

PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN CHANGE 77: *CURTIS STREET BUSINESS AREA*

Summary of Submissions

April 2013

Proposed District Plan Change 77

Curtis Street Business Area

Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
1	Naomi Lane	13 Cooper Street, Karori, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter supports the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>It would be a good use of the site as it is not suitable for residential development due to the high tension power lines and limited sunlight. There aren't many large parcels of land in Wellington for business development. The area is not very densely populated therefore development would not have too greater impact.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>To approve the plan change.</p>			
2	New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga	Attn: Sasha Walters PO Box 2629, Wellington 6140	Did not state
<p>The submitter neither opposes or supports the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>NZHPT supports the statement in the heritage assessment that NZHPT should be contacted prior to any works on the subject property. NZHPT has concerns that the heritage conclusion that potential risk of damage of an archaeological site is minimal and recommends that an archaeological investigation is undertaken on site before development is considered. The submitter refers to obligations and requirements under the Historic Place Act 1993.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>Did not state.</p>			
3	Bernard O'Shaughnessy	139a Daniell Street, Newtown, Wellington 6021	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area due to the way it's been handled so far.</p> <p>This looks like another water front mess, Island Bay section mess, John St mess, Manners Mall dig up mess, CBD mess, Kilbirnie mess or Miramar mess. The culture of Council officers needs to change to helping us customers and not existing for business interests. Make the place a park or gift it to Zealandia.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the plan change is better clarified and communicated and that the status quo remains in place</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
4	Alison McEwen	4 Paisley Terrace, Karori, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area</p> <p>The site is within a recreational and residential area where business and retail development would be out of keeping with the wider area. The proposal with damage a significant part of the ecological corridor and buffer zone between Zealandia and Otari-Wilton Bush. These are important ecological and tourist resources, funded by a large amount of rate-payer money. Potentially there will be significant impacts on the local community (light and noise pollution, dust, increased traffic and parking difficulties. Council should enhance recreational opportunities in the area.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>Retain the site as an Outer Residential and Open Space zone.</p>			
5	Madeleine McAlister	133 Karori Road, Karori, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter supports the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>Karori requires some quality retail outlets. There would be less traffic if residents didn't have to travel elsewhere to purchase anything from a spade to plants. For a large suburb its retail is third word.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That (the) change may go ahead without more delay.</p>			
6	Jane Clunies-Ross & Hamish Hill	124 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned about vegetation removal and the visibility of development on site, particularly size, density, colour, lighting and noise. The submitter is concerned about the negative effect any development would have on the resale value of the street and their property. The submitter is very concerned about traffic safety, including safe access to the nearby childcare facility, increased traffic and traffic noise. The submitter is concerned about the impact on local birdlife, the glowworm colony and seepage wetlands and ecological corridor. The submitter does not consider that the site is fit for business purposes, particularly because there is little foot traffic in the area. There are already nearby shopping Centres available. The site would be better developed for a sporting area.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>Did not state.</p>			
7	Ian Appleton	21 Campbell Street, Karori, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Housing affordability:</i> The submitter queries the need for more commercial or retail premises in Wellington, stating there are many vacant shops and offices. This suggests to the submitter that there is an excess of commercial and retail premises and we don't need any more. The submitter questions that there is no demand for housing on the site. Central government is struggling with the lack of affordable housing. Given the site is already zoned for housing, the best use for the site is affordable housing. The submitter questions whether the presence of overhead power lines make the site unsuitable for housing, especially as the Council has allowed a child care facility to be built on site. If it is ok for a child care centre, surely it is ok for affordable housing.</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> The submitter refers to employment and manufacturing statistics, stating that Karori has seen</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>minimal movement on retail employment. The submitter considers employment, distribution needs and industrial activities are better located on the northern fringe of the city. The submitter considers new retail activities would be best located in Karori Town Centre and areas of future residential growth. The proposal would introduce a "drive to" node, with lower quality tenancies that would be quickly abandoned when better premises became available in Karori or Marsden Village. A mix of small scale industrial activity, commercial/service activity and retail would be better than a single large scale operation. The Northland shops are totally ignored in the economic assessment.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The submitter raises concern with traffic delays, vehicle maneuvering, car parking and road safety discussed in the traffic report.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The submitter raises concern about the potential built development impact on birdlife and flight paths out of Zealandia. Zealandia should be consulted.</p> <p>The submitter notes that archeological remains are unknown.</p> <p>The submitter has concerns that the Council may not have in place ways and means of ensuring compliance with its laudable objectives and policies.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the proposed district plan change does not proceed</p>			
8	Michael Gibson	7 Putnam Street, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area because of the deficiencies and the way in which Council has conducted itself with regard to the site.</p> <p>The submitter considers that it is hypocritical to approve an adjoining childcare centre but now discourage other childcare centres and residential activities because of "reverse sensitivity" issues in the proposed plan change.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The submitter raises concern that development of the site will impact on ecological values. The submitter refers to the significance of the ecological corridor, the regional significance of the Kaiwharawhara Stream valley and impact of increased stormwater discharge, access to and preservation of the glow-worms and seepage wetlands being impacted on.</p> <p><i>Landscape:</i> The site has strong landscape and visual links. Management of visual effects should preclude large single level and monolithic buildings and limits on vegetation removal to the western boundary of the site and adherence with the NPSET guidelines on electricity transmission. The submitter notes that the site is adjacent to a recreational walkway and its northern end is highly visible. The submitter suggests earthworks within 10m of the western boundary be a controlled activity and vegetation removal be permitted so long as replacement native species are planted within 6 months.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The submitter considers the traffic-flow assessment was conducted over a very short period and that the full traffic implications have not been properly identified. The traffic report excludes the impact of Northland traffic. The submitter refers to statistical information regarding the location of bus stops, road widths and traffic flows and potential traffic generation. Development of the area would see traffic waiting times at intersections deteriorate, impact on safe on-street parking and safe turning of semi-trailer vehicles.</p> <p><i>Process:</i> The submitter appends an email chain which he considers demonstrates Council officer bias in their approach to this matter and the level of competence of elected members.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>Did not state.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
9	Michael Gibson	7 Putnam Street, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area and seeks that it be rejected immediately.</p> <p><i>Process:</i> The submitter considers that the Council's (Strategy and Policy) Committee was prejudiced in its decision making by instructing officers that the site should be "Business 2". This was based on an inadequate s32 report on a previous attempt to alter the zone. The public were excluded from the debate and advice at that Committee meeting which was unjustified. Inevitably the "Business 2" resolution was prejudiced which flowed on to the instructions to those who were employed to write specialist reports (for Plan Change 77).</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the proposal is declined on procedural grounds.</p>			
10	Margery Renwick	197B Glenmore Street, Kelburn, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The submitter raises environmental concerns with the Plan Change. It is ironic that Council has signposted the Sanctuary to Sea Walkway but now wishes to rezone the area for commercial uses. While the walkway may be preserved, the impact of business activities will detract from the nature of the walkway. The area should be planted in native trees in an attempt to restore it to its original condition. At the very least and wide buffer zone should be planted.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>Did not state.</p>			
11	Pauline and Athol Swann	47 Mairangi Road, Wadestown, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The submitter is concerned about permitted vegetation removal and its impact on the residential, landscape and Kaiwharawhara Stream. The area is full of native flora and fauna and in a flight path for Kaka (Objectives 35.2.1.1 - 5). The site adjoins a significant ecological corridor. Effective protection of the wetlands would require an extension of the buffer vegetation within the site (Objective 35.2.3).</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> The submitter does not consider there is a need for commercial activities, especially as Crofton Downs and its services are located nearby (Objective 35.2.2). Industrial activities are better located on the northern fringe of the city not in a prime ecological zone</p> <p><i>Landscape:</i> The site has strong landscape and visual links to the wider open space network. It is also adjacent to a recreational walkway. Management of visual effects would preclude large structures. Large earthworks would have adverse run-off effects on the Kaiwharawhara Stream.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The site has little of no ability to safely provide on street parking. Development of the site would require mitigation works at intersections. Limiting the size of development may be more effective. The submitter notes the very popular John Galloway Park, Skateboard park, Wilton and Cardinal McKeefy Schools and Otari bowling club and considers the presence of large service trucks in the area a frightening scenario.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>Did not state.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
12	Anne & Gordon Somerville	6 Curtis Street, Northland, Wellington 6012	
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> the submitter considers the area integral to the local ecological corridor. The western and northern boundaries of the site should exclude all if the primary native forest and buffer vegetation ensuring the survival of ecological values in the area.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The submitters has lived in Curtis Street for some 35 years and have noted the increase in number and type of vehicular traffic (notably articulated lorries & buses). Curtis St is already struggling to cope the load and service pipes under this road require frequent repair due to the damage by heavy traffic as well as damage to the submitters own property boundary. The intersection at Curtis St/Chaytor St. is dangerous. Not included in the transport report is the number of frequent bumps/dents/head & tail lamp breakages that occur. These can be expected to increase in number and severity with proposed DPC 77. Provision for improved safety of pedestrians and on-site parking will be required given the expected increase in traffic.</p> <p><i>Geotechnical:</i> The submitter questions possible inaccuracies in the geotechnical report.</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> Commercial activity in the area this should not be at the expense of current businesses in the surrounding areas of Kelburn, Northland, Standen St, Mrsden Village & Karori central. Karori residents tend to leave the suburb for school/work/shopping. Any commercial enterprise therefore will need to generate its own market need to ensure financial viability.</p> <p><i>Noise:</i> Sound carries a considerable distance in this area; therefore sound levels for the rezoned site should be set at the current residential levels.</p> <p><i>Electricity transmission lines:</i> The “buffer corridor” either side of the centreline of the transmission lines is a prudent exclusion zone and should be adhered to (i.e excluding buildings).</p> <p><i>Cost:</i> The financial cost of rezoning this area including replanting, site development, traffic mitigation, increased maintenance of roading and slips will be borne by rate payers – not the individual decision-makers at WCC. Ultimately, any ecological cost will be felt by generations to come.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>To give effect to WCC existing plan for the valley as a site within WCC controlled open space to enhance the ecological corridor as indicated in future initiatives of Wellington Outer Greenbelt Management Plan May 2004.</p> <p>To change permissible development on the site to include lower thresholds for footprints for retail, commercial and all buildings along with signage, earthworks, noise & lighting</p>			
13	John Boshier	68 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Electricity transmission lines:</i> Section 36.6 (j) and 36.7 (i): There is a double circuit 110 kV transmission line directly above 55 – 85 Curtis Street. These lines carry high voltage electricity from the main 220 kV substation at Wilton to Central Park, and are operated by Transpower NZ. The latter is the grid supply point for the southern CBD and south Wellington. Loss of supply at Central Park causes widespread power failure in the city. The Transmission Line Buffer Corridors report (published by Transpower September 2012) has a clear policy and Code of Practice opposing earthworks and construction of new buildings directly under transmission lines. The submitter provides detailed reasons for this including: security of electricity supply,</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>safety of the public, electromagnetic field radiation (EMR) and access to the transmission infrastructure. For these reasons, Transpower has a clear policy on transmission line buffer zones (including 12m red zone buffer and 20-25m green zone buffer).</p> <p>The submitter refers to NZECP34:2001 which is a mandatory code of practice which sets minimum safe distances from transmission lines to protect persons, property, vehicles and mobile plant from harm or damage from electrical hazards. The Code establishes clearance distances to buildings and structures, the ground, and other lines, as well as how close buildings, structures and excavations can occur to poles and towers.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern that as the transmission corridor is not designated that Councils position is the Transpower guidelines need not be adhered to. This is neither appropriate nor responsible on the part of the consent-granting authority and Council should adhere to Transpower's guidance on transmission corridors. If Council does not take all reasonable steps to protect the public from electrical hazards, it exposes itself to liability of litigation from persons who are affected or who believe they have been affected by the hazard.</p> <p>New large-scale landfill and buildings must not be built directly under transmission lines. If new buildings are contemplated in the Curtis Street Business Area, they should be small scale and must not intrude into the red zone, e.g. two rows of buildings 12 metres on each side of the transmission lines.</p> <p><i>Noise:</i> Section 36.6 (n): The report entitled Noise Advice is disappointingly superficial. The advice is flawed because it appraises the Creswick Valley as it is at present; not as it might be if it were a Business Area. It does not assess the likely outcomes of any development. Sound propagates across the valley due to its steep sides and on calm days, traffic noise is audible in Creswick Terrace and Paisley Terrace. This noise effect is also very dependent on wind speed.</p> <p>A noise impact analysis of the proposed development would examine: traffic flow, vegetation clearance, operational noise, reflective surfaces. The amphitheatre effect and environmental outcomes will be unfavorable and almost certainly detrimental to the surrounding residents.</p> <p>The provisions of 36.6 (n) 'Noise' are satisfactory as they impose limits. The Activities Standards must better specify the allowable activities in approving the design of the (business) Park. The submitter recommends that Council ensure in DPC77 that the buildings and paved areas be small in size and that vegetation be maximised in order to limit the increase in noise propagation to surrounding residents. The Plan Change should not be approved until an expert assessment of the noise effects of the Business Park under these assumptions is completed.</p> <p><i>Previous use of the site:</i> Section 32 (3.1): The owner/developer and the Council have both cited previous use as a precedent for the present proposal to change the zoning. The submitter considers the Section 32 report is deficient because: it does not describe the size and scale of these activities; it does not specify when the listed activities were carried out or ceased; it does not comment on whether the activities were a legal use of the land. This is misleading and needs to be corrected. The submitter describes the use of the site from 1975, including Council depot traffic, a recycling centre. It cannot be said that the site was 'industrial'.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That District Plan Change 77 be declined. If DPC77 is not declined, the submitter seeks that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council to fully comply with Transmission Line Buffer Corridors, September 2012 in DPC77. The implications are that any application for a large-scale landfill and building would be declined and that smaller buildings to each side of the transmission corridor might be approved. There would be a 24 metre corridor between the buildings under the transmission line, which would effectively be a road or access way. 			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council to ensure in DPC77 that the buildings and paved areas be small in size and that vegetation be maximised in order to limit the increase in noise propagation to surrounding residents. The Plan Change should not be approved until an expert assessment of the noise effects of the Business Park under these assumptions is completed • Council to agree that that Section 32 (3.1) of Plan Change 77 be disregarded in respect of the previous use of the site. 			
14	Jennifer Boshier	68 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The submitter notes the indigenous first remnant and ecological corridor identified in the Ecological Assessment. The indigenous vegetation on site is of critical importance in maintaining the integrity of the whole corridor. It has been functioning as an ecological corridor for native birds for the past 40 years, with its importance increasing with the creation of Zealandia. The ecological integrity of the corridor could be lost if the site was development or earth worked on its western boundary. The buffer vegetation on site could be improved to provide connectivity with the corridor.</p> <p><i>Landscape:</i> Vegetation removal is fundamentally at odds with maintaining the biodiversity values of the western escarpment. The submitter wishes to see that the principle of open space over built form should be used for 55-85 Curtis St.</p> <p><i>Economic:</i> Kelburn Shopping Centre should also be assessed. Dimensions of social wellbeing that will be increased are not discussed. An economic analysis is not the same as a social impact report and the therefore the s32 report is deficient in this regard.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The Curtis St and Creswick Terrace intersection (with its topography and lack of visibility) is a hazard has been omitted from the transportation report. There is no discussion on the cumulative traffic effects generated from the childcare centre and likely development. Re-routed traffic via local roads is not realistic.</p> <p><i>Purpose of the District Plan:</i> It is unclear how the objectives of the district plan will be implemented in PC77. This includes maintaining and enhancing values (buildings do not add to the amenity of the area), efficient use of resources (conflicts within existing suburban centre investment), avoiding hazards (high voltage lines implications), accessibility (the creation of new driving patterns for shopping) open space and natural features (removal of Open Space B).</p> <p><i>Rationalisation of zoning.</i> The submitter questions how widely held is the view that the existing zoning does not reflect the likely use of the land and the "legitimate expectation" of the land owner to develop the land. The existing zoning sets out the "legitimate expectations" about land use on this site. It was presumably a considered judgment by Council about the sustainable use of the land.</p> <p>The submitter has lived in the area since 1974. To describe the use of the land as industrial is not accurate.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That PC77 is declined as it is inconsistent with the key objectives of the District Plan and the s32 report is deficient. If the plan change is not declined, the submitter seeks the following: delete Policy 35.2.1.5, amend Objectives 35.2.2 and 35.2.3, amend Policies 35.2.3.1 and 35.2.3.3, delete policy 35.2.3.4, amend policy 35.2.3.5, insert a new policy to protect and enhance the ecological corridor and amend Objective 35.2.4.</p>			
15	Peter Henderson	78 Homebush Road, Khandallah, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>The Open Space B land should retain its current protective zoning. As an alternative, a "land swap" whereby an area equivalent to that which is currently zoned Open Space B be located elsewhere on the site, such as the western boundary. The reason for this is that Open Space B land facilitates the development and protection of ecological corridors, the Curtis Street site is a linkage in a chain of ecologically significant sites.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the Capital Coast Health v Wellington City Council decision and notes that the site was acquired from the Council as Open Space B, the underlying zoning has been rightfully transferred and Council has the right to give regard to the provisions of the District Plan over private property rights.</p> <p>The landowner should accept limitations on the rights of development when weighed against a greater public good of retaining and developing a significant link in an ecological corridor. Other Open Space land in the area is not an acceptable reason to disregard the Curtis St site. The retention of the zoning will alleviate the loss of the ecological values in the area, especially as further residential development in the area proceeds.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>To retain the integrity of the city's ecological corridor network. Any change that is made to PC77 must not reduce the area of land that is currently zoned Open Space B on site.</p>			
16	Angela Mansell & Antony Walker	149 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Earthquake Hazard:</i> 55-85 Curtis St is highly vulnerable to flooding following an earthquake because of active Wellington Fault runs directly through the Karori Reservoir. This RMA issue is not addressed in the Section 32 report and has not been used to inform consideration of the disadvantages, costs and risks of the proposed rezoning.</p> <p><i>Noise:</i> The submitter strongly disagrees with the statement in the Noise technical report that "there is no amphitheatre effect in this area". The submitter has already experiences construction noise from the childcare centre. No detailed information concerning the "noise surveys that have been undertaken in this general locality" is provided. Noise levels at the site should not exceed that for residential areas.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> There are already significant and hazardous parking and traffic volume pressures along Curtis St. There should restrictions on activities that generate increased traffic volume and greater parking provision on the site. Additionally, public access to the City to Sea walkway needs to be maintained.</p> <p><i>Electricity transmission lines:</i> The proposed Plan Change should comply with Transpower's Transmission Line Buffer Corridors Policy and ensure that there are no structures or buildings built under a 12 metre red zone either side of centre line of the transmission lines</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>To give effect to Council's existing plan for this valley for the site to be within Council controlled open space to enhance the ecological corridor as indicated in future initiatives of the Wellington outer green belt management plan May 2004 and because of the flood risk of the site following an earthquake; and</p> <p>That the permissible development on the site be changed accordingly with lower thresholds for footprints for retail, commercial and all buildings along with signage, earthworks, noise and lighting.</p>			
17	Jennifer & Michael Holmes	24 Randwick Road, Northland, Wellington 6012	No

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> The proposed re-zoning of 55 to 85 Curtis Street is based largely on economic factors, specifically the perceived increased demand for commercial activity and commercial-use land in Wellington's western suburbs. The economic report is Karori-centric, excludes neighbouring Centres such as Crofton Downs, Northland and Johnsonville. It does not give an overall view of commercial activity demand versus supply for the western suburbs as a whole. An analysis of the commercial-use proposals for the Curtis Street site over the last 15 years seems to be missing. The submitter questions the validity of the economic conclusions drawn.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The transport assessment and its conclusions are misleading and unfit for purpose. The scope of the study is too narrow to accurately represent the traffic implications of the proposed re-zoning. It covers Chaytor and Curtis Streets and Old Karori and Whitehead Roads only and excludes other key roads (likely routes / "rat-runs" to and from the site) in the vicinity, such as Randwick Road and Creswick Terrace. The potential impacts of increases in traffic volumes and of heavy-vehicle traffic on this road should be reassessed. The submitters cite many examples of where they consider much of the data on which the underlying analyses are based are out-of-date and/or incomplete.</p> <p><i>Other:</i> The rationalisation of zoning section refers to there being a legitimate expectation on the part of the landowner that the site can be developed. On what basis is this expectation deemed legitimate?</p> <p>Why is Plan Change 73 still subject to Environment Court appeals? Should the appeals process not be allowed to run its course before any further work on and decisions about the re-zoning of this site?</p> <p>The proposal to re-zone the site seems at odds with the recent development of a childcare facility next door.</p> <p>The submitters raise concern with a number of the plan change provisions, including Section 3.10 Definitions (currently incomplete and should include further definitions), Section 35.2: Provisions (the word "require" would seem more appropriate that "ensure" for many of the provisions), Objective 35.2.1 (amend explanation), Objective 35.2.2 (reference should be made to "ensuring the adverse impacts on the surrounding community are minimised"), Objective 35.2.4 (explanation on notification), Rule 36.3(a) (review), Rules 36.3(b) to (d) (should explicitly list noise), Rule 36.4 (require a noise assessment), 36.6(e) (amend final bullet point), Rule 36.6(o)i (clarify acronym HFSP) and Rule 36.6(o)ii to v: (reference to LPG?).</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>Commission the following before proceeding with the next steps in the Plan Change Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • further economic analysis to validate or otherwise the perceived increase in demand for commercial activity in the western suburbs • an additional and wider-scoped transport assessment to fully determine the potential impacts on the surrounding road network. Specifically, the scope to include Randwick Road and Creswick Terrace, and other likely 'rat-runs'. • a full impact versus benefits analysis of the proposed rezoning of the Curtis Street site, incorporating the above assessments. 			
18	Mark Casson & Patricia James	28 Cressick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter supports those aspects of the plan change that recognise the unique setting of the site and provide protection for residents in terms of light, noise and traffic.</p> <p><i>Noise/Lighting:</i> Many surrounding residents' homes have a "direct line of sight" for noise. All noise levels, including any fixed plant noise and external ventilation systems machinery, should not exceed that set for</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>residential areas. A general limit of 8 lux across the whole site should not be exceeded to ensure the surrounding residents; green areas and wildlife habitat are not adversely affected.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The concept plan should include specific provisions for entry and exit to the site and greater parking provision to recognise the narrow character of Curtis Street and immediate neighbouring streets. Consideration should be given to the placement of traffic lights or one or more pedestrian crossings.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council revisits all noise levels, including any fixed plant noise and external ventilation systems machinery so that do not exceed that set for residential areas. Provide more screening and limits on lighting to protect resident's privacy, the glow worm colonies and buffer planting and regenerating areas on the fringes of the site.</p> <p>That Council revisit the entry and exit provisions to/from the site, traffic feeding back into Chaytor and Whitehead Rd and pedestrian movements to the site from Curtis Street, Whitehead Rd and Chaytor Street</p>			
19	Kristin Gibson	7 Putnam Street, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The present Residential & Open Space zoning were emphasised to the purchaser when the Council sold the land. There is now a covenant preventing supermarkets and this should remain. I do not think that the public would have been asked to comment on rules about supermarkets if there had been a report telling the Mayor and Councillors about the covenant (the submitter notes a news article relating to supermarkets). The ecological and other values of the land would be ruined if commercial or industrial zoning was permitted.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the status quo at 55-85 Curtis Street remains.</p>			
20	Sean Thompson	3a Sydenham Street, Northland, Wellington 6012	Did not state
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The present Residential & Open Space zoning were emphasised to the purchaser when the Council sold the land. There is now a covenant preventing supermarkets and this should remain. I do not think that the public would have been asked to comment on rules about supermarkets if there had been a report telling the Mayor and Councillors about the covenant (the submitter notes a news article relating to supermarkets). The ecological and other values of the land would be ruined if commercial or industrial zoning was permitted.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the status quo at 55-85 Curtis Street remains.</p>			
21	Imogen Thompson	3a Sydenham Street, Northland, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The present Residential & Open Space zoning were emphasised to the purchaser when the Council sold the land. There is now a covenant preventing supermarkets and this should remain. I do not think that the public would have been asked to comment on rules about supermarkets if there had been a report telling the Mayor and Councillors about the covenant (the submitter notes a news article relating to supermarkets). The ecological and other values of the land would be ruined if commercial or industrial zoning was</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>permitted.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the status quo at 55-85 Curtis Street remains.</p>			
22	Ryan O'Donnell & Amanda Oliver	11 Curtis Street, Karori, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> Curtis Street already struggles with existing road use against residential parking and road width. The submitter has serious concerns regarding road user safety as traffic congestion increases. Consideration also needs to be made for the on-flow effects of the child care centre. The Concept Plan should include specific provisions for the safe entry and exit to the site.</p> <p><i>Noise/Lighting:</i> Better consideration to lighting levels must be given than the generally applied limit of 8 lux. More consideration needs to be given for screening, privacy impacts on residents and preservation of the glow worms and surrounding wildlife. Provision should be made to ensure construction and operating noise does not exceed those currently set out for residential areas.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> Flora, fauna and waterways need better protection, and measures must be put in place to protect seepage into the neighbouring wetlands and Kaiwharawhara stream. Ensure that the biodiversity plan is considered and enforced for all future development proposals.</p> <p><i>Electricity transmission lines:</i> Council acknowledge and honor Transpower Policy on a 12m buffer..</p> <p><i>Concept Plan:</i> A Concept Plan should not only be mandatory, but also publicly notifiable.</p> <p><i>Rationalisation of zoning:</i> The submitter did find mention of a zoning change from Outer Residential to Business 2 in Council documents when purchasing their property. The character and heart of the valley will be irrevocably altered and with serious consequence should Industrial activity be engaged. The plan change is underhand and predetermined and Council is acting largely without concern or interest in how the residents feel. Sensible restrictions on floor plans and monolithic structure should included to ensure the primary role of the neighbourhood – that is, residentially zoned for homes, is maintained</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>In addition to the above, Council restrict permissible development on site to those developments with a footprint reasonable to neighbouring residents, additionally applying restriction on earthworks, signage, noise and associated commercial branding.</p>			
23	Trelissick Park Group	Attn: Peter Reimann 51 Heke Street, Ngaio, Wellington 6035	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> This site adjoins a significant ecological corridor for flora and bird/insect/stream life. Any development could affect the ecology of the whole Kaiwharawhara Stream valley. The vegetation within the corridor along the Kaiwharawhara Stream valley is regionally significant, as are the Kaiwharawhara Stream itself, the seepage wetlands above the site (with glow-worm community) and the buffer vegetation that extends into the site.</p> <p>The Plan Change does not take sufficient notice of the mitigation recommendations in the ecology report and should do so.</p> <p>The development presents a great opportunity for Council to showcase a “green” Business Area, in the spirit of its "Our Living City" project.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>The submitters raise concern about the cumulative effect of fast stormwater run-off during heavy rainfall from hard surfaces such as roofs, driveways and car parks on the Kaiwharawhara stream. In addition to the recommendations in the Landscape report, a wetland area, planted with native grasses, sedges and rushes, would also help slow/absorb stormwater before discharge into the Kaiwharawhara Stream and enhance the attractiveness of the area.</p> <p>The submitters experience with other developments has demonstrated lax monitoring during the work and subsequently, by Council officers. They suggest that a section be added covering periodic inspection, then sign-off at completion by a Council officer, certifying compliance with the resource consent conditions.</p> <p>The submitter suggests detailed amendments to the plan change provisions, including Rule 35.1 (amend), Rules 35.2.3.3 and 35.2.3.7 (replace with submitters suggestion), Rule 36.6 (f) (amend and include a new items iv and v based on recommendations in the Ecology Report), add a new Rule 36.6 (p) "Stormwater" and Rule 36.7 (amend Assessment Criteria).</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That greater recognition is given to the above points.</p>			
24	Sarah Holden	18 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Rationalisation of zoning:</i> The Section 32 report contains a number of errors. When the site was sold by the council in 1998 it was made clear that potential purchasers should submit tenders that were in keeping with existing zoning. The Council has acted with a large degree of bias towards the zoning of the site and has appeared to discount options for promoting recreational facilities for the site. The Section 32 report does not provide clear evidence of a need to provide for increased commercial activity and does not properly address the impact on other suburban centres. The Section 32 Report promotes rationalisation of zoning entirely on the basis of economic use of the site, without consideration of residential amenity, landscape character or ecological values. It provides no evidence to support an increase community social well-being.</p> <p><i>Noise/lighting:</i> Noise pollution from the site will be inevitable. Therefore all noise levels, including fixed plant noise, should not exceed that set for residential areas. Lighting levels for the site should not exceed that of outer residential areas. More requirements for screening and limits on lighting are needed to protect the glow worm colonies and buffer planting and regenerating areas on the fringes of the site, including the assurance that levels do not detract from the character of the open space or of the ecological corridor.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The plan should include adequate provision for maintaining public access to the City to Sea walkway and for walking and cycle access. The traffic plan should take into account implications for increased traffic through Creswick Terrace (a difficult road to navigate). Extra congestion on Curtis St will increase traffic through Northland, with knock on effects for residents. Restrictions should be placed on activities that generate significant increases in traffic volume and parking, beyond that previously incurred by the former Karori Garden Centre.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> More provisions should be put in place to protect the seepage wetlands and buffer vegetation (regionally significant). The plan change should maintain the ecological corridor connecting the near-contiguous green belt of open space within the valley of the Kaiwharawhara Stream. The plan change does not account for an increase the area of impervious surface on the site, would have implications for run-off through the culvert into the Kaiwharawhara Stream. There are insufficient protections for soil removal and site works. Soil should be assessed for contamination with any application for resource consent for earthworks. The plan change should identify the scale and intensity of development that is unacceptable on this site.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p><i>Economics:</i> The Section 32 Report Economic Impact assessment does not provide adequate analysis of the likely impact on existing Centres – specifically Northland, Marsden Village and Karori – of development of a new Business Area on this site.</p> <p><i>Concept plan:</i> The submitter would like to see a Concept Plan be developed for the site. This plan should be obligatory and publicly notified. Failure to require a comprehensive Concept Plan for development of the site opens the possibility for incremental development to achieve a gross floor area significantly greater than 500m² without being subject to proper controls.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council withdraws the proposed District Plan Change 77 providing for increased commercial activity in the western suburbs until any need for such provision not already provided by DPC73 has been demonstrated. Council give effect to Council’s existing plan for this valley, namely to enhance the ecological corridor, as indicated in “future initiatives” of the Wellington Outer Green Belt Management Plan May 2004.</p> <p>If the DPC 77 is not withdrawn, any new zone for the site should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide specific rules to control the permissible development on the site to protect and maintain the existing vegetation on the western and eastern boundaries and to control the permissible development on the site to avoid any increase in volume, velocity, contaminant load or temperature of stormwater entering Kaiwharawhara Stream from the site. • Ensure that all noise levels, including fixed plant noise, should not exceed that set for residential areas. • Limit lighting to be in keeping with levels that do not detract from the character of the open space or of the ecological corridor adjacent to the site. Lighting levels for the site should not exceed that of outer residential areas. • Place restrictions on activities that generate significant increases in traffic volume and parking, beyond that previously incurred by the former Kaori Garden Centre. Note that the child care centre will significantly increase traffic on the site. • Provide adequate provision for maintaining public access to the City to Sea walkway and for walking and cycle access to and past the site, and for parking for existing approved activities in Old Karori Road once the child care centre is fully operational • Ensure soil be assessed for contamination with any application for a resource consent for earthworks. • Identify the scale and intensity of development that is unacceptable on this site. • Require a mandatory and publically notified comprehensive concept plan for the site. 			
25	Jitesh Patel	59 Northland Road, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Process:</i> The Section 32 report makes several erroneous and misleading assumptions about development of the site. When the site was sold by the council in 1998 the new owners were aware of the existing zoning. The Council has acted with a large degree of predetermination towards the zoning of the site, instructing Council Officers to prepare for a Business 2 zoning in May 2012. Councils notification photo was designed to present an image of an abandoned site with little environmental or community value. The Curtis Street Business Area is introduced as being to provide for increased commercial activity in the western suburbs. It would be inappropriate to introduce new provisions when adequate provision might already exist in DPC73 while DPC73 is still subject to appeal.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p><i>Transport:</i> The assessment has been arbitrarily limited to only a few intersections and specifically excludes five intersections likely to have more than minor adverse effects from the proposal. The proposal would increase significantly the area of impervious surface on the site (on-site parking provision) immediately adjacent to the culvert of the Kaiwharawhara Stream. Provisions made for restrictions on activities that generate increased traffic volume and parking demand appear inadequate. There will be traffic increase in Randwick Road & Farm Road</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> DPC77 does not recognise or implement the ecological corridor and the contiguous green belt of open space within the valley of the Kaiwharawhara Stream. There is no mention of Outer Green Belt Management Plan or the Biodiversity Action Plan 2007. DPC77 provides insufficient protections for soil removal and site works, given the high likelihood of contaminated soil already on site. There is no specific requirement for a soil assessment for contamination to be provided with any application for resource consent for earthworks, despite the known history of the site. Specific restrictions on discharges that could impact on the Kaiwharawhara Stream are insufficient</p> <p><i>Electricity transmission lines:</i> Transpower's Transmission Line Buffer Corridors Policy (September 2012) should apply. No consideration has been given to potential EMF exposure of employees engaged in commercial activities on the site beneath the transmission lines.</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> The economic impact assessment is deficient in that it does not provide analysis of the likely impact on existing Centres – specifically Northland, Marsden Village and Karori – of development of a new Business Area on this site. The encouragement of multiple business uses on the site does not address possible displacement of existing businesses within nearby Centres and therefore the impact on the viability of those Centres. The plan change does not provide sufficient controls on activities to avoid adverse effects on the wider landscape and nearby residential areas. There is no signal within the objectives, policies and rules as to what scale and intensity of development is unacceptable on this site.</p> <p><i>Concept Plan:</i> This should be both obligatory and publicly notified.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council withdraws proposed District Plan Change 77 providing for increased commercial activity in the western suburbs until any need for such provision not already provided by DPC73 has been demonstrated.</p> <p>Give effect to Council's existing plan for this valley for the site to be within Council controlled open space to enhance the ecological corridor as indicated in "future initiatives" of the Wellington Outer Green Belt Management Plan May 2004</p> <p>Provide specific rules to control the permissible development on the site to protect and maintain the existing vegetation on the western and eastern boundaries;</p> <p>Provide specific rules to control the permissible development on the site to protect and maintain a clear corridor beneath the high voltage transmission lines.</p>			
26	Maurice Moore	141 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The premise of changing the Curtis Street to a Business Area is fundamentally flawed. The erection large buildings on the site will have a serious effect on the ecological corridor that exists between Zealandia and Otari Wilton bush. The proposed re-zoning and anticipated construction of a large retail complex at this narrow part of the corridor will limit the extent of the wild life recovery.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>That Council withdraws the proposal to rezone the Curtis Street area. That the site is re-purchased by the Council and restored as native bush. In recognition of Sir Paul Callaghan's work in promoting the concept of ecological corridors, the area should be named after Sir Paul</p>			
27	Heather Rose Sharpes	73 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Process:</i> Council needs consider, from the outset, what the appropriate zoning of this site in this neighbourhood is. The submitter has spent considerable time and energy in seeking simple consultation in relation to this site and does not expect to have to repeatedly make similar submissions if resource consents are applied for.</p> <p><i>Noise:</i> The site sits in a natural amphitheatre. Noise from a commercial site would similarly reverberate around the valley.</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> Objective 35.2.1. The submitter does not support that there is "demonstrated demand for commercial and employment activity in Wellington's western suburbs." Local businesses in Northland are struggling to keep afloat. Rezoning for commercial purposes will simply put more pressure on already stretched businesses that are operating.</p> <p><i>Concept Plan:</i> Objective 35.2.2. A pre-approved concept plan should be compulsory.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> Objective 35.2.3. The descriptors used in these objectives and policies are largely unenforceable, especially given they only "encourage" rather than "require".</p> <p><i>Amenity:</i> Objective 35.2.4. It is hard to understand how these objectives and policies might be interpreted by the Council. The submitter uses the example of Policy 35.2.4.4 and fails to understand how the already increased traffic to and from the childcare facility will not already impose a significant adverse effect on local residential streets. The submitter also questions the purpose of Policy 35.2.4. There should be rules that prohibit activities that would be inconsistent with the character if the residential neighbourhood.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The submitter raises strong concern about the childcare centre and the impact of increased traffic on neighbouring streets, traffic safety and traffic noise.</p> <p><i>Hazardous substances:</i> Objective 35.2.10 is a curious policy given that this land lies in the flood plain if the Karori dam, on a fault line, and is formed in part on top of contaminated land.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council reconsider whether there is a convincing reason to rezone this land for commercial purposes. The rules should determine, not simply suggest, what may be built on site. Noisy activities should not take place on the site. Retain existing vegetation and glow worms on site. Consider cumulative traffic effects.</p>			
28	Cecilia Doogue	29 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The proposal would impact on the surrounding quiet, residential communities of Northland, Wilton and Karori and the flora and fauna within.</p> <p>The submitter disagreed with the noise assessment and can hear sound echoing and rising up and across this gully.</p> <p>There should be a stream flowing through the site it linking to those in Karori Sanctuary and Otari bush to allow flora and fauna flourish.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>Surrounding residents who look out over this peaceful green area don't want to listen to cars, trucks and smell the exhaust fumes nor does the childcare centre next door.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to keeping large scale development in areas which are already unsuitable for residential living, e.g. near motorways, airports and railways.</p> <p>Is the site this a flood path for Karori Reservoir? Is there an allocation for recreation and business land set aside in Karori West area?</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the site is zoned an Open Space B area and that Council repurchase the land and have it maintained in keeping with the surrounding area – Karori Wildlife Sanctuary (green corridor) to Otari. Consider walkways and cycleways through this area.</p>			
29	Briggett Ann Parkin	77 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Landscape:</i> The predominately residential area has strong visual and landscape links to the wider valley. Larger activities will dominate and detract from visual aspect of the site.</p> <p><i>Electricity transmission lines:</i> The NPSET should restrict buildings to no more than 1500m² in the transmission corridor.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> Place stronger restrictions on vegetation removal. The submitter notes the importance of the ecological corridor, glow-worms and seepage wetlands. Concern is raised over possible chemical leakage from the (former tip) site into the Kaiwharawhara Stream.</p> <p><i>Noise/Lighting/Dust:</i> The gully is a natural amphitheatre and traffic noise is audible from the submitters home. The proposal will result in noise during the construction phase as well as noisier delivery vehicles on built. In this regard, small scale businesses are more preferable than retail/supermarket or home building supply stores. Noise samples should be a prerequisite for any resource consent application. The development will result in significant dust from earthworks. Strict guidelines need to be put in place and adhered to. Lighting will have a severe effect on neighbouring properties and discourage birdlife.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> Further assessment is required relating to traffic and parking issues. The submitter refers to statistical information regarding the location of bus stops, road widths and traffic flows and potential traffic generation. Development of the area would see increased delays at intersections, increased traffic volumes on surrounding road networks and compromised traffic safety. Ensure any development includes sufficient onsite parking and impose parking restrictions in surrounding road networks.</p> <p>Include requirements regarding seismic activity on site. Include provision to allow for heritage excavation and research should any be found on site.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the plan change restricts the nature of activity to small scale commercial/industrial developments rather than retail, supermarket or home building supply outlets. Significantly extend the buffer zone to provide sufficient protection for glow-worms and birdlife. Allow for sufficient on-site parking. Ban overnight lighting</p>			
30	Geoffrey Neil Plimmer	66 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> The submitter considers the plan change has weak case for viability, meaning that economic</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>gains are unlikely to compensate for social, health and ecological losses. There are risks of a failed or marginal development being a precursor to special pleading for further changes, such as a conversion to big box retail. It creates regulatory uncertainty for other businesses, and harms confidence in the integrity of Council processes and will inhibit investment by other businesses. Concerns the submitter raises about the plan change include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor market definition and the argument that 'leakage' is a problem is unfounded. The argument being used is a misleading and overly parochial application of economics. • Provide Unsubstantiated arguments for demand and there is no justification for the forecast showing a demand in retail land (427% in 15 years) as it is inconsistent with its population and employment forecasts. • Provide Poor fit with overall retail trends including ignoring macro retail trends, such as the rise of internet shopping, big box retail and the shift to central city retail. All these undermine the viability of retail arising from the proposed plan changes. • Provide Displaced rather than new economic activity. Existing suburban centres are increasingly likely to struggle and a retail development in Curtis St would make existing businesses less viable, possibly fail itself, and likely need substantial alterations (to big box retail) to be viable. This would be counter to the City Council's policy desire to strengthen existing suburban centres. • Provide The unattractive physical features of the site will further undermine appeal as a retail destination • The 'business case' and proposed zoning changes seem biased toward the interests of the developer. This creates regulatory uncertainty for other business owners (and residents) and is likely to inhibit other economic development. Business are entitled to make decisions with confidence in the integrity of Council regulatory processes and have a legitimate expectation that zoning rules are not changed just because a particular developer wants them changed. The proposed plan change is bad for economic development. <p>Commercialisation and retail development of any form on the Curtis St site has serious viability risks, which will sheet back to WCC and local residents through poor social, economic and ecological outcomes. It will encourage a plan designed to fail, so that any development can be adapted incrementally to fit developer aspirations for big box retail.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That proposed plan change 77 is stopped.</p>			
31	Bev Abbott	40 Pembroke Road, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The Section 32 Report does not present a convincing case for commercial activity as the most efficient use of the site. Nor has it provided a robust comparison of all the available zoning options, including retention of the status quo. Open Space B is probably the most appropriate zoning for the area given its location and its physical, social and environmental characteristics.</p> <p>In the event that Council decides to proceed with the DPC 77, the submitter requests that Council makes the following adjustments to DPC 77:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 35.2.3: Create a separate objective (and planning framework) to protect ecological values. • Provide Objective 35.2.3: Amend explanation to include wetland seepage, glow worm colony and indigenous fauna. Add new policy to specifically focus on the wetland seepage and glow worm colony on Old Karori Road. • New Standard 36.6 (g): Add a new standard specifying low light levels. • Policy 35.2.3.3: Split policy into two separate policies and include both under the new ecological objective. 			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>Policies would ensure protection of trees and vegetation on the western boundary of the site and encourage retention of trees and vegetation within the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule 36.1 (i): Amend so that vegetation removal is a controlled activity (as opposed to permitted). Develop a standalone standard for vegetation removal. • Policy 35.2.3.4: Amend policy to focus on using similar species and patterns of replacement planting within the site, particularly the western boundary. • Policy 35.2.3.7: Rewrite to provide additional protection for the Kaiwharawhara Stream, including replacing the term "encourage" with "ensure". • Standard 36.7 (e) introduce additional standards to protect the Kaiwharawhara Stream i.e. ratios for hard to permeable surfaces. • Objective 35.2.3 and 35.2.4: Shift policies 35.2.3.1, 35.2.3.2 and 35.2.3.5 to Objective 35.2.4 to cater for residential character, landscape and amenity issues. • Policy 35.2.6.3: Provide clear guidance about the implications of the high voltage transmission lines (with this in mind review Rules section). • Policy 35.3.9.1: Rewrite policy so that it becomes easier to identify the standards required to reinforce this policy. • Section 36.6 (g): incorporate a natural light standard. • Objective 35.2.1: Amend explanation to explain rationale for giving preference to commercial activities over other activities. • Objective 35.2.1: Expand explanation to explain how facilitating commercial activity in the Curtis Street Business Area will assist in meeting the social needs of people in Northland, Karori and Wilton, and the wider city. Add one or more policies to enable decision-makers to give a higher weighting to activities that contribute to meeting the social and economic needs of people living near the site or in the wider city than to activities that contribute only to the economic wellbeing of people with a direct financial interest in commercial activities in the site. • Objective 35.2.1: Clarify when residential activity is appropriate (i.e. ancillary to a commercial activity) and when short-stay visitors (i.e. campervans) is appropriate. • Policy 35.2.1.5: Delete the word "large". The current policies do nothing to protect the viability of smaller Centres. • Objective 35.2.2: Ensure the policy framework, rules and standards reinforce Council's commitment to encouraging alternative transport nodes. • Policies 35.2.2.2 and/or 35.2.2.3: Amend to reinforce the site can allow for temporary activities without breaching transport and parking standards. • 35.3 Methods: Refer to the Biodiversity Action Plan 2007, the Outer Town Belt Management Plan, the Open Spaces Framework and National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission. • Rules 36.3: provide opportunities to influence the size or any buildings greater than 500m2. • Section 35.1 Introduction: Amend to include more information about the sale of this site, zoning and lessons learned. <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council retains the current mixed zoning pending preparation of Section 32 Report that compares all available zoning options. In the event that Council decides to proceed with the SPC 77, the submitter requests that Council makes amendments as outlined in their submission.</p>			
32	Rodney John Lewington	4 Highbury Crescent, Northland, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The submitter sees a need to retain and enhance the green corridor between The Karori Sanctuary</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>and Otari Wilton's Bush and refers to the Outer Green Belt Management Plan (May 2004) which would have this part of the valley under Council control as an open space and as part of the ecological corridor. The plan change should refer to the Council's biodiversity plans and protect the seepage wetlands and glow worm colony and the Kaiwharawhara Stream.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> Should the plan change proceed, it needs to include specific provisions for entry and exit to the site so as to avoid delaying through traffic on Curtis Street and to maintain public access to the City to Sea Walkway. Parking should be provided to avoid parking on nearby side streets. Presumably parking on Curtis Street and Whitehead Road would not be permitted. The plan change needs to address the interaction between the kindergarten and other uses in that part of the valley.</p> <p><i>Concept Plan:</i> The concept plan should be obligatory and publicly notified.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council implement its existing Outer Green Belt Management Plan so that the site is Council controlled (open space) and part of the ecological corridor. Failing this, amend the plan change in line with the submission points. These should be included in "essence of the plan" so that they become non-negotiable in the event of any future development on the site.</p>			
33	Marsden Village Association	146a Karori Road, Karori, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Rationalisation of zoning:</i> The Association does not consider that there would be of benefit to the community if the site was developed for commercial activity. They strongly assert that there has not been appropriate canvassing of options other than opting for preparing a case for Business 2 zoning. There is comparative analysis of the value to the local community, and Wellington as a whole, of creating an attractive open space "green area" that would additionally support the ecological corridor for bird life between Zealandia and Otari. There has not been adequate consideration against other initiatives that have recently received consent and are progressing.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The Association is concerned that inadequate research has been done as to the possible congestion of traffic, including potential delays to traffic using the surrounding roads and the impacts for the intersection of Curtis Street and Chaytor Street. The submitter raises concern about the Child Care Centre with and consider that it is quite unrealistic to say that is a completely separate matter and not relevant to this proposal. Access is limited, especially for delivery vehicles and the areas is not currently serviced by regular public transport.</p> <p><i>Electricity transmission lines:</i> The plan change should comply with Transpower's Transmission Line Buffer Corridors Policy (no structures or buildings built within a 12 metre red zone either side of the centre line of the transmission lines).</p> <p><i>Concept Plan:</i> The Concept Plan should be obligatory and publically notified.</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> The plan change is missing detailed analysis on the economic impact of on existing Centres – especially Marsden Village, Standen Street and Karori Mall. There is no indication of what steps might be taken to ensure that proposed commercial uses do not impact adversely on the existing centres or that future commercial enterprises are other than those currently found in the existing Centres and /or involve new products and services that will add significant net benefit to both this locality and the greater Wellington area.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council implement its existing Outer Green Belt Management Plan so that the site is Council controlled (open space) and part of the ecological corridor and that any permissible development on the site should be</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
with significantly lower thresholds for footprints of buildings and that the necessary steps are taken to mitigate the expected traffic congestion that would inevitably ensue.			
34	Ian Stockwell	2 Paisley Terrace, Karori, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> The economic assessment report displays a naïve approach with its statement that while overall net employment has dropped 8 % in Wellington this is only 'temporary ', especially given the current global economic situation and forecast for the next 5 years and the continuing cutbacks in NZ government spending. Insufficient account has been taken of the fact that any commercial development of the site is likely to erode the economic base of nearby businesses. There is no evidence of any consultation with nearby businesses.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The foundations of Whitehead Road do not cope with the existing traffic flows and in particular the heavy articulated commercial vehicles. The proposal would substantially add to this and this repair work needs to be included in any cost / benefit analysis. The plan change does not provide sufficient account of the increased traffic flows that will be generated by the childcare centre. Increased traffic flows will lead to installation of traffic lights on the corner of Curtis St and Chaytor St and the reconfiguration of the Whitehead Rd / Curtis St junction. These additional costs also need to be included in any cost / benefit analysis. There needs to be greater provision for onsite parking.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The proposal needs tighter controls to protect the seepage wetlands and buffer planting, discharges into the Kaiwharawhara stream and soil removal. There needs to be greater protection given to the 'Sanctuary to Sea' recreational walkway.</p> <p><i>Concept Plan:</i> The Concept Plan should be made mandatory and publicly notified.</p> <p><i>Lighting:</i> The proposed limit of 8 lux across the whole site does not provide adequate privacy for residents or protection for the glow worm colonies in the seepage wetlands.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council makes amendments to the plan change as outlined in the submission. That commercial development has lower foot print thresholds.</p>			
35	Paul Broughton & Susan Ryan	403 Karori Road, Karori, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter supports the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>Karori is one of the largest suburbs in New Zealand yet planning has failed to encourage any significant business growth in the area which matches the population growth of the suburb. Karori residents are forced to drive across to the Rongotai bulk retail area or go to Petone in the event we need anything other than limited food supplies. The location of the site should allow for a typical bulk format as the site is low when compared to the surrounding residential.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council allows the site to be developed to provide residents with access to retail shopping.</p>			
36	Gregory Howell	72 Curtis Street, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The submitter feels that the area could be suited to and benefit from small businesses, however the scale of the construction intended to be crammed into the area and the predetermination of Council do not meet with submitters approval. Council has continually ignored submissions from residents and the submitter</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>considers that any developer who applies for exemptions from the proposed site restrictions will receive them (on a non-notified basis).</p> <p><i>Noise/ Lighting:</i> Fencing on this site designed to block out noise and light would be ineffective: the shape of the land means that sound and light from the section will be projected upwards, towards the neighbouring properties. Security lighting will glare in through bedroom windows all night. Increased traffic would make quiet mornings a thing of the past for the whole valley.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> Depending on the business, there's a potential for increased traffic. The submitter raises safety concerns about lack of footpaths and traffic volumes in the area. More vehicles also add to the noise on the cut-rate, cheap road seal that's been laid. Deliveries by articulate vehicles would cause ridiculous issues as they try to maneuver in the narrow areas.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> Any sort of industrial area or vehicle access will be polluting the Kaiwharawhara Stream. Everything that drips, leaks, or abrades from vehicles (fuel, lubricants, antifreeze, soaps, battery acids, brake linings, rust, etc) will be washed into the waterway.</p> <p><i>Electricity transmission lines:</i> Supposedly Transpower is against anyone building directly under high-tension power lines. Why does the Council feel it's exempt?</p> <p><i>Economic:</i> The construction of a Mega centre will have direct impact on local businesses in the area. How impartial are Council?</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council implements its existing Outer Green Belt Management Plan so that the site is Council controlled (open space) and part of the ecological corridor and that any permissible development on the site should be with significantly lower thresholds for footprints of buildings. Improve reporting on any developer consent requests for changes to the current thresholds along with impartial third-party evaluations on just what the impact of said changes would be.</p>			
37	Paul Oliver & Rowena Cullen	24 Monaghan Avenue, Karori, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The existing zoning should be retained allowing the preservation and development of the area as a green corridor along the Kaiwharawhara stream. This would support the newly established Biophillic City team at Council and the Councils partnership with Victoria University (Council funded Eco Friendly City research). One of the most important features of a sustainable city is protecting green corridors. This is inline with Councils Sustainable City Vision). The plan change gives priority to economic well-being over social well-being. The Councils Biodiversity Plan 2007 and the Outer Green Belt Management Plan 2004 are missing from the s32 document. A green corridor is in line with the city's investment in Zealandia.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The proposed plan change will generate additional traffic problems in an area suffering from traffic congestion. No provisions has been made to enhance public transport service. Additional traffic lights would be needed and cause further delay. There is a lack of alternative routes to and from the area.</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> Existing retail outlets in Karori are struggling to survive. An expansion in the suburbs will place pressure on retail in the inner City. The submitter notes retail expansions in Johnsonville and Crofton Downs.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council decline the plan change and that it implement its existing Outer Green Belt Management Plan which envisaged enhancement of the ecological corridors along the Kaiwharawhara Stream.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
38	Rod Bryant	67 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes

The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.

Ecology: The Kaiwharawhara Stream has been the subject of much restoration input from the wider community yet still exhibits severe pollution at its culvert discharge point immediately north of Ian Galloway Park. Any development work, especially foundations, for commercial buildings on a rezoned site risks potential leakage into the culvert, thus increasing the level of pollution. The ecological corridor from Zealandia, through Wilton's Bush and the Kaiwharawhara Valley could be undermined by a further lowering of the stream's water quality. Further restoration of the stream could be enhanced if the culvert is relined along its entire length to prevent seepage of contaminants, the rezoning proposal could prevent this. The sites former rubbish tip use can be expected to contain contamination for many years, if not indefinitely. Any disturbance through development is likely to result in exposure of the wider environment to these contaminants.

Economics: Existing businesses in Karori have shown a tendency to fail for a variety of reasons, including lack of patronage. There does not appear to be sufficient demand for increased retail/business operations in the general vicinity of the site proposed for rezoning. It is extremely difficult to establish and maintain a retail business in Karori or the general vicinity as local residents of the suburb tend to shop elsewhere. This is unlikely to change with commercial development on a rezoned site.

Transport: The assessment doesn't give any indication of the accident record for the area. The submitter has witnessed an accident on Whitehead Rd and believes this could be expected to occur more frequently if the area is rezoned. The roads in the area are narrow, steep or have tight corners at certain junctures. These roads are simply unsuitable for heavy vehicles likely to service commercial premises on a rezoned site. Promotions by commercial operators on a rezoned site are bound to attract increase patronage during peak business times like Saturday morning. This combined with narrow streets, parked cars and overflow parking could cause gridlock. The submitter notes increased traffic and parking due to sporting activities at Ian Galloway Park. The intersection of Chaytor and Curtis Streets is problematic at peak times. Increased traffic in the area could result in a gridlock situation and increased dangers for both drivers and pedestrians.

Decision Requested:

That Council implement its existing Outer Green Belt Management Plan so that the site is Council controlled (open space) and part of the ecological corridor and that any permissible development on the site should be with significantly lower thresholds for footprints of buildings, signage, noise and lighting.

That consideration is given to extending the Zealandia concept by council reacquiring, with philanthropic support, the land proposed for rezoning, in order to establish a sanctuary for Wellington reptiles (geckos and skinks).

39	John Bickerton	131 Orangi Kaupapa Road, Northland, Wellington 6012	No
----	----------------	---	----

The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.

Transport: Curtis St is an important arterial road connecting Johnsonville / Ngaio to Karori and Kelburn and for use in the event of an earthquake. Its present state is unsuited to modern-day usage even without the introduction of the nearby child-care centre: it is dangerous for both motorists and pedestrian usage. A high-level plan for improving these thoroughfares is a prerequisite to any rezoning exercises

Ecology: The Creswick Valley is an important eco-conduit between Zealandia and Wilton to Johnsons Hill and through Albemarle Stream to Tinakori Hill. Great efforts have been made to cleanse Kaiwharawhara and

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>Albemarle Streams from contaminations which happened as a result of our history. This progress would be set back by inappropriate development of the Curtis St site. A consolidated plan for managing these open-space areas (the Outer Green Belt?) is a prerequisite to any rezoning exercise of this site</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> The impact of retail development in Curtis St on nearby Centres is unattractive. Whilst some commercial uses may be appropriate for the site, these should be identified prior to rezoning. These uses would provide the basis for assessing the economic impact.</p> <p><i>Electricity transmission lines:</i> These are a health hazard and development within this corridor should be prohibited. Exceptions to this general rule could be made on a case by case basis but not where people are living or working underneath.</p> <p><i>Process:</i> Any development needs to be carefully controlled from the outset. A publicly notified concept plan for the whole area should be part of any Resource Consent Application.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the plan change is withdrawn until a high level roading plan and a consolidated open space plan for the area has been approved. In the event that the plan change proceeds Council should prohibit developments under the transmission lines and that the public be notified a concept plan for the whole area for any Resource Consent Application, even if it is only for part of the site.</p>			
40	Frances Fiona Knight & Wayne Dexter Newman	68 Curtis Street, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The submitter points out that the plan change is like a “Suburban Centre” zone that was previously discounted by officers under DPC73 and questions the zoning of Part Lot 1 on DP1746. DPC77 introduces piecemeal urban planning and local exceptions and added complexity, rather than a consistent and comprehensive set of objectives, policies and rules.</p> <p><i>Rationalisation of zoning:</i> The legitimate expectation for the land can only be based on the activities for which the site was zoned when the landowner acquired it. If the landowner had a speculative expectation of substantial capital gains from a change of zoning, this was at his own risk. The submitter questions the actual difficulties in District Plan application from having two zones on one property and Council has interpreted lack of residential development as indicative of the unsuitability of the site for residential use. The site contained residential dwellings for decades and another valid reason might be that the landowner during the housing recent boom was not a residential property developer and had no interest in becoming one.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the Capital Coast Health v Wellington City Council decision and notes that the site was acquired from the Council as Open Space B, the underlying zoning has been rightfully transferred and Council has the right to give regard to the provisions of the District Plan over private property rights. Council contractors mow the grass on the north-eastern part of the “Open Space” zone and have done so regularly since the site was sold by the Council in 1998.</p> <p>The assertion that there is no demand for more recreational land in the area is contrary to statements within the Council’s own published plans. The submitter considers “Open Space” zoning avoids adverse effects on the environment, safeguards the life-supporting capacity of the ecosystems within the valley and sustains the potential of natural and physical resources while managing the use and protection of natural and physical resources in a way which enables local people and communities within the wider area to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being, health and safety. The conclusion that this is not the most appropriate or efficient use of the land appears questionable.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>The impact of the Business Area on the open space, natural features and habitats, landscape and ecological values, residential character and amenity are omitted from the s32 analysis which significantly diminishes the credibility of the analysis as a valid consideration of alternatives, benefits and costs for what is being proposed. Similarly omitted is any assessment of the potential benefits, disadvantages, costs and risks for zoning the site for “Centre”, “Business 1” or “Business 2” activities.</p> <p><i>High-order resource management:</i> “Sustainable management” appears to be interpreted entirely in economic terms with development of the site being implied to have a direct correlation with the well-being of people and communities. It is not explained how the loss of open space would contribute to the social well-being of the community in Northland, Wilton or Karori. The S32 does not address several key directions nor does it include reference to Wellington’s Outer Green Belt Management Plan May 2004 or the Biodiversity Action Plan 2007 which both outline key ecological initiatives.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The S32 report notes regionally significant ecological values, but the proposed objectives and policies are not described as “ensuring” retention of trees and vegetation. The rules and standards address only mitigation, with no reference to avoiding or remedying removal of trees and vegetation. These deficiencies indicate a failure to provide measures to protect and maintain the ecological values in the wider area.</p> <p><i>Heritage:</i> The S32 report heritage assessment does not address the fact that parts of the site appear to have been occupied prior to 1885. The lack of any requirement for a heritage assessment prior to undertaking earthworks leaves the site without effective regulatory protection.</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> The economic assessment states that Karori lacks business space and retail spend. The need for additional business space at Karori town centre is not addressed by this proposal. There is no suggestion that the existing pattern of commercial activity in the present distribution of centres inefficient or unsustainable. The proposed new Business Area could be significantly disruptive of the present centres and it is not clear how a new area would be a more efficient or sustainable use of resources.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> Only four intersections were considered for the transport assessment. The effect on streets or roads in Northland was not assessed, although potential adverse effects on two streets (Creswick Terrace and Randwick Road) were identified. The effect on Paisley Terrace, Seaforth Terrace or Rosehaugh Avenue were not assessed, nor on Karori Road and the streets accessed from it between the intersection with Chaytor Street and Marsden Village.</p> <p>The transport assessment identified that service vehicles site cannot safely negotiate the intersections with Curtis Street at Old Karori Road and Whitehead Road at present, but that access to the site from either of these streets would be preferable to access to the site directly from Curtis Street. Access to the site from Curtis Street could cause increased road safety risk. The submitter notes the lack of public transport in the area.</p> <p>The s32 report describes a “requirement for all vehicle servicing areas and car parking to be accommodated on the site” as a specific solution. The numerous safety concerns within the transport assessment are more than minor, but have not been properly resolved. The suitability of the site for the nature and scale of the activities being considered is called into question by the transport assessment.</p> <p><i>Noise:</i> The assessment considers the current undeveloped condition of the site and does not account for the site with earthworks, retaining structures and car parking all of which might contribute acoustically reflective surfaces and replace acoustically absorbent vegetation on the site. The assessment of potential noise effects was not fit for purpose for a S32 Report. The submitter considers there is an amphitheatre effect.</p> <p><i>Electricity transmission lines:</i> Transpower’s Corridor Management Policy appears to be misrepresented</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>significantly in two ways: the nature of the “buffer corridor” and the area it affects. The Council has introduced a focus on “sensitive activities” that is entirely absent from the published rationale for the policy, which is to keep a corridor clear of buildings to have access to the lines for safe operation and maintenance. The S32 report omits Transpower’s position regarding rezoning the “Open Space” area, which would appear to be an appropriate land use zoning beneath transmission lines. The Council appears to incorrectly suggest that the entire site lies within the buffer corridor and have therefore treated the whole site as inappropriate for the location of “sensitive activities”.</p> <p><i>Definitions:</i> The submitter questions the definition of “Temporary activities” and “Sensitive activities”.</p> <p><i>Objectives and Policies.</i> Objective 35.2.1: The social needs of the western suburbs and wider city that has not been established. Although retail activity is excluded retail activities appear to be contemplated. Objective 35.2.2: Refers to promoting an urban environment without reference to the suburban, residential and open space character of this site. Policy 35.2.3.1: implies the consenting authority will “design” buildings and structures. It should ensure that reflective and brightly coloured materials are not used. Policy 35.2.3.3: does not provide protection for the trees and vegetation along the western boundary or specific reference to protection of the flora and fauna of the ecologically significant seepage wetlands adjacent to the site. Policy 35.2.3.7: Does not provide protection for the Kaiwharawhara Stream. Control on the total permissible area of impermeable surface need to be included. Policy 35.2.4.4: The minimum protection would be to ensure that traffic generated by development of the site imposes less than minor adverse effects on local residential streets. Policy 35.2.5.2: Multiple transport modes are not available and this policy identifies the specific and significant deficiencies of this site for the activities being proposed. Policy 35.2.5.5: Contains no guidance on the assessment criteria for appropriate site access. The minimum protection would be to ensure the provision of site access that creates no increased road safety risk. Policies 35.2.4.5 and 35.2.5.6: Require signs to be managed to two different and potentially under contradictory sets of criteria, without indicating which should prevail. 35.2.4.5 should establish the context within which 35.2.5.6 is applied. Policy 35.2.6.1: The minimum protection should be to ensure activities are managed to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects from noise, lighting, dust or discharge whether within the site or on the wider landscape and environment. Policy 35.2.6.2: Provision of transport corridors and utility lifeline facilities are necessary to provide a safe working environment. Objective 35.2.7: Any proposed subdivision needs to be consistent with an already approved, notified concept plan. Objective 35.2.8: No specific iwi or Maori association with this site has been identified.</p> <p><i>Rules and Standards:</i> Rules 36.1(b), (g) and (i): Provide no clear indication of the maximum permissible limits for these activities or how the permitted activities relate to the Objectives and Policies. Rule 36.1(e): It is not clear how permitting retail activities relate to the Objectives and Policies described in 35.2.1 and 35.2.5 that appear to favour non-retail activities on the site. Rule 36.2: Concept plans should also consider the design and external appearance of buildings and structures etc, signage, transport effects, environmental hazards, the operation of the transmission line and the impact on the vitality of existing Centres. Concept plans should also be publicly notified. Rule 36.3: Provides no signal on maximum gross floor areas for retail activities exceeding 500m² or commercial activities or integrated retail activities exceeding 2,500m² or supermarkets exceeding 1,500m² at which the scale and intensity of the proposed development is unacceptable. Council’s discretion should include criteria to assess the impact of both integrated retail activities and supermarkets. No mention is made of the present encumbrance on the title certificates preventing use of the site for a supermarket. Rule 36.6: provides activities standards that appear to have trigger values that differ from those indicated for restricted discretionary activities at 36.3 (submitter provides specific examples). Rule 36.7: fails to require a comprehensive concept plan and allows for incremental and uncoordinated development.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>Decision Requested::</p> <p>That Council rejects proposed District Plan Change 77 providing for increased commercial activity in the western suburbs until any need for such provision not already provided by DPC73 has been demonstrated. That Council retains the existing zoning of the site or alternatively amend DPC77 to give full effect to Council's existing plan for this valley such that the site is zoned and managed to be within Council controlled open space to enhance the ecological corridor as indicated in "future initiatives" of the Wellington Outer Green Belt Management Plan, May 2004.</p> <p>If DPC77 is not rejected, undertake a full and proper Section 32 analysis of the economic, traffic, residential amenity (including noise and light), site contamination and ecological effects of the proposed zoning, and provide a properly qualified expert heritage assessment of the site; and</p> <p>Amend the objectives, policies and rules (including notification provisions and assessment matters) to better avoid, remedy or mitigate the potential adverse economic, traffic, residential amenity, site contamination, ecological and heritage effects of commercial development on the site.</p> <p>Without limiting the above general relief, make the following specific changes to DPC77:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove from the area proposed to be rezoned the Open Space B zoned area (marked by the red boundary on the map of the proposed rezoning); and • Provide specific rules to control the permissible development on the site to protect and maintain the existing vegetation on the western and eastern boundaries; and • Provide specific rules to control the permissible development on the site to protect and maintain a clear corridor beneath the high voltage transmission lines; and • Provide specific rules to control the permissible development on the site to avoid any increase in volume, velocity, contaminant load or temperature of stormwater entering Kaiwharawhara Stream from the site; and • Provide clear direction in the objectives, policies and rules as to the scale and intensity of development considered appropriate on this site; and • Provide specific rules to control the permissible development on the site to avoid more than minor adverse effects on the residential amenity, landscape character and ecological values within the wider landscape from activities within the site. • Amend DPC77 to incorporate (a) the specific relief sought above and/or (b) amendments which support the alternative approach to managing the site as Council controlled open space to enhance the ecological corridor as indicated in "future initiatives" of the Wellington Outer Green Belt Management Plan May 2004 and/or (c) any consequential and/or additional amendments that are necessary to address the concerns raised above and give full effect to the intent of this submission. 			
41	Rosemary Tomlinson	14 Putnam Street, Northland, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>It is inappropriate to have a small island of land zoned for business in an area which has nearby shopping Centres. The area is predominately residential and the development could put off potential home seekers and does not sit well with the child care centre. The development is likely to be unattractive unless strict conditions are applied.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The submitter raises safety concerns with increased traffic flow, narrow streets, limited off street parking, congestion, problems at intersections and insufficient public transport.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The submitter notes the ecological corridor from the Karori Sanctuary through to Wilton Bush/Otari and the work of volunteers to replant the Kaiwharawhara Stream. Commercial development will introduce pollution and negate this good work. The glow worm colony will be put at risk by development. The</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>submitter questions leeching from the former tip.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the land remains zoned as Open Space B and Outer Residential as at present.</p>			
42	Amanda Otzen	30 West Road, Northland, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The submitter would like to see this quite historic and beautifully bushy area retained as one of the last links with colonial Wellington's history and developed as link reserve or a heritage park, retaining the natural beauty of the area between the playing fields and Chaytor Street, preserving also the sense of historic landscape along the Old Karori Road. The submitter suggests uncovering the stream and resurrecting the lower part of the Old Karori Road as a path to the upper, paved Old Karori Road connecting to Otari to the Karori Sanctuary. This certainly draws eco-tourists. Local iwi could create an early Maori garden to further the interpretive value of such a heritage park. The plan change and resulting businesses would destroy the landscape by paving it for parking and destroy the residential and bucolic nature of the area by the use of industrial lighting, neon signs, piped music and traffic noise</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council maintains the open space and residential zoning for this land.</p>			
43	Creswick Valley Residents Association Inc	Attn: Paul Barker 14 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Process:</i> The Section 32 report makes several erroneous and misleading assumptions about development of the site. When the site was sold by the council in 1998 the new owners were aware of the existing zoning. The Section 32 Report misrepresents the legal position in that the purchase price for the land would have reflected the potential uses available with that zoning. The Council has acted with a large degree of predetermination towards the zoning of the site, instructing Council Officers to prepare for a Business 2 zoning in May 2012. Council's notification photo was designed to present an image of an abandoned site with little environmental or community value. The Curtis Street Business Area is introduced as being to provide for increased commercial activity in the western suburbs. It would be inappropriate to introduce new provisions when adequate provision might already exist in DPC73 while DPC73 is still subject to appeal.</p> <p><i>Piecemeal planning:</i> There is no clear evidence of the need to provide for increased commercial activity and the plan change does not gauge what effect new development would have on other established centres. DPC77 introduces new rules for commercial activities specific to this site that are piecemeal urban planning and local exceptions and added complexity, rather than a consistent and comprehensive set of objectives, policies and rules.</p> <p>The plan change does not signal what scale and intensity of development is unacceptable on the site nor does it sufficiently provide direction or clarity to accurately assess the scale or type of development that might occur. This creates a level of uncertainty about the form of development that might ultimately be approved by Council. This makes it very difficult to evaluate the impact on local residents and other nearby commercial centres.</p> <p>Incremental development of the site could potentially occur as a permitted activity or through concept plans. The link between concept plan rules and related assessment criteria seems weak.</p> <p>The argument for the loss of open space or inclusion of Open Space land within the area is inadequate.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p><i>Heritage:</i> The Heritage Assessment undertaken was inadequate and off the point. No provision is made for a heritage assessment to be undertaken prior to any earthworks or development of the site.</p> <p><i>Noise/Lighting/Dust:</i> Noise generating activities on the site may be as few as 20 metres away from the nearest residents' houses. All noise levels, including fixed plant noise, should not exceed that set for residential areas. The cumulative effect of commercial noise not addressed.</p> <p>The general limit of 8 lux across the whole site is inadequate to provide privacy for residents and to ensure the surrounding green areas and wildlife habitat are not adversely affected. More requirements for screening and limits on lighting are needed to protect the glow worm colonies and buffer planting and regenerating areas on the fringes of the site, including the assurance that levels do not detract from the character of the open space or of the ecological corridor.</p> <p>The rules to control potential dust and visual amenity affects are inadequate.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> DPC77 does not address the maximum levels of activity envisaged or give a clear limit to development of the site or restrict access to the site in accordance with the road safety risks identified in the Traffic Assessment. The assessment has been arbitrarily limited to only a few intersections and specifically excludes five intersections likely to have more than minor adverse effects from the proposal.</p> <p>DPC77 would need to include specific provisions for entry and exit to the site, especially for servicing vehicles. The plan should include adequate provision for maintaining public access to the City to Sea walkway and for walking and cycle access. The plan does not recognise parking arrangements for the child care centre.</p> <p>The proposal would increase significantly the area of impervious surface on the site (on-site parking provision) immediately adjacent to the culvert of the Kaiwharawhara Stream. Provisions made for restrictions on activities that generate increased traffic volume and parking demand appear inadequate. There will be traffic increase in Randwick Road & Farm Road.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The provisions to protect the regionally significant seepage wetlands and buffer vegetation that extends within the site are wholly inadequate. DPC77 does not recognise or implement that a significant part of the site is worthy of being set aside in order to maintain a regionally significant ecological corridor connecting the near-contiguous green belt of open space within the valley of the Kaiwharawhara Stream. The Section 32 Report promotes rationalisation of zoning entirely on the basis of economic use of the site, without consideration of residential amenity, landscape character or ecological values. It provides no evidence to support an increase community social well-being.</p> <p>DPC77 gives no mention of the Outer Green Belt Management 2004 or the Biodiversity Action Plan 2007.</p> <p>The plan change does not account for an increase the area of impervious surface on the site. There are insufficient protections for soil removal and site works. Soil should be assessed for contamination with any application for resource consent for earthworks. Specific restrictions on discharges that could impact on the Kaiwharawhara Stream are insufficient.</p> <p><i>Electricity transmission lines:</i> Transpower's Transmission Line Buffer Corridors Policy (September 2012) should apply. No consideration has been given to potential EMF exposure of employees engaged in commercial activities on the site beneath the transmission lines.</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> The economic impact assessment is deficient in that it does not provide analysis of the likely impact on existing Centres – specifically Northland, Marsden Village and Karori – of development of a new Business Area on this site. The encouragement of multiple business uses on the site does not address possible displacement of existing businesses within nearby centres and therefore the impact on the viability of those Centres. The plan change does not provide sufficient controls on activities to avoid adverse effects</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>on the wider landscape and nearby residential areas. There is no signal within the objectives, policies and rules as to what scale and intensity of development is unacceptable on this site.</p> <p><i>Concept Plan:</i> This should be both obligatory and publicly notified. Failure to require a comprehensive Concept Plan opens the possibility for incremental development without being subject to proper controls.</p> <p><i>Other:</i> PC77 does not include a definition of “temporary activities” and needs to provide more clarity and certainty as to what can occur as a temporary activity on the site and possible effects.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council reject proposed District Plan Change 77 providing for increased commercial activity in the western suburbs until any need for such provision not already provided by DPC73 has been demonstrated. Retain the existing zoning of the site or alternatively amend PC77 to give full effect to Council’s existing plan for this valley such that the site is zoned and managed to be within Council controlled open space to enhance the ecological corridor as indicated in “future initiatives” of the Wellington Outer Green Belt Management Plan May 2004.</p> <p>If DPC77 is not rejected, undertake a proper Section 32 analysis of the economic, traffic, residential amenity (including noise and light) site contamination and ecological effects of the proposed zoning, and provide a properly qualified expert heritage assessment of the site; and</p> <p>Amend DPC77 objectives, policies and rules (including notification provisions and assessment matters) to better avoid, remedy or mitigate the potential adverse economic, traffic, residential amenity, site contamination, ecological and heritage effects of commercial development on the site</p> <p>Without limiting the above general relief, make the following specific changes to PC77:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove from the area proposed to be rezoned the Open Space B zoned area (marked by the red boundary on the map of the proposed rezoning); and • Provide specific rules to control the permissible development on the site to protect and maintain the existing vegetation on the western and eastern boundaries; and • Provide specific rules to control the permissible development on the site to protect and maintain a clear corridor beneath the high voltage transmission lines; and • Provide specific rules to control the permissible development on the site to avoid any increase in volume, velocity, contaminant load or temperature of stormwater entering Kaiwharawhara Stream from the site. • Provide direction in the objectives, policies and rules as to the scale and intensity of commercial development considered appropriate on this site. • Amend DPC77 to incorporate (a) the specific relief sought above and/or (b) amendments which support the alternative approach to managing the site as Council controlled open space to enhance the ecological corridor as indicated in “future initiatives” of the Wellington Outer Green Belt Management Plan May 2004 and/or (c) any consequential and/or additional amendments that are necessary to address the concerns raised above and give full effect to the intent of this submission 			
44	Wilton Residents' Association	Attn: Robert Davies 16 Gloucester Street, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The proposal is in an area that is mostly reserve or recreation. Potentially, it forms part of an ecological corridor between Zealandia and Otari and Trelissick Park and it is the submitters preference the whole site become part of this corridor. If this is impractical, a substantial buffer zone around the Old Karori Road track should be set aside. This could be a quid pro quo arrangement, turning some of the current open area in a business area. Special conditions should apply to avoid contamination of groundwater.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p><i>Amenity:</i> The submitter raises concern about the impact of noise, lighting on the ecological corridor and the impact of buildings for the local residents who overlook site. Small scale development would be more acceptable than any big box development.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The submitter considers the site is unsuitable for high traffic flow and notes difficulties with access, bottlenecks, commuting times and limited public transport. Site planning also needs to take account of the new childcare centre. These factors mean the site is unsuitable for big box commercial development but may be ok for small enterprises that won't generate a lot of traffic.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the whole site should be given reserve status and made part of an ecological corridor between Zealandia, Otari and Trelissick Park. If this is impractical, an ecological corridor comprising a substantial buffer zone around the Old Karori Road track should be set aside from the commercial development and given open space or reserve status. Very strict limits should be placed on the type of any commercial development as regards impact of traffic flows both to the site and passing the site, and also to visual impact, compatibility with surroundings, lighting, noise and pollution including runoff.</p>			
45	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Attn: Hayley Vujcich PO Box 11646, Wellington 6021	
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p>			
46	Mary Munro	1 Orari Street, Ngaio, Wellington 6035	Yes
<p>The submitter neither opposes nor supports the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The submitter considers that Council needs to put some very clear guidelines and restrictions in place so that this site is not wide open for extensive complete commercial development. The site is awkward, neglected and relatively unattractive. It is not a natural destination. It has some significant historical and ecological features, and it is part of the Kaiwharawhara Catchment (and therefore relevant to the WCC's Project Kaiwharawhara).</p> <p>The submitter considers that the site is ideal for some sort of Green Business Area. It fits well with WCC's "Our Living City" project. With Green Star rated small-scale buildings, sensitive clearance and planting and innovative features e.g. the restoration and enhancement of a wetland area, this area could become a show piece for the city. This part of the city does not need another retail Centre given nearby Centres which are probably struggling in these difficult economic times. Any development at Curtis Street needs to be differentiated in some way. A Green Business Area, a centre for start-ups, or a collection of innovative workshops/ business premises make more sense.</p> <p><i>Concept Plan:</i> This should be mandatory and publicly notified. Any concept plan should be assessed against criteria designed to protect the residential and landscape character and the Kaiwharawhara Stream. Noise and lighting limits need to be identified and should relate to the surrounding residential area, and the glow worms on the historic road. Car and pedestrian access should be specified, as well as parking provision. Demonstrate how the ecological corridor will be protected and enhanced, including buffer planting.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
That a Concept Plan be made mandatory and publicly notified.			
47	Andrew Monahan	29 Kainui Road, Hataitai, Wellington 6021	Yes
<p>The submitter supports in part the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The submitter partly supports the rezoning subject to suggested amendments and the retention of residential existing use rights. The site is small in the wider context and has been previously used for commercial activities. The western suburbs have a large population, with limited land for extension and is under catered for retail. The site is privately owned, has limited aesthetic value, has no commercial activity and is in no way contributing to any social and economic needs. The site has commercial appeal with the submitter noting Foodstuffs previous interest, the Mitre 10 proposal and other potential retails. The plan change intention is to provide for positive social and economic conditions but in reality the site specific rules make it extremely difficult to gain resource consent. The Council have been over conservative to please immediate neighbours without appreciating the greater benefits to the City.</p> <p>The submitters suggested amendments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the signage provisions should read the same as Business 1 Area; • That the definition of retail should be consistent with Business 1 Area; • That Residential should be a permitted activity; • Amend the height limited of 6m (it is currently unworkable); • The references to "pre approved concept plan" and a "mix of commercial activity" should be removed (it is not economically viable to design a site without a tenant in mind and the possibility of finding a number of smaller tenants is virtually nil). <p>Decision Requested: Did not state.</p>			
48	Bjorn Sutherland	31 Paisley Terrace, Karori, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The traffic assessments are confusing and hard to interpret. There is less focus on the impacts on Whitehead Rd. The submitter questions whether 25% of trips from the proposal would go up Whitehead Road and would like this reassessed. The submitter points out that Paisley Terrace is dependant on safe and acceptable traffic flows of Whitehead Rd, which is currently at capacity. Particular issues and concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety when turning right from Paisley terrace down Whitehead Road; Pedestrian access across Whitehead Road to the foot path; • The safety of walking up the footpath; • Whitehead Road experiencing traffic backing up past Paisley Terrace. The submitter notes that traffic moves quickly up Whitehead Road and there is a blind corner. This would worsen with development of the site and the submitter has concerns that there will be a fatality. <p><i>Geotechnical issues:</i> The site urgently needs to be investigated to determine what contaminants are on site and what the public health and environmental risks are. The submitter raises concern about the possibility of treated timber and asbestos in the fill. Council needs to ensure leaching is properly mitigated.</p> <p>Decision Requested: That the site not be rezoned to Curtis Street Business Area.</p>			
49	Andrew J W Foster	27 Versailles Street, Karori, Wellington 6012	Yes
The submitter supports that the site is able to be used for business purposes (Business 1 or 2) zoning.			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>However this needs to be subject to adequate protection of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • amenity of neighbouring residents • environmental protection as the site sits on a critical corridor between Zealandia and Otari; and the • adequate assessment of the economic impact of supermarket or large scale integrated retail developments on Northland, Marsden Village and particularly Karori Centre. <p><i>Economics:</i> The submitter considers that supermarket or integrated retails development should be required to undertake a comprehensive economic impact assessment. The submitter agrees that Karori as an area is short of land zoned for commercial activity. However, the submitter disagrees with the original S32 assessment that this shortage means that any sort of commercial development on the Curtis St site would not have a potentially significant adverse effect on nearby Centres. Karori residents already do a very large proportion of their grocery shopping outside of the Karori catchment. A large supermarket would detract, potentially significantly, from existing supermarkets undermining viability. This is a matter of sufficient significance to warrant a proper economic impact assessment.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the requirement for an economic impact assessment for proposed supermarkets and integrated retail developments is retained.</p>			
50	John Christopher Horne	28 Kaihuia Street, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The activities which would be permitted by the proposed DPC 77 would have adverse impacts on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the residential amenity of this part of the valley of Kaiwharawhara Stream • the natural environment, including regenerating native forest, and the glow-worm colony it supports, and the key part this site's natural values play in the ecological corridor linking Karori Sanctuary / Zealandia, Johnston Hill Reserve, Outer Green Belt, Otari-Wilton's Bush, Trelissick Park, and Kaiwharawhara Estuary <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the Council withdraws proposed DPC 77; gazettes the land as Recreation Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977 and declares the land to be part of Ian Galloway Park.</p>			
51	Leoni Hawkins	39 Albemarle Road, Northland, Wellington 6012	Did not state
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> The assessment seems to be very Karori centred and excluded other Western suburbs and fails to give a wide enough view. The conclusions drawn about the need for commercial use property are questionable.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> This assessment is very narrow and doesn't accurately represent the implications of rezoning. Specifically many more streets needed to be included such as Randwick road. I also find it hard to understand how the 17m or longer trucks required to service the site will manage to use the roads.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The site for rezoning is part of a significant ecological corridor along the western hills. It also has a great glow worm colony which deserves better buffer protection.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the traffic assessment is reassessed and includes a wider area before proceeding further and that earthworks along the western boundary to be a controlled activity.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
52	Elizabeth Buckley Bargh & Robert Buckley	145 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>There is a presumption on the part of both Council and the landowner that this land should be rezoned. The submitters do not accept this presumption as the land currently serves a number of purposes that could easily be enhanced the residential area (a green corridor that includes glow works, regenerating bush or further recreational space) The landowner should work with the current zoning restrictions.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the Council reclaims, if needs be purchases back this land and utilizes it for the local community; or that the Council declines rezoning of the entire area and requests the current landowner to develop it within the restrictions of the current zonings.</p>			
53	Alexandra Hill	26 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Amenity:</i> The submitter has concerns that the business zoning cause visual and noise pollution for the residents both in Curtis Street and on either side of the valley.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The submitter is concerned about the traffic on Curtis Street and the potential congestion as well as new traffic generated by the childcare centre.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The valley currently provides a green corridor for the native birds that live at Zealandia and surrounding areas. Certain businesses will have a detrimental impact on the 'green corridor', particularly if vegetation is removed and the land concreted for car-parking.</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> The submitter would support small, compatible businesses to operate in the valley, provided that the green corridor was not put in jeopardy and that visual and sound pollution was not an issue. The garden centre that previously existed was an example of a business that could operate without impacting the green corridor. A small scale business would have less impact, such as another garden centre or a café.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council reconsiders the plan to rezone Curtis Street to Curtis St Business Area and to look at alternative land uses that will not compromise the green corridor.</p>			
54	Kathryn Jane Hunt	141 Creswick Terrace, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Rationalisation for zoning.</i> The section 32 report assumes that zoning should change from the current Outer Residential and Open Space zoning to a Business 2 Area. The focus is on how to manage the zone changes, rather than whether they are necessary at all. The submitter strongly believes the changes are not necessary or in any way advantageous to the local or extended community.</p> <p><i>Ecology.</i> The valley should be retained as Open Space and be restored as far as possible to its natural state. The last few years have seen a dramatic increase in the variety and quantity of birdlife, and local valley residents take great pride and pleasure in their growing numbers. This was championed by the late Sir Paul Callaghan, who described it as a 'thin finger of green' extending from the Karori Sanctuary to Kaiwharawhara. Sir Paul's vision was to extend current ecological reserves so that our native species can</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>survive outside of controlled environments. It is therefore crucial that we retain this green belt for native flora and fauna, and for Wellingtonians and visitors to enjoy. This would include restoration of the stream from the culvert. There would be considerable community interest and support for such a venture.</p> <p><i>Electricity transmission lines:</i> The section 32 implies that the presence of these lines seem to preclude any sort of commercial development that has groups of people regularly gathering and working beneath them.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council, in partnership with the local residents, returns the valley to Open Space (and zone the previous Outer Residential zone as Open Space), negotiate with the current owner to re-purchase the land, and restore it to its natural state. This project should be undertaken in the memory of the late Sir Paul Callaghan, and the resulting park be named in his honor.</p>			
55	Sara Clarke	2 Putnam Street, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The area is surrounded by residential and open space land. Any business area would see like an island. This is incongruous given the ecological values in the Kaiwharawhara Stream, glow worms and ecological corridor. The transport report already identifies the area as having reduced service levels. The proposed zoning will make this worse.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council consider rezoning all of the site to a zoning contiguous with adjacent land uses. Consider zoning only a small portion of the land as Business Area, while retaining open space/residential for the remainder. Acknowledge the ecological values in doing so. Change the permissible development for the portion zoned Business Area to reduce the threshold for foot prints for retail/commercial activities.</p>			
56	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Attn: Mike Hurley, PO Box 1021, Wellington 6140	
<p>The submitter supports the proposed rezoning of the land away from residential but does suggest amendments to the plan change.</p> <p>The submitter outlines their role and function as the State Owned Enterprise that plans, builds, maintains and operates New Zealand's high voltage transmission network, the National Grid, which links generators to distribution companies and major industrial users. The submitter notes that National Grid transmission line traverses the proposed Business Area.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission 2008 (NPSET) that confirms the national significance of the Grid and the need to appropriately manage both the transmission network and activities and development close to it as well as its role under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)</p> <p>Specifically referring to policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET, the submitter notes that Policy 10 requires decision makers to manage activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the transmission network and that Policy 11 mandates buffer corridors for sensitive activities.</p> <p>The submitter states that the definition in the NPSET for "sensitive activities" lacks specificity, especially given that non sensitive activities are not defined. It is considered that people can be equally at risk to a low probability high impact event at work as they are at home. On this basis, any workplace or area where large numbers of people congregate is also captured by the definition of sensitive activity. Therefore, the submitter suggests that the Plan Change definition for "sensitive activities" is amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The plan change applies to a discrete area of land within the City that has unique characteristics. The over</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>head transmission line is elevated above the site is within a valley with no support structures. The site has a large vertical clearance distance from the conductors of the transmission line. The submitter seeks that sensitive activities are excluded from the area within 12m either side of the centreline of the transmission line.</p> <p>This is a prudent management approach to manage sensitive activities in this location.</p> <p>The submitter notes that it is unlikely that business activities could locate away from the 12m corridor proposed (either side of the centreline). On this basis, the submitter can, in this instance, accept non-sensitive activities being located underneath the conductors. The preference is that these activities should not involve large numbers of people being located under the conductors for any significant period of time. It may be possible to layout the development of the site accordingly; e.g. provide the carparking, loading spaces, or storage areas under the transmission lines.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the definitions of retailing activities in the proposed plan change can be used to encourage only those less sensitive activities from establishing directly beneath the transmission lines. The more sensitive activities should not be provided for within 12m from the centreline of the transmission line.</p> <p>If buildings and/or structures are (and associated earthworks) constructed beneath the transmission lines they must be designed and constructed to maintain safe separation distances from the conductors of the transmission lines under all operating conditions. Therefore the submitter seeks an additional standard in rule 36.6(b) to ensure that this is clearly recognised and that they are identified as an affected party.</p> <p>The submitter raises opposition that utility lifelines are a discretionary activity, yet hazardous substances are only controlled. The establishment of significant volumes of hazardous substances on the site is not supported by submitter and this should be a non-complying activity.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that any subdivision around the transmission lines is a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>The submitter supports that the objective and policy framework has identified the electricity transmission network and the need to ensure that the ongoing operation and maintenance is not compromised but does seek minor changes to reflect that it development around the transmission lines can have adverse effects other than just reverse sensitivity effects on the lines.</p> <p>The submitter requests that the national grid lines are referred to as either the 'National Grid transmission lines' or 'Electricity Transmission lines'.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the provisions of the Plan Change 77 are amended to ensure:</p> <p>Within the bounds of the plan change that the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission 2008 is given effect to, including:</p> <p>Amend Objective 35.2.6 (delete "reverse sensitivity"); Amend Policy 35.2.6.2 (include reference to electricity transmission line); retain policy 35.2.6.3 (but amend grammatical change); Retain the explanation to objective 35.2.6 and subsequent policies as notified; Retain objective 35.2.10 as notified; Retain policy 35.2.10.1 as notified; Amend bullet point (e) in Rule 36.1 (include Trade Supply Retail and Yard Based Retail activities); Delete Rule 36.2 (a) Subdivision; Delete Rule 36.2 (b) Hazardous substance activities; Amend Rule 36.3 (notification statement); Amend Rule 36.3 (subdivision as a restricted discretionary activity); Amend Rule 36.4 (b) (reference to 12m buffer); Amend Rule 36.5 (include 12m buffer, sensitive activities and uses; offices; Retail Activities and Places of assembly); Amend the definition of sensitive (to include buildings occupied by people for 20 hours a week or more); include a new activity standard in i36.6(b) (minimum clearance of 6m); Retain the location of the Electricity Transmission Line on the Planning maps; Amend any reference to high voltage transmission line to either "electricity transmission line" or</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
"national grid transmission line".			
57	Sheena Yvonne Bennett	8 Putnam Street, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Noise:</i> The area may not be technically a natural amphitheatre, but noise is clearly heard in the areas surrounding the valley. Noise from any commercial development in Creswick Valley would be intrusive to all the surrounding suburbs and definitely in Northland.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The submitter questions the validity of the transport report and the survey timeframe and does not think that it shows a true picture of traffic in Curtis Street. The report does not consider traffic in Randwick Road/Curtis Street and Albermarle Road /Curtis Street intersections. The submitter has moved from Curtis St principally because of the dangerous traffic.</p> <p><i>Ecological:</i> The submitter would prefer the land was retained by Council as a natural corridor between Zealandia and Otari Wilton's Bush. The glowworm colony should be protected.</p> <p><i>Economics:</i> The submitter fails to see the need for more Business in this area. Current businesses in Northland, Karori and Kelburn struggle as it is. The report is biased towards changing the status of the area.</p> <p><i>Process:</i> The publicly notified photo of this area was misleading. Any future development or decision of this site should always be well notified.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That the area should be purchased back by the Council and the zoning be changed to open space or park to join the corridor between Zealandia and Ian Galloway Park. Alternatively, the zoning should be unchanged.</p>			
58	Frances M C Lee	24 Orari Street, Ngaio, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The Council needs to take full cognisance of all its policies that relate to the site, including "Project Kaiwharawhara", the "Biodiversity Action Plan" and "Our living City". The Biodiversity Action Plan refers to "daylighting culverts" and building over the converted site would negate such action. Unless specifically designed and planned, buildings on site could increase pollution and stormwater run off, effecting down stream flows, sediment buildup and destroy stream life. The area is part of a bird corridor and the submitter suggests permitting on addition planting on site. Important landscape features (including glowworms) need preservation. The submitter suggests extending the "wetland" onto the site.</p> <p>The site so not suitable for commercial development. The submitter questions the suitability of the child care centre. Any buildings in this area should be small in height and coverage and limited in number. Absolutely no supermarkets.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>The decision could be to make it all Open Space B.</p>			
59	Michelle and Julian Davies	56 Curtis Street, Northland, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> There is a lack of parking facilities (especially with the new child care centre) which will affect the submitter. The submitter notes the lack of foot path and considers an increase in traffic will create a safety concern. An increase in traffic would impact on the submitters ability to entre and exit their car port. The Curtis/Charter St intersection is dangerous to cross (particularly on Saturdays). Parents already volunteer their time each morning to help children was safelt to and from Cardinal McKeefry School.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p><i>Noise/Dust:</i> The submitter would be affected by traffic noise because their house is only 6 feet from the road. Noise of the traffic affects the submitter outside and disturbs any peace when inside. The extra dust and dirt will affect the submitter's asthma.</p> <p><i>Amenity:</i> Any building would have a visual effect on and change the submitter's environment. Any building would be out of place with the green character of the area.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> Removal of trees and bush would have an impact on the bird population.</p> <p>Decision Requested: That Council leave the Curtis Street zoning as Open Space B</p>			
60	Michael and Rachel Roth	25 Curtis Street, Karori, Wellington 6012	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The traffic count report has little relevance as it does not reflect the actual usage of the Kindercare site. Any activity near Kindercare has huge implications. The Kindercare will generate a total of 450 extra vehicle movements on Curtis St during the week, significantly impacting on the road network. The submitter refers to Kindercare resource consent and notes officer advice at that time that highlighted future potential traffic issues. This needs to be appreciated by Council when considering the rezoning of the site. The Kindercare alone will lead to unacceptable congestion at peak times. Permitting retail development on site will further add to this. The submitter considers that the Kindercare parking arrangements are unsatisfactory and that the southern road boundary of the site will be used by parents when no parks are available within the Kindercare site. Any business or retail activity will be faced with, and add to, this traffic hazard.</p> <p>Decision Requested: Due to the unacceptable road safety risk, that the southern boundary not be used as an access way to the site.</p>			
61	PrimeProperty Group	Attn: Ian Leary, Spencer Holmes Ltd PO Box 588, Wellington 6021	
<p>The submitter generally supports the proposed Curtis Street Business Area but seeks a number of amendments.</p> <p>The submitter outlines their role and investment in Wellington's property market and points out that they have been working through the plan process for Curtis Street since late 2008. The submitter notes the Plan Change 73 history, the 2010 resource consent for a Mitre 10 and the High Court judicial review.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the wider provisions of DPC 77 but notes that this is a small site of only around 1 hectare and when assessed against the wider suburb and city it is only a fraction of the land area. Effectively, the effects being considered in DPC77 are local and therefore the plan provisions should keep the scale of those effects in proportion.</p> <p>The site is suited to a single large commercial building due to its shape, topography, access and existing infrastructure layout. The site has specific restrictions that make development on the site expensive, therefore the submitter opposes all provisions of this plan change which would restrict, or seek to limit the establishment of a large commercial/retail building or being able to respond to market demands and opportunities to develop the site. The submitter accepts and supports the provisions that require specific effects of all potential uses of the site to be assessed at the time of application.</p> <p>The submitter agrees that there is a limited amount of land available for retail/trade supply facilities in the</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>Karori and a shortage of commercial land. The provisions which limit the development of commercial size buildings therefore undermine the plan change. The provisions do not support the development of larger buildings which would make the development viable.</p> <p>The DPC 77 provisions as notified will not allow the unlocking of the land for the economic benefit of the owner and the wider community. It will provide local employment opportunities and flow on effects such as potentially allowing for reduced travelling times for residents to visit/work locally.</p> <p>The RMA is not incumbent on the owner of this land to provide land for visual enjoyment of the neighbouring property. The land is privately owned and not of high ecological value.</p> <p>The submitter also considers that the analysis on urban design is incoherent (provides examples). The Council's own s32 analysis does not support the provisions restricted retail activity on the site and does not justify the imposition of those provisions within DPC 77.</p> <p>Specific provisions supported by the submitter include:</p> <p><i>Objectives and Policies:</i> Objective 35.2.1; Policies 35.2.1.1, 35.2.1.3, 35.2.14; Objective 35.2.2; Policies 35.2.2.3 to 35.2.5; Objective 35.2.4 (subject to a reasonable balance between community expectations and development potential); Policies 35.2.4.1 to 35.2.4.5 (subject to an appropriate rule structure and notification provision); Objective 35.2.5; Policies 35.2.5.1 to 35.3.5.5, Objective 35.2.7; Policy 35.2.7.1 (without limiting the options for both commercial and residential activities) and Policy 35.2.7.4.</p> <p><i>Rules and Standards:</i> Permitted Activity Rule 36.1 (but also include residential activity as a permitted activity); Controlled Activity Rule 36.2 (delete reference to Concept Plan) and Discretionary Activity Rule 36.3(a).</p> <p>Specific provisions opposed by the submitter include:</p> <p><i>Rules and standards:</i> Discretionary Restricted Activity Rules 36.3 (b), (c), (d) and (e) (Activity Gross Floor Areas) on are all strongly opposed (the cost of providing resource consent assessment reports outweighs any actual or potential effects); Discretionary Activity Rule 36.4(b); Activity standard 36.6 (a), (b) & (c) (standards set an unreasonably low level of building bulk); Standard 36.6(e) (more onerous requirements such as (iii) which states "No cut face should be visible above any building roofline" is opposed); Permitted activity standards 36(f)(i) &(iii) (5% landscaping ambiguous and difficult to understand. 10 metres is also an unreasonable amount of space to take up on the site of the whole Western boundary) and Standard 36.6(i) (too onerous); Standard 36.6(l) (not required and is confusing).</p> <p><i>Assessment Criteria Section 36.7:</i> This creates a degree of ambiguity in the way the plan provisions will apply and be used. The submitter specifically opposes 36.7(d) (sets unreasonable requirements and performance standards greater than other areas across the city); 37.7(j) (controls on retail are unnecessary and therefore this criteria is not relevant).</p> <p><i>Concept Plan:</i> Policy 35.2.1.2, 35.2.2.1, Policy 35.2.2.2, Policies 35.2.7.2 and 35.2.7.3 are opposed. The preparation of a concept plan for the level of development likely to occur on the site is effectively detailed design. Council has over-anticipated the development potential of the site. Clauses and rules relating to the concept plan are opposed, including assessment criteria 36.7(a), (b), and the first bullet of other criteria in respect to the concept plan.</p> <p><i>Control of supermarkets:</i> Policy 35.2.1.5. While unlikely to establish on the site, a supermarket would increase competition, improve choice, provide jobs and be a positive to the local environment. The policy seeks to limit the markets ability to provide competition and vitality.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> Objective 35.2.3. Creswick Valley is not predominantly residential in character. The valley sides area predominantly residential, whereas the valley floor is used for other purposes with large buildings which</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>are not residential in scale including recreational buildings, school buildings and the new childcare facility.</p> <p>The plan change provisions must appropriately recognise that the subject site is not within a residential area as such. All nearby residential activity is separated from the site.</p> <p>Policies 35.2.3.1, 35.2.3.2, to 35.2.3.4 to 35.2.3.7 are opposed as they require a greater degree of environmental assessment and protection to that required in the rest of the city. That implies that this site is to some degree, more sensitive than other areas of the city which is not correct. The site is highly modified and contains little or no vegetation of high ecological value. The submitter opposes any provisions which seek to require eco-sourced plant species for this site.</p> <p>The effects on the Kaiwharawhara stream are completely overstated. The proposed provisions to treat stormwater on site would be totally ineffective without the same provisions being applied to all roads, commercial sites and residential properties in the rest of the catchment. Placing new requirements on the subject site that don't apply to development in other sites within the city raises an issue of fairness and equity. The cost implications are high and the actual return in terms of environment outcome will be negligible. Earthworks should covered by a specific earthworks chapter of the Plan.</p> <p><i>Notification:</i> Community interest does not outweigh a landowners right to make a reasonable use of their land without undue costs in the consent process. PPG requests that specific non-notification clauses be re-inserted into the plan provisions to specifically cover Traffic, Urban Design (design and external appearance) and some bulk and location provisions.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> Policy 35.2.5.6 (signs) is subjective and its inclusion would require a traffic assessment of all signs which is required in other areas of the city.</p> <p><i>Electricity transmission lines:</i> Objective 35.2.6. The submitter acknowledges the other legislation and policy. However, as the site is wholly owned by one party, reverse sensitivity uses (other than the power lines) are a matter of owner management, rather than District Plan provisions.</p> <p>The submitter is neutral on:</p> <p>Objectives and related Policies 35.2.8, 35.2.9, 35.2.10; Rule 36.5 (subject to the final determination of what activities would be deemed to be non-complying); Permitted Standard 36(g),(h), (j) and (k) and permitted standards 36.6(m), (n) and (o).</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That DPC 77 be adopted with the changes and amendments discussed above, or alternative relief that achieves a similar outcome</p>			
62	Hilary Freda Patton	4 Samuel Parnell Road, Karori, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Ecology.</i> The site is close to a significant ecological corridor. The glow worm colony needs to be protected. The Kaiwharawhara Stream is at risk from storm water discharges.</p> <p><i>Transport.</i> The roads in the area are narrow. Parking on the road is inappropriate.</p> <p><i>Electricity transmission lines:</i> Transpower recommend buffer corridors with no new buildings 12m each side of lines.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That Council declines the proposed Curtis St Business Area rezoning and instead retain the current status of the land.</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
63	Jessica Jane Campbell	37 Collier Avenue, Karori, Wellington 6012	No
<p>The submitter does not state whether they support or oppose the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The submitter notes road traffic crashes in the area and considers more thought needs to be given to the overall design of the Curtis Street corner if commercial zoning is to go ahead. The submitter describes the existing situation at Curtis St/Chaytor St/Raroa Road and considers this needs to be a part of the commercial design. More consideration needs to be given to removing the blind corner south of the Whitehead Road intersection</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That a traffic plan for the corner of Curtis St /Chaytor St and Curtis St /Chaytor St/Raroa Rd receives more investigation. That the whole of Curtis St is treated as a whole when considering road alignment.</p>			
64	Ruth Pemberton & Ken New	31 Sugarloaf Road, Brooklyn, Wellington 6021	Yes
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>Any future change to the zoning should not be for business development as proposed in the Councils reports. Council has a chance to readdress the decision previously made when it sold the land. Council has now recognised the natural values of the City's environment in its sustainability policies. The forest and glow worm colony and the Kaiwharawhara Corridor are unique with the City's environment.</p> <p>Decision Requested:</p> <p>That any future change to the zoning should not be for business development.</p>			
65	The Architectural Centre Inc.	Attn: Christine McCarthy PO Box 24178, Wellington 6142	Did not state
<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Curtis Street Business Area.</p> <p>The Plan Change proposes weak planning mechanisms to achieve important aims of sustainable design, good urban design and appropriate site use (e.g. Policies 35.2.2.3 and 35.2.3.3). Stronger mechanisms are needed to ensure that the stated council aims are actually able to be achieved. These principles need planning controls.</p> <p><i>Ecology:</i> The site is proximate to an established green corridor and above the culverted Kaiwharawhara Stream. This area is thinnest part of the ecological corridor and so is particularly in need of sensitivity. It is likely that the ground has some degree of contamination. The submitter recommends a requirement for wildlife corridors on the site and development ought to also address the need for site remediation. Identifying contamination and reinstating the Kaiwharawhara Stream would form part of any remediation proposal.</p> <p><i>Concept plan:</i> The plan change refers to a concept plan but an actual plan is not included. The inclusion of the referenced concept plan is important in evaluating this proposal for a District Plan Change. Reinstating Kaiwharawhara Stream should be included in this concept plan.</p> <p><i>Sustainable building:</i> Reference to this is worthy but should also include requirements pertaining to construction/site waste management etc. Aspirations for "appropriate levels of natural light" (Policy 35.2.9.2) could be at the cost of high levels of heat loss and higher energy-use, and that achieving energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable building must involve holistic understandings of a design rather than singling out one potential energy-saving aspect.</p> <p><i>Maori:</i> The submitter questions how the council take into account the principles of tino rangatiratanga,</p>			

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>kaitiakitanga and Te Tiriti o Waitangi. This site appears to have significant potential for a meaningful engagement given the historical significance of the Kaiwharawhara Stream to Māori. Reinstating the stream in conjunction with consultation with iwi appears to be appropriate.</p> <p><i>Urban Design:</i> The submitter has concern that Policy 35.2.3.2 (which discourages "the use of reflective and brightly coloured building materials) might led to an uninspiring mediocrity of cream, beige and olive greens. The submitter suggests promoting the use of natural materials and finishes (e.g. stained timber, weathering metals etc). The submitter has concern about the size and scale of buildings and proposed gross floor areas are too large for this site. The submitter considers the assessment criteria to break up building forms and to form an integrated solution (36.7(b)) may be contradictory.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i> The submitter supports good public mass transport policies (35.2.5.2; 35.2.4 explanation) but questions what uses on the site would encourage use of public mass transport and how could these be accommodated. Issues pertaining to public mass transport are complex and include destination matches as well as more obvious infrastructure such as bus routing, bus stops and good bus shelters. A possibility would be to extend the route of the No. 14 so that it travels along Curtis St.</p> <p>Decision Requested: Did not state.</p>			