

## **Speaking notes – Planning – Amy Camilleri**

Good afternoon, my name is Amy Camilleri and I am the Council's reporting officer and will take my evidence as read.

I would like to acknowledge and thank the submitters for speaking today and taking the time to come and or be online with us.

There are few matters I would like to highlight:

The first is driver behaviour which has been brought up on a number of occasions during this hearing, specifically around the convenience of parking availability. I do acknowledge that I am not a traffic expert but in my opinion, the concept of this increased convenience results in more dependence on private motor vehicle use, rather than encouraging other modes of transport. In order to change people's preferred modes of transport, choice must be given rather than providing for a singular mode in this case the private motor vehicle.

In my own personal situation I live within proximity to a centre zone with a subsequent supermarket and I prefer to walk rather than drive because it is easier for me to do my shopping and it is within my walkable catchment to home. In this case convenience and choice play a huge factor in my decision making. In saying this I acknowledge my age, demographic and ability is one portion of users.

Another item I would like to note is the notion of amenity. Amenity is more than meeting standards and the qualitative numbers or prescription listed within the rules of the plans when considering lighting and noise. Amenity is driven by the human senses and as noted in both district plans and the RMA. Amenity is defined as:

- *those natural or physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people's appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes.*

The district plan gives reference to the type of amenity that would be anticipated or found within the residential area when examining the objectives and policies listed

within both my s42A report and minute 3 response. Cumulatively what is being proposed creates an adverse effect on the amenity and goes against the intent of what could be anticipated in the area and noted within my s42A report.

The policy direction within the plans is not saying no to non-residential uses, it is saying yes in some cases where the proposal is compatible with the residential zone and to an extent the neighbouring zones.

I would also like to note that if the zoning was changed to be Local Centre Zones it would not be helpful in this case because the LCZ rules would generally not change the activity status in the 2024 plan and car-parking of this scale is discouraged.

Both plans, including rules, standards, objectives and policies paint a picture of what could be non-residential in nature and considered acceptable. I don't think that the proposal is of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone. The wording and language that has been used within the plans provides a clear direction of what is consistent and not consistent.

In terms of the permitted baseline, I question the credibility that has been mentioned from time to time and hold my position that there is no relevant permitted baseline in this case.

I noted that the commissioner gave reference to 'other activities' and what this means. when looking to the 2024 district plan 'other activities' that would be considered permitted subject to meeting the permitted activity standards within the residential zone including:

- Child care services
- Visitor accommodation
- Home Business
- Community gardens

These activities have been prescribed in the plan and gives direction on what is or could be permitted within the zone.

In terms of the reference to policy CC.9 I note that this was missing from my minute three response. Policy CC.9 Reducing greenhouse gas emissions associated with transport infrastructure as per the RPS Plan Change 1 which specifically states: *particular regard shall be given to whether, use and development have been planned to optimise overall transport demand, maximising mode shift from private vehicles to public transport or active modes, in a way that contributes to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.*

In my opinion the proposal does not achieve the mode shift from private vehicles to alternative modes of transport in response to reducing greenhouse gas emission.

I still remain of the opinion that the recommendation to refuse the proposal is upheld.

I am now open to questions.