

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS SOUGHT ON WAITAKERE CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 26 LIVING ENVIRONMENT BULK AND LOCATION RULES

No.	Name	Address for Service	Decision Sought from Waitakere City Council
26/1/-	E B Greensmith	205A Godley Road, Titirangi	<p>Retain decks and terraces in exclusions: 4.1 Refer Building Coverage Pp 28, 29 Doc. B Some people, particularly the older prefer single level dwellings, this means that the 150sq.m. maximum coverage MINUS double garage of 36 sq. m MINUS 3 bedrooms (one each for a couple and one spare) at 75 sq. m of Courtyard, which may on steeper sites have to be a deck or terrace, leaves 39 sq. m – a pretty minimal sized dwelling and contravenes NZSS 1900 Chapter 4.</p> <p>5.0 Refer Pg 29 Doc B Buildings Item 5 probably contradicts the Building Act. Item 10 When is paved surface not a Terrace?</p> <p>6.1 Refer Pg 6 Doc B 9.1 (i) This makes no distinction between single, double bedrooms or bunkrooms.</p> <p>6.2 Refer Pg 7 Doc B 9.1 (v) Outdoor space and a slope of 20% is surely contradictory and is not useable unless terraced which then becomes a part of Building Coverage under this proposal and contradicts Assessment Criteria 9(b) below. 6.3 Refer Pg 6 Doc B 9.1 (vi)</p> <p>The Building Code requires ground level to be below floor level, which then requires step(s) – this is then not accessible directly. 7.0</p> <p>Refer Pg 29 Doc B Terraces are not described in definitions – is a grassed area a Terrace? When is a paved area a Terrace? Steps are not described in definitions – are steps with a 4m tread and a 100mm riser Steps or a Terrace? 8.0 Refer Pg 6 Doc A Living Environment Rule 8 Does this mean that the main glazing if screened can be <u>on</u> the site boundary? 9.0 Refer Pg 6 Doc. <u>A Living</u> <u>Environment Rule 10</u> <u>Does this mean a small</u> <u>business can be subdivided off from a residential site which is larger</u> <u>the then minimum?</u></p>
26/2/-	Suzanne Dunne	PO Box 52, Piha	<p>Extend deadline of submission. Give summary of effects of the Plan on coastal villages. Full community consultation.</p>

Deleted: A Living

No.	Name	Address for Service	Decision Sought from Waitakere City Council
26/3/-	WRPS C/- Meridian Planning Attn: James R Hook	P O Box 8960 Symonds Street Auckland 1150	a) That Council limit changes to the Human and Natural Area rules of the District Plan to those proposed by Waitakere City Council under Plan Change 26. And/or c) Any alternative or consequential relief that may satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
26/4/-	Piha Ratepayer's & Residents Assoc. Attn: Tony Dunn - President	PO Box 55, Piha, Waitakere City	Support for Plan Change 26 if there is no impact to either weaken or make more permissive the District Plan planning regulations for Coastal Villages.
26/5/-	Protect Piha Heritage Society Inc. Attn: Sandra Coney	PO Box 3, Piha, Waitakere City	<p>3. Living Environment Rule 3: Building Location – Natural Landscape Elements ← 3.1</p> <p><u>We oppose this Plan Change as it applied to the Coastal Villages and Waitakere Ranges Living Environments. The rule change deems it a permitted activity to add to or alter a dwelling on a sensitive ridge or headland/cliff/scarp as long as it does not increase the height or footprint of a building. We understand that this means that an existing deck with a roof could be enclosed to become part of a house as a permitted activity.</u></p> <p>3.2 We submit that such an addition or alteration could add to the bulk and prominence of a building, so that buildings are no longer subservient to the natural environment. The creation of solid walls, in a variety of colours, or glazing, will add to the bulk and dominance of a building especially in locations which are prominent and publicly visible.</p> <p>3.3 A deck can frequently be 'seen through' to vegetation or sky beyond. At night-time it is invisible, as it is not lit. It sits more lightly on the landscape.</p> <p>3.4 Enclosure of a deck in such a location should be subject to scrutiny as to its effect on the landscape.</p> <p>3.5 We do not believe this proposed change is consistent with the WRHAA, especially the objectives of the Act to ensure that built form is subservient to the natural environment and that the darkness of the night sky is protected.</p> <p>3.6 The Section 32 analysis says that this would avoid further bush clearance but we do not think it will have this effect, as property owners will probably then seek to build further decks to replace those enclosed.</p> <p>4. Living Environment Rule 5: Height in relation to boundary 4.1</p> <p>The Section 32 analysis stated that this plan change was designed to 'Amend this Rule so that the Height in Relation to Boundary (HIRB) recession planes also apply to road boundaries' and to this end has added 5.1 (iii) to include recession planes for buildings adjoining the Transport Environment.</p> <p>4.2 When the Plan Change went to the Planning and Regulatory Committee in May this was intended as a city-wide rule change, however, in the notified plan change, it is confined to Rural Villages.</p>

Formatted: Left, Tabs: 0.62 cm, Left

No.	Name	Address for Service	Decision Sought from Waitakere City Council
			<p>4.3 At Piha there has been recent experience of buildings two-stories high located close to the road, and built in front of iconic pohutukawa which give great natural beauty to that stretch of a highly used public beach.</p> <p>4.4 Consequently, the Society submits that Rule 5.1 (iii) should be applied to the Waitakere Ranges Living Environment and Coastal Villages Living Environment. This would reduce the bulk and prominence of buildings facing onto a road.</p> <p>4.5 The Society submits that the Council should consider the measurement point for the recession planes should be 1.5 metres and the plane 45 degrees adjoining the Transport Environment for the Waitakere Ranges Living Environment and Coastal Villages Living Environment.</p> <p>4.6 We would argue that in particularly sensitive environments, such as the Coastal Environment, where amenity and natural values need to be preserved, the set-back from the road for buildings should be greater.</p> <p>4.7 The Society therefore submits there should also be an increase in the yard between the front boundary of a property and a building when adjoining a Transport Environment, within the Waitakere Ranges Living Environment and Coastal Villages Living Environment.</p> <p>4.8 We understand that the Council is concerned that pushing buildings back from the road in forested area may have the effect of greater bush clearance. We would also be concerned about this. There needs to be a balance between the protection of bush, and the protection of the visual amenity and landscapes of natural areas.</p> <p>4.9 The rules need to ensure that roads in natural area are not lined with built structures such that the natural environment is dominated by built form, but also protect the eco-systems and indigenous vegetation of the natural areas. We ask that the Council consider how these objectives can be reached through the Plan Change.</p> <p>4.10 We submit that this would give effect to the WRHHA, which requires a greater level of protection in the Heritage Area. Most, if not all, of the roads on the West Coast are in scenic areas, with highly valued natural environments. A principal purpose of the Act is to make the built environment subservient to natural and rural landscapes.</p> <p>4.11 It is not clear from the Plan Change what the status would be of buildings which exceed 5.1 (iii). We submit these should be Discretionary Activities. This would enable 5(e) 'amenity values and neighbourhood character' to be assessed when considering such any application.</p> <p>5. Additional Assessment Criteria 5.1</p> <p>We support the addition of Assessment Criteria 5(e) regarding the extent to which the height, location, scale and design of buildings 'complement amenity values and neighbourhood character'. 5.2</p> <p>This will enable Discretionary Activity applications to be assessed against the amenity values of an area, and the existing neighbourhood character. 5.3</p> <p>This will be particular important in the Waitakere Ranges and Coastal Villages Living Environments which</p>

No.	Name	Address for Service	Decision Sought from Waitakere City Council
			<p>are under pressure from development. 5.4 The Society submits that this criteria also be applied to Limited Discretionary Activities, 5(e). 6. Living Environment Rule</p> <p>9 Outdoor Space 6.1 We support the changes to Section 9, Outdoor Space, which require dwellings and minor household units to have outdoor space that is accessible from the main living area of the dwelling and the minor household unit.</p> <p>7. General Natural Area Rule 3: Earthworks 7.1 The Society supports the removal of earthworks within an approved building platform on a sensitive ridges as a Permitted Activity, and inclusion if earthworks are under 30m² under Limited Discretionary Activities, and if more than 30m² as Non-Complying.</p> <p>7.2 This would be consistent with the WRHHA. 7.3 We have a general concern about the level of earthworks that are permitted in the Waitakere Ranges Living Environment, which are essentially the forested areas of the West Coast, and often highly prominent. There have been examples recently where vast amounts of rock and earth have been removed from sites which was permitted because it is an approved building platform.</p> <p>7.4 We ask the Council to consider how this could be the subject to more scrutiny through changes to the rules in this Plan Change, and thus give effect to the WRHAA.</p>
26/6/-	Waitakere City Council Attn: Philip Brown	Private Bag 93109, Henderson	<p>The Council consider making the following amendments to Plan Change 26:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Require resource consent for any addition or accessory building between the existing dwelling and the road boundary that exceeds five metres in height; ii. Require resource consent for any minor household unit situated between the existing dwelling on a site and the road boundary; iii. Clarify the scope of the words “new dwelling(s)” and “new buildings” in the proposed Plan Change; iv. Remove the application of the ‘Height in Relation to Boundary’ rule in respect of the front boundary of a property; v. Make minor household units a limited discretionary activity in respect of any site less than 600m²; vi. Remove the provision in the ‘Carparking and Driveways’ rule that effectively makes minor household units a controlled activity on any site less than 600m²; vii. Provide an exception to the Height in Relation to Boundary rule for small scale renewable energy devices (such as solar cells and wind turbines), in a similar manner to the current exclusion to chimneys; viii. Provide for the Height in Relation to Boundary rule to be applied from a boundary on the far side of any pedestrian accessway adjoining a site;

No.	Name	Address for Service	Decision Sought from Waitakere City Council
			<p>ix. Introduce a requirement for screening of outdoor space that is required for each household unit or minor household unit;</p> <p>x. Introduce a new provision for screening established on boundaries with roads, open spaces and other public areas to ensure that the need for privacy is balanced with a desire to achieve passive surveillance;</p> <p>xi. Amend the 'Outdoor Space' rule to clarify the requirements for outdoor space that are applicable to minor household units and household units on the same site, including orientation and separation/aggregation requirements;</p> <p>xii. Introduce a requirement in the 'Carparking and Driveways' rule for Category I and II shared driveways to include a passing bay at the road entrance where the driveway is accessed from a major road;</p> <p>xiii. Provide for the inclusion of covered decks within an area of outdoor space;</p> <p>xiv. Such other matters, related to the foregoing, that may be addressed in evidence at any hearing that is to be held.</p> <p>That the Council make such amendments to Plan Change 26 as may be appropriate in order to address the matters raised in this submission, including any consequential amendments to the District Plan that may be required.</p>
26/7/-	Jane Greensmith & John Lenihan	185 Konini Road, Titirangi, Waitakere City	<p>3.0 There appears to be two documents relating to this proposed plan change which are contradictory or confusing.</p> <p>3.1 'Proposed plan change 26 Living Environment Bulk and location Rules prepared in fulfilment of Section 32; hereinafter referred to as Document A.</p> <p>3.2 'Proposed Plan Change 26 Living Environment Bulk and Location Amendments to the District Plan' hereinafter referred to as Document B.</p> <p>4.1 Refer Building Coverage Definition Pp 28, 29 Doc. B Many people, particularly older people, require single level dwellings, this means that the 150sq.m. maximum coverage MINUS double garage/carport of 35sq.m. MINUS 2 larger or 3 smaller bedrooms equalling 35sq.m. plus a small bathroom & laundry space of 15sq.m. and the requirement for 75sq.m. of open space outdoor living, which may on sloping sites have to be a deck or terrace of 15sq.m. minimum, leaves only 50sq.m. for kitchen, dining and living – a pretty minimal sized dwelling and possibly contravenes NZS 1900 Chapter 4. In tandem with the daylight protection rules it is often not possible to build a second storey, particularly on sloping sites.</p> <p>4.2 Refer Pp 28, 29 Doc. B This contradicts 3.1.5 pg 8 Doc. A 5.0 Refer</p>

No.	Name	Address for Service	Decision Sought from Waitakere City Council
			<p>Pg 29 Doc B Buildings contradicts the Building Act. Item 10 When is paved surface not a terrace? B 9.1 (i) between single, double bedrooms or bunkrooms. Outdoor space and a slope of 20% is surely contradictory and is not useable unless terraced which then becomes a part of Building Coverage under this proposal and contradicts Assessment Criteria 9(b) below. Doc B 9.1 (vi) requires ground level to be below floor level, which then requires step(s) – this is then not accessible directly. Terraces are not described in definitions – is a grassed area a Terrace? Steps are not described in definitions – are steps with a 4m tread and a 100mm riser Steps or a Terrace? Overall the existing rules are onerous and inflexible and the proposal makes them more onerous. Of particular concern is that the rule will lead to people not having homes with uncovered decks or terraces and no access to and proper use of outdoor spaces and this is surely unhealthy and undesirable. Oppose Plan Change 26 in part.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Item 5 probably 6.1 Refer Pg 6 Doc B This makes no distinction 6.2 Refer Pg 7 Doc B 9.1 (v) 6.3 Refer Pg 6 The Building Code 7.0 Refer Pg 29 Doc B</p>
26/8/-	Transit NZ Ltd Attn: Michal Akurangi	PO Box 1459, Auckland 1	<p>Transits submission is partly opposed to the plan change unless the following standards are included in the plan change. In order for Transit to manage the State highway effectively, efficiently and in a sustainable manner, Transit seeks the following relief;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">All new development with the 'Road Noise Effects Area' (as defined within Appendix 5D – Transits Planning Policy Manual) adjacent to any State highway are to meet the internal sound standard AS/NZ2107:2000.</p> <p>Further to our submission there is an expectation from Transit that the aforementioned standard would be applied to all the zones adjacent to the State highway network to mitigate reverse sensitivity issues.</p>