

Summary of submissions
Proposed District
Plan Change 68

Ngauranga Forest rezoning

November 2008

Summary of Submissions

District Plan Change 68 – Ngauranga Forest Rezoning

- Submitters -

The list below contains the names and contact information for submitters on Plan Change 67.

Number	Name	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
1	Judith & Gerald Byers	88A Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
2	Dani Coplon	80 Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
3	Regional Public Health	Private Bag 31907	Lower Hutt	Attn: Dr Stephen Palmer
4	M Donoghue & D Mackay	90A Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
5	Cr. John Morrison	Wellington City Council	101 Wakefield Street	Wellington
6	Peter & Miriam Ameye	100B Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
7	Peter Henderson	78 Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
8	Dr Susan Jackson	78 Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
9	Ann Corcoran	72 Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
10	Homebush Road Residents Group	96 Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
11	Tom & Amy Yuan	92 Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
12	Janine Buxton	100A Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
13	Board of Trustees	Cashmere Avenue School	Cl- Hazelton Law	PO Box 5639, Wellington
14	Nick & Alison Dixie	96 Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
15	Laura Dixie	96 Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
16	Forest & Bird, Wellington Branch	David Rohan	PO Box 4183	Wellington
17	Lynette Mellsop	92B Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
18	Jennifer Roy	94 Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
19	Peter & Sandra Shakes	102 Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
20	K Fraser & M Ingpen	100 Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
21	Christopher Gollins	113A Motuhara Road	Plimmerton	Porirua
22	Andrew Monahan	28 Rewa Road	Hataitai	Wellington
23	Ludovic Mahu	71A Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
24	Brendan Clegg	59 Satara Crescent	Khandallah	Wellington
25	Alan & Patricia Brown	63 Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
26	Anthony Carter	86 Homebush Road	Khandallah	Wellington
27	Greater Wellington Regional Council	PO Box 11-646	Wellington	Attn: Ling Phang
28	Wellington Tenths Trust	Po Box 536	Wellington	Attn: Liz Mellish

CONTENTS

1.	GENERAL SUBMISSIONS	3
1.1.	General support for the plan change	3
1.2.	Other General Submissions.....	3
1.3.	Zoning	10
2.	TRAFFIC.....	11
3.	STORMWATER, FLOODING & STABILITY.....	14
4.	LANDSCAPE AND ECOLOGY	16

1. General Submissions

1.1. General support for the plan change

Submission 21

The submitter supports the plan change in its entirety. It will lead to the availability of residential land in an area of obvious demand, consistent with the Northern Growth Management Framework. The area is close to the city, well-connected to existing residential areas and along existing public transport routes.

Decision Requested:

That Council approve the plan change.

Submission 22

The submitter supports the plan change in its entirety. It is submitted that the residential use and small natural extension off Homebush Road is the best use of the site. The submitter notes the plan change area covers only a small portion of the entire land and existing infrastructure can cope with additional lots.

Decision Requested:

That Council approve the plan change.

Submission 24

The submitter supports the plan change in its entirety. It is submitted that Khandallah is experiencing a shortage of available housing for sale. Further that the land serves little purpose as open space and is more appropriate as residential – it offers great views and is near the city and schools.

Decision Requested:

That Council approve the plan change.

1.2. Other General Submissions

Submission 1

The submitter understood when buying their property that the land would be retained as Open Space. The submitter is opposed to the rezoning.

Decision Requested:

That the rezoning be declined and the status quo retained.

Submission 2

The submitter is concerned about increased pressure on local schooling infrastructure with the proposed intensification of the area. There is concern that local schools do not have the capacity at present and more residences would add to this pressure.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 3

The submitter opposes the plan change. It is submitted that the rezoning is inconsistent with wider Council policy (Urban Development Strategy, Centres Policy, etc) – specifically, it is contrary to the idea of a compact urban form and better-connected urban edge. This application encroaches onto green space valued for its natural character and open space value.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application and retain the status quo.

Submission 6

The submitter opposes the proposal and considers the proposed accessway to be inadequate. Further, it is noted that the applicant knew the land was zoned Open Space when purchased.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application and retain the status quo.

Submission 8

The submitter believes that the proposal is contrary to the District Plan's intent to protect the open, natural character of Wellington's open spaces. The Plan also recognises that it is immaterial if the land is in private or public ownership as to the importance of protecting these areas.

The submitter notes that the Council has not earmarked this area as appropriate for residential intensification despite the applicant's use of the Northern Growth Management Framework as justification.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application and retain the status quo.

Submission 9

The submitter notes that the applicant knew the zoning of the land was Open Space upon purchase in 2006.

It is also submitted that the neighbourhood has a warm community spirit which will be eroded if this rezoning is allowed.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 10

The submitter states that the applicant has not acted in good faith towards the local residents as they seem to be unconcerned for the potential effects on the environment and the community.

The land is not part of the Northern Growth Management area, and should not be considered as part of Council's growth strategy. Under the existing Open Space provisions, residential subdivision of the land would be a non-complying activity. In terms of s104D of the RMA, such an application should not be seen as having minor adverse effects on the environment. The application would be contrary to the Open Space objectives and policies in the District Plan.

The submitter also highlighted potentially significant Iwi historical values of the land that should be considered.

There is concern from local residents as to the availability of places within schools in the area. Additional housing in the area would place unreasonable strain on local school infrastructure.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 11

The submitter notes that the proposal is contrary to Open Space objectives in the District Plan, stating that the area should be valued for its natural character.

It is also submitted that the proposal could add pressure to the local school infrastructure.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 13

The submitter notes that the local school has experienced a large increase in enrolment in recent years, largely due to the effects of infill housing. The plan change proposal would provide for a significant increase in family numbers in the area, adding further strain to the school. If the rezoning is approved, the school may be forced to consider further reductions in the zone defining enrolment.

The submitter also illustrates that the area is not contained in the Northern Growth area which is emphasised in the application.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application; or

If the above relief is not granted, that the land be rezoned as Rural.

Submission 14

The submitter notes that the proposal is contrary to Open Space objectives in the District Plan, which states that such land should be valued for its natural character. The land is not within the Northern Growth Area despite the applicant using the Northern Growth Framework as an argument to support the development.

It is submitted that the access to the site is inadequate, poorly sited, lacks technical feasibility, and would have a significant impact on the neighbouring property. The submitter believes the provided drawings are inaccurate and illegible. It is believed that the completed retaining structure would intrude on neighbouring sunlight access planes and privacy. It is considered a more appropriate siting for the ROW to be where the existing house is at 98 Homebush road to allow for mitigation landscaping. It is likely that construction on the ROW will damage trees and shrubs on neighbouring properties as well.

The submitter questions the adequacy of the 3m wide strip to gain the access for the site.

The submitter notes that the existing buses and schools face capacity problems with existing local population and that the increase in residences would add further pressure.

It is also submitted that the neighbourhood has a warm community spirit which will be eroded if this rezoning is allowed.

The submitter believes the overall adverse effects of the proposal are such that they cannot be resolved or mitigated and supposed benefits are unsubstantiated.

The submitter disagrees with the application suggesting the development will address the growing housing needs of the city.

The submitter is concerned that the applicant will apply to further develop the remaining land on the site.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 15

The submitter believes the land should be preserved as open space to preserve the existing values of the land.

It is submitted that the destruction of the bush for construction is contrary to responsible dealing of climate change effects.

The submitter believes the neighbouring homes will experience seriously reduced property and amenity values.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 17

The submitter believes the proposal is contrary to Council policy of maintaining green spaces to ensure Wellington's natural character.

The submitter also suggests that the engineering impact of construction will have adverse effects on neighbouring properties.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 18

The submitter believes that the land is valued for its natural character and informal open spaces, and should remain in a natural or unbuilt state. It is noted that the site is not within the Northern Growth Management Area. The submitter believes there will be significant adverse effects on the adjoining neighbours.

The submitter does not agree that the area is a logical extension of the existing urban area. The submitter also questions the minimal impact of the traffic, earthworks and construction.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 19

The submitter notes that the proposal is contrary to Open Space objectives in the District Plan, which states that such land should be valued for its natural character. The land is not within the Northern Growth Area despite the applicant using the Northern Growth Framework as an argument to support the development.

It is submitted that the access to the site is inadequate, poorly sited, lacks technical feasibility, and would have a significant impact on the neighbouring property. The submitter believes the provided drawings are inaccurate and illegible. It is believed that the completed retaining structure would intrude on neighbouring sunlight access planes and privacy. It is considered a more appropriate siting for the ROW to be where the existing house is at 98 Homebush road to allow for mitigation landscaping. It is likely that construction on the ROW will damage trees and shrubs on neighbouring properties as well.

The submitter questions the adequacy of the 3m wide strip to gain the access for the site.

The submitter notes that the existing buses and schools face capacity problems with existing local population and that the increase in residences would add further pressure.

It is also submitted that the neighbourhood has a warm community spirit which will be eroded if this rezoning is allowed.

The submitter believes the overall adverse effects of the proposal are such that they cannot be resolved or mitigated and supposed benefits are unsubstantiated.

The submitter disagrees with the application suggesting the development will address the growing housing needs of the city.

The submitter is concerned that the applicant will apply to further develop the remaining land on the site.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 20

The submitter believes the proposal is contrary to the RMA and District Plan, both of which value the special character of such land.

The submitter notes that the subdivision plan is indicative and the final number of dwellings on the site could be significantly increased.

It is also submitted that the neighbourhood has a warm community spirit which will be eroded if this rezoning is allowed.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 23

The submitter notes that the applicant knew the zoning of the land was Open Space upon purchase in 2006.

It is also submitted that the neighbourhood has a warm community spirit which will be eroded if this rezoning is allowed.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 25

The submitter notes that the applicant knew the zoning of the land was Open Space upon purchase in 2006. If approved, this could set a negative precedent in other areas of the city. The area is a valuable part of the natural green entrance to Wellington, and the area has been enhanced in recent years by the emergency of regenerating bush and birdlife. The zoning would have a severe impact on the surrounding area. The long driveway would require major earthworks, raising the questionable nature of the land's stability.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 27

The submitter states that the plan change (when assessed against the relevant provisions of Chapter 14 of the Regional Policy Statement [RPS]) will result in positive environmental quality outcomes and greater use of resources; however, the plan change is inconsistent with Chapter 9 of the RPS.

The application's landscape assessment concludes that the vegetation of the site has open space values. The submitter believes that further subdivision and development of the area may have potential impacts on the Wellington Harbour landscape. The site forms part of the coastal escarpment and should be protected.

The submitter suggests that the implications of future development need to be carefully considered to prevent compromising of open space values and the vulnerable portion of the local ecosystem.

Decision Requested:

That the Council consider the following issues prior to making a decision on the plan change:

- the effects of removal of the trees including the block of pines on site stability.
- measures to enhance or restore indigenous biodiversity.
- legal protection of regenerating native vegetation by way of consent notice or covenant to ensure successful development of this site
- implication of additional housing on the ecological linkages of the subject site with nearby reserve and open space areas including Tyers Road reserve, Homebush Park (Khandallah to the west)

Submission 28

The submitter does not oppose the extension of residential use on the land, but wishes to be involved in the consultation with the landowner and Council to assure parties are aware of the cultural significance for Iwi and to assure the relationship with the land is recognised through the process. The submitter does not support rezoning of the entire area.

Decision Requested:

That the Council have further consultation with the submitter to fully consider the above matters.

1.3. Zoning

Submission 2

The submitter opposes the plan change. It is noted that the applicant bought the land with an Open Space zoning. The proposed rezoning contradicts the Council's intent to protect natural and green areas of the city. Any residential subdivision should be treated as non-complying activity under the current Open Space rules. The proposal should not be seen as having minor adverse effects as suggested by the applicant. Changing the zoning would compromise the local ecosystem.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 4

The submitter believes the proposed rezoning contradicts the Council's intent to protect natural and green areas of the city.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 7

The submitter believes that Open Space B areas are one of the city's assets. Approving this application would give weight to future consumption of Open Space land for residential purposes. It is appreciated that there are difficulties surrounding the zoning of privately-owned land as Open Space; however, the submitter notes that the applicant purchased the land with the knowledge of the existing zoning – this application should fail as it is contrary to the objectives of the District Plan.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 14

The submitter cites the Environment Court decision highlighted in paragraph 9.11 which reads, "private land should not be zoned for reserve and open space purposes unless it is already reserved for such purposes..." As the land has already been zoned Open Space, the submitter argues it should remain that way.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 19

The submitter cites the Environment Court decision highlighted in paragraph 9.11 which reads, "private land should not be zoned for reserve and open space purposes unless it is already reserved for such purposes..." As the land has already been zoned Open Space, the submitter argues it should remain that way.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

2. Traffic

Submission 2

The submitter notes that the street is very busy and often has cars parked on both sides. There is concern over the potential increase in vehicle traffic on an already-dangerous road.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 4

The submitter states that Homebush road is under strain with limited on-street parking available. Traffic safety will be affected by increased construction traffic and vehicles from the proposed residences.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 5

The submitter believes that too much development in the area would put pressure on the infrastructure there, as Homebush Road has limited room for traffic and on-street parking. Increased traffic noise will also impact local residents.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application and retain the status quo.

Submission 9

The submitter states that vehicle traffic increased significantly with local infill housing projects. It is submitted that local roads are dangerous with frequent construction vehicle traffic. The entrance to the subdivision is located near a tight corner frequented by busses and cars, and an increase in cars due to the proposal is a matter of concern.

On street parking is already at a premium around the entrance to the land, and this would be made even more difficult if the proposal is approved.

It is submitted that construction traffic would create a traffic and personal health hazard for the area.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 10

The submitter believes the application's traffic assessment to be flawed. There is concern about the potential increase in traffic volume on the already dangerous, narrow road. The submitters are also concerned for pedestrian safety in the area with an increased traffic volume.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 11

The submitter notes that the accessway to the site is situated at a dangerous corner in the road. The increase in vehicle traffic to the street arising from the proposal will result in traffic problems. There is a concern for pedestrian and child safety with respect to heavy vehicle traffic there. The increase in local population would also put a strain on bus and on-street parking availability.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 14

The submitter notes that the site accessway enters Homebush Road at a tight and blind corner. Also significant is the fact that the footpath is only on the side of the Road that contains the accessway to the site. It is believed that the proposed accessway will have a significant adverse effect on the neighbouring property and is unreasonable.

The accessway would also result in the loss of at least 2 kerbside parking spaces, which is already limited in the area.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 15

The submitter states that Homebush Road is narrow and winding, with limited parking which will be worsened if the application is approved. There is concern for safety conditions arising from increased vehicle traffic.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 17

The submitter states that the added construction and subsequent residential traffic from the proposal would increase safety issues to a road already under strain.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 19

The submitter notes that the site accessway enters Homebush Road at a tight and blind corner. Also significant is the fact that the footpath is only on the side of the Road that contains the accessway to the site. It is believed that the proposed accessway will have a significant adverse effect on the neighbouring property and is unreasonable.

The accessway would also result in the loss of at least 2 kerbside parking spaces, which is already limited in the area.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 20

The submitter notes that the site accessway enters Homebush Road at a tight and blind corner. The accessway would also significantly affect the neighbouring property.

The accessway would also result in the loss of at least 2 kerbside parking spaces, which is already limited in the area.

Increased traffic noise and safety will be significant concerns arising from the proposal. Additionally, parking is already at a premium on-street, and this will be pressured further with the introduction of new residences.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 23

The submitter states that vehicle traffic increased significantly with local infill housing projects. It is submitted that local roads are dangerous with frequent construction vehicle traffic. The entrance to the subdivision is located near a tight corner frequented by busses and cars, and an increase in cars due to the proposal is a matter of concern.

On street parking is already at a premium around the entrance to the land, and this would be made even more difficult if the proposal is approved.

It is submitted that construction traffic would create a traffic and personal health hazard for the area.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 26

It is submitted that local roads are dangerous with frequent construction vehicle traffic. The entrance to the subdivision is located near a tight corner frequented by busses and cars, and an increase in cars due to the proposal is a matter of concern.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

3. Stormwater, flooding & stability

Submission 1

The submitter questions the stability of the area – recent landslips have occurred in similar nearby areas. The steep gradients of a number of the indicative sites pose a significant risk.

Decision Requested:

That the rezoning be declined and the status quo retained.

Submission 2

The submitter notes that the geotechnical report indicates instability and suggests further investigation. Increases in landslips in the area have been noticeable in recent times, and there is concern that existing residences could be in danger of damage with increased instability from earthworks, runoff, etc.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 4

The submitter is concerned over the slope stability on the site, and the impact of construction on adjoining land.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 10

The submitter notes the application's geotechnical report refers to obvious land instability and suggests further investigation. Increases in landslips in the area have been noticeable in recent times, and there is concern that existing residences could be in danger of damage with increased instability from earthworks, runoff, etc.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 11

The submitter notes that the land is close to the fault line and its steepness is prone to landslip. The rezoning could increase destabilisation and landslips in this unstable area.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 14

The submitter sites that the required earthworks for the application are likely to cause the collapse of the landscaped hillside on the adjoining property below the ROW.

Increased run-off and risk of flooding arising from the proposal is of concern to the submitter

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 19

The submitter sites that the required earthworks for the application are likely to cause the collapse of the landscaped hillside on the adjoining property below the ROW.

Increased run-off and risk of flooding arising from the proposal is of concern to the submitter

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 20

The submitter notes the application's geotechnical report refers to obvious land instability and suggests further investigation. Increases in landslips in the area have been noticeable in recent times, and there is concern that existing residences could be in danger of damage with increased instability from earthworks, runoff, etc.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

4. Landscape and ecology

Submission 1

The submitter is concerned that the development would compromise their current outlook. Ngauranga Gorge is a key location in as set out in *Capital Spaces*. There is abundant flora and fauna in the area which would be seriously impacted by the rezoning.

Decision Requested:

That the rezoning be declined and the status quo retained.

Submission 2

The submitter states that the proposal will have adverse landscape effects for local residents, harbour users, and other wider suburbs.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 4

The submitter states there is significant plant and animal life in the area that should be considered.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 5

The submitter believes the proposal would infringe on valuable green belt land of regenerating bush running from Thorndon to Petone. Allowing further residential encroachment in the area would seriously impact the look of the city and harbour. This is not simply a localised issue, but should be viewed in a city-wide context. The local streetscape character would also suffer from the proposal.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application and retain the status quo.

Submission 6

The submitter opposes the proposal as it threatens areas of regenerating native bush.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application and retain the status quo.

Submission 7

The submitter notes that the land contains naturally regenerating vegetation, which should be protected from removal. The area's current open space character provides an attractive environment for local birdlife and a natural green entrance to the city.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 8

The submitter notes that the site forms a forested and regenerating native bush clad gateway into the city. The sight is highly visible from throughout the city. The rezoning would set a negative precedent for similar areas.

Heavy removal of plant life for residential purposes will threaten the use of the area by birdlife.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application and retain the status quo.

Submission 9

The submitter notes that the area contains a great deal of regenerating bush and, increasingly, native birdlife.

It is also noted that the steep nature of the site causes risk of slope instability with future construction.

The submitter believes the rezoning would have a negative visual impact for locals and from the wider areas of the city, including the harbour.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 10

The submitter states that the rezoning would allow for a significant change in landscape character of the site, with adverse visual effects arising for local residents and wider community.

The site contains regenerating bush and provides an ideal environment for local birdlife.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 11

The submitter believes the rezoning would provide a negative impact on the City's overall landscape quality.

Further, the area provides shelter for a range of birds and other wildlife that are valued by local residents.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 12

The submitter is concerned about adverse landscape effects arising for local residents and citywide if the proposal is approved. The area presently provides an attractive outlook from the harbour and balances the built and natural landscapes.

Decision Requested:

That the Council carefully consider the ramifications of the rezoning and subsequent residential construction on the city's landscape values.

Submission 14

The submitter believes the proposal will result in the loss of an invaluable portion of regenerating bush. The green open space character of the area gives pleasure to a large number of local residents and wider Wellington.

Further, the existing bush provides shelter and sustenance for a range of wildlife.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 15

The submitter believes the proposal involves the destruction of significant native bush which should be preserved.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 16

The submitter believes the zone change would negatively impact on the indigenous vegetation in the area and significantly and adversely affect the landscape character of the site. The Wellington Branch of Forest and Bird has recognised the area as environmentally significant – both in terms of vegetation and animal life. The submitter rejects the application's assertion that the site has low ecological value.

The area is highly visible from wider Wellington and should be protected to preserve landscape values.

The submitter also notes the Council's Biodiversity Action Plan which seeks to "Protect Wellington's indigenous biodiversity on both public and private land."

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 17

The submitter believes the area contains significant vegetation and an ideal environment for wildlife.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 19

The submitter believes the proposal will result in the loss of an invaluable portion of regenerating bush. The green open space character of the area gives pleasure to a large number of local residents and wider Wellington.

Further, the existing bush provides shelter and sustenance for a range of wildlife.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 20

The submitter believes the plan change would have a significant and adverse effect on the landscape values of Wellington and would compromise the idea of the city's green belt.

The area contains significant native bush and birdlife.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 23

The submitter notes that the area contains a great deal of regenerating bush and, increasingly, native birdlife.

It is also noted that the steep nature of the site causes risk of slope instability with future construction.

The submitter believes the rezoning would have a negative visual impact for locals and from the wider areas of the city, including the harbour.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.

Submission 26

The submitter notes that the area contains a great deal of regenerating bush and, increasingly, native birdlife.

It is also noted that the steep nature of the site causes risk of slope instability with future construction.

Decision Requested:

That the Council reject the plan change application.
