

Adamsonshaw submission Points

My name is Frank Sutton. I am an Intermediate level Environmental Planner for Adamsonshaw in Wellington City.

Adamsonshaw is a surveying and planning consultancy dealing mostly with small rural and residential subdivisions and some larger multi-unit residential subdivisions and developments.

The AdamsonShaw Submission points are on the residential sections of the PDP.

Subdivision Standard SUB-S2 Water supply

Adamsonshaw has been having to amend conditions of subdivision consents where Wellington Water Limited have attempted to require upgrades to existing water supply pipes servicing existing dwellings. This is not able to be enforced under the RMA and AdamsonShaw has been successful in their arguments every time. However, the same draft conditions keep coming through. So, the wording of the conditions in the PDP need to be specific.

SUB-S2 should refer to new vacant allotments. An allotment created around an existing dwelling (ie. not a vacant allotment) will not create an adverse effects on the existing water supply arrangement currently serving the existing house. Therefore, upgrades to the existing water supply arrangement (to meet current standards by Wellington Water Limited) cannot be required in the form of a condition of the subdivision consent as per Section 108AA(1)(b)(i) of the Resource Management Act. The existing water supply arrangement servicing the existing dwelling on the allotment (as long as the dwelling is to remain as part of the subdivision) can be retained in full.

Relief sought

SUB-S2 should be amended to specifically refer to new vacant allotments.

Additionally, a point could be added to ensure that existing water supply arrangements continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.

Subdivision Standard SUB-S3 Wastewater disposal

Like the point above.

SUB-S3 should refer to new vacant allotments. An allotment created around an existing dwelling (ie. not a vacant allotment) will not create an adverse effects on the existing wastewater system/connection currently serving the existing house. Therefore, upgrades to the existing wastewater system/connection (to meet current standards by Wellington Water Limited) cannot be required in the form of a condition of the subdivision consent as per Section 108AA(1)(b)(i) of the Resource Management Act. The existing wastewater system/connection servicing the existing dwelling on the allotment (as long as the dwelling is to remain as part of the subdivision) can be retained in full.

Relief sought

SUB-S3 should be amended to specifically refer to new vacant allotments.

Additionally, a point could be added to ensure that existing wastewater system/connection continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.

Subdivision Standard SUB-S4 Stormwater management

Like the two points above.

SUB-S4 should refer to new vacant allotments. An allotment created around an existing dwelling (ie. not a vacant allotment) will not create an adverse effects on the existing stormwater system/connection currently serving the existing house. Therefore, upgrades to the existing stormwater system/connection (to meet current standards by Wellington Water Limited) cannot be required in the form of a condition of the subdivision consent as per Section 108AA(1)(b)(i) of the Resource Management Act. The existing stormwater system/connection servicing the existing dwelling on the allotment (as long as the dwelling is to remain as part of the subdivision) can be retained in full.

Subdivisions can involve creating allotments around existing dwellings. Allotments that contain existing dwellings do not need to be provided with hydraulic neutrality. This is because the dwelling existing prior to the subdivision and the subdivision is not increasing the stormwater runoff on this allotment.

Relief sought

SUB-S4 should be amended to specifically refer to new vacant allotments.

Additionally, a point could be added to ensure that existing stormwater system/connection continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.

Point 2 should be amended to say "All subdivisions creating vacant allotments must achieve hydraulic neutrality". A note could point out that existing dwellings do not require hydraulic neutrality.

Medium Density Residential Zone Standard MRZ-S4 Boundary setbacks

The current standards in the Operative District Plan are more permissive than the PDP yard/setback standards.

Relief sought

The front yard setback should be 1.5 metres, or 10 metres less half the width of the road, which ever is the lesser. This allows the front yard setback to be 0 meters if the width of the road is 20m or wider.

There should be no side or rear yard setback requirement. Except that, A minimum width of 1 metre must be maintained between buildings where a residential building (other than an accessory building) on an adjoining site is sited less than 1 metre from the boundary. Given that at least 1m needs to be maintained for fire safety.

The above is based off of the current District Plan setback standards

Medium Density Residential Zone Standard MRZ-S7 Outlook space (per unit)

This is one of the main limitations to intensification of development and dwelling density in the established residential areas. The requirement to provide a 4m deep outlook space is too much. The 4m width requirement is ok.

Relief sought

If possible, the depth of the outlook space should be reduced to 3m so that the complying outdoor living space can double as outlook space.

High Density Residential Zone Standard HRZ-S4 Boundary setbacks

The current standards in the Operative District Plan for the corresponding zone are more permissive than the PDP yard/setback standards.

Relief sought

The front yard setback should be 1 metre as it is in the Operative District Plan for the inner residential zone.

There should be no side or rear yard setback requirement. Except that, A minimum width of 1 metre must be maintained between buildings where a residential building (other than an accessory building) on an adjoining site is sited less than 1 metre from the boundary. Given that at least 1m needs to be maintained for fire safety.

Further Submission Point -001

I support, in part, the submission of Wellington City Council (266.140) being a submission on Medium Density Residential Zone Standard MRZ-S5 Building Coverage.

The exemptions proposed by Wellington City Council in their submission are similar to the existing exemptions to site coverage in the Operative District Plan. However the exemption for uncovered decks and uncovered structures should be increased to being "no more than 1m in height above ground level" and "eaves up to 1m in width" as this is the current exemptions under the ODP. Given the topography of Wellington, most decks are greater than 500mm. Decks are used to provide flat outdoor living space and they should not count towards site coverage where they are less than 1m.

It is sought that the exemptions are increased to match what is in the ODP. Amend MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as follows:

This standard does not apply to:

- a. Uncovered decks and uncovered structures no more than 1m in height above ground level; and
- b. Eaves up to 1m in width.