

Upper Hutt City Council  
Private Bag 907  
UPPER HUTT 5140

Upper Hutt Town and Country Assn  
c/-Bob McLellan  
7 Paton St  
Mangaroa  
Upper Hutt  
[bobsnotes@xtra.co.nz](mailto:bobsnotes@xtra.co.nz)  
4-5267775

17-04-2015

Ref Private Plan Change 40 (Wallaceville) Consultation

Below is our submission to the Upper Hutt City Council in relation to this consultation. We wish to be heard in support of this submission.

We support the development of the Wallaceville block as generally proposed in the Plan Change request. The location and size lend it to the development of housing and related commercial sites.

## **General comment**

As we reviewed this request we found it difficult because of the lack of an overall Upper Hutt context. We look forward to the release of the Upper Hutt (Urban and Rural) Strategy which will enable proposals to be assessed in relation to the overall direction of Upper Hutt. In particular, there is no City Structure (Spatial) plan for the area, which will no doubt be a problem for considering any proposal for the CIT.

## **Infrastructure**

We are not in a position to comment on the requirements on city infrastructure. In part this is because the possible subdivision and density details are not available. And of course, we do not know what the capacity of existing infrastructure is. At some stage the Council will need to assess development contributions for this project. This is a key interest to establish the balance of costs between the developer and the ratepayers.

There is some constraint on removing stormwater from the site. We are in favour of solutions which use local soakage and storage buffering. We are concerned that the inevitable overflows have not been seriously addressed so we consider that the stormwater proposal as written is unsatisfactory. We do not agree with the suggestion that Grant's Bush or the Floodplain Forest Remnant should be the location for flood attenuation basins. This land is covenanted for conservation reasons and is not there for other purposes.

## **Transport**

We will make the comment (which is really GW responsibility) that any increase in public transport services should be in place early in the development. This will help avoid establishing a pattern of private transport use where public transport would be used if it were available.

Similarly train services and the facilities at the nearest station should be addressed early on.

No sections should have direct access to Alexander Rd. Access should only be through the Gateway

entrances.

## **Amendments to zoning policies and rules**

We are concerned at the effect of the proposed 'tuning' of the District Plan to create specific policies and rules for the Wallaceville block. This will increase the complexity of the Plan and the many references to the external Wallaceville Structure Plan document may detract from clarity and certainty. On the other hand, we appreciate the need to make Policies and Rules that result in the best use of the site. Overall, we would like to see the amendments restricted to the absolute minimum required.

## **Rezoning Part Section 102B and Part Section 61B**

There seems to be some confusion whether this is Rural Hill or Rural Lifestyle.

This piece of land looks to be a shingle fan from the gully stream at the head of the section. If that is the case then significant flows of water must come down the stream at times. This suggests that at least an in-depth report should be made of the area and that possibly it is not a good place for houses (ref Rata St, Naenae, flood).

Access for traffic from the proposed houses will create yet another impediment to Alexander Rd.

Services will need to be supplied from across the road.

We believe that serious consideration should be given to swapping this land with a relatively bare portion of the Forest Remnant covenant.

## **Grant's Bush and Forest Remnant Covenants**

The important thing to note about these is that they have been covenanted for many years for conservation purposes and that should be respected. They are not available for alternative purposes, even public walkways. They should be fenced off and managed to preserve and enhance their natural attributes (ref the mess created in the covenanted land behind Mt Marua).

## **Urban Design**

Components of urban design lie in the Planning Rules and Policies, Structure Plan, subdivision and building code. At this point of the development there is not enough information to assess the urban design and without a subdivision request the Council cannot ensure the required aspects of design. The Council should retain full control of all decisions that relate to urban design in this development. This includes the appropriate zoning rules and policies.

## **Specific points**

Interestingly the Section 32 report in the application is limited to WDL only. We will be interested to see the Section 32 review by the Council.

Amendment 9. 'Seeks to retain where practical exiting notable trees'. Replace with 'Retains existing notable trees'.

Amendment 17. Subdivision in WSP should be Controlled, not Restricted Discretionary.

Amendment 21. To avoid any confusion should state the maximum number of storeys as well. 11m can allow for 4 storeys.