview of the feedback received via the available consultation options, including the feedback on the proposed provisions provided, and feedback received via the online spatial map which allowed people to provide comments on the proposed zoning.

Officers examined the main themes of the feedback which had been received during the consultation period, focusing first on the spatial aspect of feedback received for each zone.

Members enquired about the feedback received on extending the Rural production Zone further in Mangaroa, with officers explaining the feedback suggested changing proposed lifestyle zoning in the area to production.

Officers then moved on to the main themes of the feedback received for the PC50 rural provisions, which focused on:

- Support for protection of productive soils
- General support for subdivision controls, including clustering
- Consistency and equity in zones
- Associated/dependant reporting and strategic direction

Members asked Officers whether the public understood the proposed clustering provisions, with Officers responding that it was difficult to tell from feedback received, but that they believed they were fairly well understood, however clustering in the Settlement Zone may have been harder to understand. Officers noted that some explanation was required when enquiries arose during the engagement period. This may have been because of the discrepancy of yields from zone controls versus clustering controls, and the perception that clustering in the Settlement Zone was a requirement, rather than an option.

Members also commented on the approach to zoning of productive land, emphasising that productive activities can still occur on smaller sections, but that the proposed subdivisions size

requirements could make it difficult to sell productive land, potentially resulting in the opportunity to utilise productive land not being realised.

Members also highlighted how local food production will be ever more so important in the future with the anticipated effects of climate change.

Officers progressed to the specific feedback topics which had been received for the proposed PC50 rural provisions, which included:

- Density, bulk and location, and clustering
- Primary production and Rural amenity
- Secondary dwellings and visitor accommodation
- Non-rural activities

Members enquired about the feedback received in relation to subdivision standards, with officers explaining the cascading approach taken with the proposed PC50 rural provisions.

Members also enquired about why animal boarding received negative feedback from the consultation. Officers explained that there was a potential misunderstanding from respondents that the provisions were enabling the activity, rather than the intended outcome of the provisions being control of the activity to manage anticipated adverse effects via resource consent.

Officers progressed to reviewing the feedback received on the proposed rural precincts. Members provided comments around the scale of anticipated commercial activities within the proposed Village Precinct and the proposed intensification adjacent to the Hutt Valley Clay Target Club. Members were not surprised by the nature of feedback received on the proposed acoustic controls for the gun club.

Area for Re-evaluation

Officers progressed to discussing the aspects which had been highlighted as needing review based on the feedback from the consultation. This includes:

- Rural Lifestyle Zoning over productive soils around Mangaroa School
- Allotment density of Settlement Zone
- Clustering metric
- Village precinct: density and commercial enablement
- Secondary dwelling sizing for Lifestyle & Settlement Zones
- Buffer placement of secondary units in General and Production Zones

Members queried whether the feedback received on the zoning around Mangaroa School was intended to retain the existing status-quo. They also enquired about the definition of productive soils, which was explained by Officers to be based on New Zealand Soil Classifications and which would be influenced by the upcoming National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.

Members also provided feedback on the approach to settlement zoning being the same across the different settlement zoned areas, whereas members expected that due to the difference in characteristics for the settlement zoned areas, they would expect some nuances in the provisions for those zones.

Members agreed with the proposed approach to Settlement Zone density based on the evidence that was used to make the determination of 2,000m² minimum density and their experience with providing on-site servicing. They supported the view that this could be re-evaluated based on the scale of the zone and potential for nutrient loading. Members also supported the proposed re-evaluation of the clustering provisions, which would likely see the removal of the clustering option for the proposed settlement zones due to the low yield difference, which is likely to result in little uptake of the proposed provisions, and few Settlement Zone parcels that may be constrained and who may take up the option to cluster development.

Members commented that the option to enable a rural day-care activity within the proposed village Precinct would be beneficial, as well as ensuring that the activities within the zone are of a scale that the zone anticipates.

Members also provided comments on the flexibility of secondary dwellings, with suggestions that a larger footprint could be permitted if the secondary dwelling was only a single storey.

In terms of additional potential updated, this was limited to reviewing Settlement Zone density on hilled sites. A member noted that there should be a distinction between flatter sites and sloped sites as they differ in character. Officers noted that geotechnical assessment would be required as part of subdivision for most hilled sites, which would influence density and appropriate areas for new parcels and building occupation. Nonetheless, officers agreed that this could be part of the scope of landscape architectural re-evaluation.

Conclusions

Officers provided a summary of the next steps for PC50. Due to the resourcing and time pressures associated with the residential aspect of the plan change, the notification date for the rural side of the project was likely to be pushed back to 2023, aiming for the first half of the year.

Officers then provided to members an overview of how to make an effective submission on a plan change to say thanks and prepare members and their communities for formal submissions.

Officers thanked the focus group members for their time and their contribution to the development of Plan Change 50 over the last 2 year period.