

Client: Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd
2nd September 2019

Hamilton City Council
Private Bag 3010
Hamilton 3240
New Zealand

Attention: Planning Guidance

Transmitted via email to districtplan@hcc.govt.nz

RE: PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 6 TO THE OPERATIVE HAMILTON CITY PLAN

To whom it may concern,

Please find attached a submission prepared by Blue Wallace Surveyors Limited ('Blue Wallace' or 'the Submitter') and lodged with the Hamilton City Council ('Council') in regard to Proposed Plan Change 6 (PC6) to the Operative Hamilton City District Plan.

The Submitter understands that PC6 reflects the results of Council's Recommendations from the Regulatory Effectiveness and Efficiency Programme (REEP) – to which Blue Wallace was a consulted party.

Blue Wallace holds no commercial advantage in providing the submission on PC6 as presented in tabular format below.

Should clarification on the matters addressed in this response be required, please do not hesitate to contact the PC6 Submission author at tim.lester@bluewallace.co.nz.

Regards



Tim Lester (Planner)
For Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd

Murray Wallace B.Surv., MNZIS
Tony Tynan B.Surv., MNZIS

25 Harwood Street, Hamilton 3204
PO Box 38, Hamilton 3240
Ph: 07 839 7799
Fax: 07 839 4455
www.bluewallace.co.nz

- Registered Land & Engineering Surveyors
- Land Development Consultants
- Resource Management Planners
- Members of the Consulting Surveyors of New Zealand 
- Registered Professional Surveyors

Phone 07 839 7799

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
1	<p>4.3.1a) Activity Status Table</p> <p><i>a) Number of residential units per site in the General Residential Zone (excluding apartments and integrated residential developments)</i></p> <p><i>i. Up to 3 residential units on front, corner, through and rear sites (excluding duplex dwellings)</i></p> <p><i>ii. Up to 3 residential units on rear sites (including duplex dwellings)</i></p> <p><i>iii. One duplex dwelling on a front site</i></p> <p><i>iv. 4 or more residential units on front, corner, through and rear sites (including duplex dwellings)</i></p>	Support	<p>The Submitter supports the proposed amendments to number of dwellings located within a Site under proposed Plan Change 6.</p> <p>Enabling up to 3 dwelling units per Site as a permitted Activity will provide greater certainty (and reduced compliance costs) for users of the District Plan when considering or undertaking infill or higher-density residential developments.</p> <p>Whilst subdivision consent will still be required in most instances, having to apply for land use consent for complying dwellings will be removed thus facilitating more efficient timeframes and lowering unreasonable costs for the developer.</p> <p>The Submitter accepts that up to 4 residential units on a Site appropriately attracts a land use consent requirement, and that a Restricted Discretionary activity status is appropriate.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks that Rule 4.3.1a) is retained as currently drafted.</p>
2	<p>4.4.1a)v. Density</p> <p><i>v. Integrated Residential Development</i></p> <p><i>300m² per single dwelling unit</i></p> <p><i>400m² per duplex (200m² per unit)</i></p> <p><i>Apartments – Average net site area of 150m² per residential unit</i></p>	Oppose	<p>The Submitter opposes the 150m² required for each apartment.</p> <p>It is considered that 150m² for each apartment is not necessary and less than 150m² can be sufficient, especially if they are two story.</p> <p>Instead the Submitter suggests making the max number of apartments equal the total site area (m²) divided by 150.</p> <p>The word ‘average’ should be retained.</p>
3	<p>4.4.3a) Permeable Surface</p> <p><i>a) Front sites, corner sites, through sites only: permeability of the front setback, excluding vehicle and access provisions front setback (required by Rule 4.4.6) to be planted in grass, shrubs or trees (see</i></p>	Support	<p>The Submitter supports in full the lessened permeability for front-yard setbacks.</p> <p>It is noted that site permeability will be retained, hence there will be no exacerbation of stormwater effects as a result of the proposed amendments.</p>

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
	<p><i>Figure 4.4.3c)</i></p> <p><i>General residential</i> 100% Minimum 50%</p> <p>...</p> <p><i>Residential Intensification Zone</i> 100% Minimum 40%</p>		<p>The Submitter seeks the front yard permeability standard as proposed under PC6 is retained as currently drafted.</p>
4	<p>4.4.5a)iv. Height in Relation to Boundary <i>iv. Where the boundary subject to measurement adjoins a legal right of way, access lot or entrance strip, the standard applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way, access lot or entrance strip</i></p>	Support	<p>The Submitter supports this proposed standard in its entirety.</p> <p>The proposed standard introduces common sense into the District Plan in regard to the effects of height to boundary when identifying the effects of any infringement on abutting properties that are separated by an accessway.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks the retention of this provision as currently drafted.</p>
5	<p>4.4.5c) Height in Relation to Boundary <i>c) The following exemptions apply to Rule 4.4.5(a):</i></p> <p><i>i. Chimneys, flues and similar projections not exceeding 2m in height and 1m² in area may protrude through the height control plane; and</i></p> <p><i>ii. An aerial as permitted in Volume 1, Chapter 25.7 City-wide – Network Utilities and the Electricity National Grid Corridor may protrude through the height control plan; and</i></p> <p><i>iii. A gable end, dormer or roof may project beyond the height control plane where:</i></p> <p><i>(a) any projection is no greater than 1.5m² in area and no greater than 1m</i></p>	Support in part	<p>The Submitter generally supports the amendments to this rule however, the Submitter seeks that an additional point be added, to acknowledge that sign off from affected parties may also be an exemption.</p> <p>The additional point is suggested as follows:</p> <p><i>iv. The written consent of the owners adjoining the height to boundary infringement is obtained.</i></p> <p>The permitted boundary activity within the RMA deems this appropriate already.</p> <p>On Comprehensive Developments there needs to be implicit internal sign off on any non-compliance sought by a developer that owns adjacent buildings proposed to be developed. (Likewise with side yards).</p>

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
	<p><i>in height; and</i> <i>(b) any projection is no greater than 2.5m cumulatively in length measured along the edge of the roof (see figure 4.4.5f); and</i> <i>(c) no more than two gable end or dormer projections occur on any given elevation.</i></p>		
6	<p>4.4.6g)ii. Building Setbacks <i>ii. The written consent of the owners adjoining the relevant setback or setbacks is obtained.</i></p>	Support in part	<p>The Submitter generally supports the amendments to this rule but seeks that an additional word be added for consistency with sub-point I above it. The suggestion is as follows:</p> <p>ii. The written consent of the owners adjoining the relevant setback or setbacks is obtained; <u>Or</u></p>
7	<p>4.4.6g)iii Building Setbacks <i>iii. It is proposed to site a building within the 1.5m setback and:</i> <i>(a) The building is less than 10m² in area;</i> <i>and</i> <i>(b) The building is less than 2m in height;</i> <i>and</i> <i>(c) The building will not be connected to electricity supply; and</i> <i>(d) There is no discharge of stormwater onto neighbouring land from the building; and</i> <i>(e) No more than one building is established on a site in accordance with this rule.</i></p>	Support	<p>The Submitter supports proposed Rule 4.4.6g)(iii).</p> <p>The proposed rule will allow for the establishment of minor building structures within the side-yard setbacks without necessitating a land use consent.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks that the amendments be allowed in full.</p>
8	<p>4.4.8 Fences and Walls <i>a) Fences and/or walls shall have a maximum height of 1.8m.</i></p>	Support	The Submitter supports the amendments to this rule.

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
	<p><u>b) The height of any fence and/or wall shall be measured in terms of natural ground level.</u></p> <p><u>c) Any retaining wall which is higher than 1.5m and load bearing is not subject to this standard and will be considered, for the purpose of assessment, as a building.</u></p> <p><u>d) Any fence and/or wall that is taller than 2.5m is not subject to this standard and will be considered, for the purpose of assessment, as a building.</u></p> <p><u>e) This rule shall not apply to any fence and/or wall which:</u></p> <p><u>(i) following construction will be located at or below the natural ground level of the land that existed prior to construction commencing; or</u></p> <p><u>(ii) is internal to a proposed development and does not result in any fence or wall which has a height of 1.8m or more in relation to natural ground level of any adjoining external property boundary not in common ownership.</u></p>		<p>The additional information added to this rule provides clarity for what was previously a rather ambiguous rule.</p> <p>In particular, the clarification around what constitutes a fence or wall will prevent unnecessary confusion.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Submitter supports the inclusion of points e(i) and e(ii), as they represent a common-sense approach.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that the amendments be allowed in full.</p>
9	<p>4.4.10b)iv. Outdoor Living Area</p> <p>iv. Located on a side of the residential unit which faces north, east or west (refer Figure 4.4.10h). For the purpose of this standard, a side that faces north, east or west means the area to the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West of the westernmost and/or easternmost corners of the dwelling, and/or • West of the west facing façade aligned at no 	Support	<p>The Submitter supports removal of the Outdoor Living Area standard pertaining to aspect.</p> <p>Given unavoidable constraints such as topography or roading layout, providing an outdoor living space to the north of the Site is not always feasible – and unfairly discriminated due to environmental factors that are outside of the developers control.</p>

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
	<i>more than 15 degrees to the north-south axis, and/or</i>		The Submitter seeks that Standard 4.4.10iv is removed from the District Plan as proposed.
10	<p>4.4.10d)(i) Outdoor Living Area <i>i. Including single residential dwellings and duplex dwellings</i></p> <p><i>Outdoor living area per residential unit</i> 60m²</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Up to 2 bedrooms 35m²; plus</u> - <u>10m² for each additional room over 2</u> <p><i>Shape</i> Capable of containing a 6m diameter circle No dimension less than 2.5m <u>Either:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>No dimension less than 4.0m; or</u> - <u>Capable of containing a 6m circle with no dimension less than 2.5m</u> 	Support in part	<p>The Submitter supports the proposed outdoor living area standard to the extend where the required area better matches the size, use and occupancy of the housing type.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks that this rule be amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No dimension <u>width contributing to complying area less than 4.0m; or</u> <p><i>No dimension less than</i> is a bad wording; dimension is too loose a word.</p> <p>Any external dimensions of outdoor living are still able to be under 2.5m with the current wording.</p>
11	<p>4.4.11(b)(i) and (ii) Service Areas <i>Minimum requirements per Residential Area unit</i> <i>i. At least 20m² 15m², and may be made up of two separate areas incorporating</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>10m² for clothes drying (e.g. foldable clothes line)</i> - <i>5m² for rubbish / recycling storage</i> <p><i>ii. Minimum dimension 3m 1.5m</i></p>	Support	<p>The submitter supports in full the amendments proposed to 4.4.11b)(i) and (ii).</p> <p>Providing greater flexibility for higher-density developments (and infill development) in regard to the provision of service areas is an effective means to encourage efficient land use within the City.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that Council retain the revised service court standards as proposed.</p>
12	<p>4.4.11(c)(i), (ii) and (iii) Service Areas <i>i. Additional 20m² for second and each subsequent residential unit 15m², and may be made up of two separate areas</i></p>	Support	<p>The submitter supports the proposed amendments in their entirety.</p> <p>By reducing the service area requirements for additional dwelling units on a Site, greater flexibility can be provided for higher density housing whilst</p>

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
	<p><u>incorporating</u> <u>- 10m² for clothes drying (e.g. foldable clothes line)</u> <u>- 5m² for rubbish / recycling storage</u> ii. <u>Minimum dimension 3m 1.5m</u> iii. <u>Duplex in Residential Intensification zone</u> <u>Individual or communal</u> <u>- 10m²</u> <u>- Minimum dimension 1.5m</u></p>		<p>still allowing adequate space for utility areas for the higher density dwellings.</p> <p>Such amendments will enable a more efficient use of the ever-increasing supply of residential land resource within the City.</p>
13	<p>4.4.11(d) – (g) Service Areas i. 10m² ii. <u>Minimum dimension 2.5m 1.5m</u></p>	Support	<p>The submitter supports the reduced minimum area standards (1.5m) as they reflect a greater efficiency in regard to development and land use whilst not diminishing functional use of the applicable land resource.</p>
14	<p>4.4.11(h)(iv) Service areas <u>iv. Service areas may be located within garages where it is demonstrated that there is sufficient room to accommodate the minimum area without impeding parking.</u></p>	Support	<p>The Submitter supports this standard as allowing service areas to be located within garages will facilitate efficient land use through enabling dual use of indoor areas where the Site may be otherwise constrained in providing this area outdoors.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks that this proposed standard is retained as currently drafted.</p>
15	<p>6.4.7e) and g) Residential Development</p>	Support	<p>The Submitter supports the revised standards under this rule as the revised standards promote infill development and the efficient use of land.</p> <p>The amendments will allow for an increase in density which in turn, will contribute to a more sustainable city as sought by the objectives and policies of The Plan.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks that the amendments be allowed in full.</p>

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
16	7.5.3d) and f) Residential	Support	<p>The Submitter supports the revised standards under this rule as the revised standards promote infill development and the efficient use of land.</p> <p>The amendments will allow for an increase in density which in turn, will contribute to a more sustainable city as sought by the objectives and policies of The Plan.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that the amendments be allowed in full.</p>
17	<p><u>23.2.6 Objective</u> <u>The type of land tenure promoted by applications for subdivision consent is appropriate to the nature of existing or approved development.</u></p> <p><u>23.2.6a Policies</u> <u>To ensure that any subdivision is supported by appropriate management structures and legal mechanisms to enable their effective ongoing management, maintenance and operation.</u></p>	Neutral	<p>The current wording for this objective and policy is vague and unclear. Similarly, the rationale for the objective and policy is also unclear.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks that the objective and policy be provided with a suitable explanation to improve clarity. Such an amendment should make clear the context in which the objective and policy can be applied.</p>
18	<p>23.6.4 Cross-lease to Freehold Fee Simple Subdivision</p> <p><i>a) The proposed boundaries shall align with those exclusive uses area boundaries on the cross-lease plan, except where there are no exclusive use areas. <u>Where no exclusive use areas are shown on the cross lease plan the boundaries shall align with the exclusive and established pattern of occupation associated with the existing underlying development.</u></i></p>	Support	<p>The Submitter supports this change.</p> <p>The addition of point c is supported in particular, as some cross-lease arrangements may have been established for a prolonged period of time and compliance with design standards may not always be achievable without changing the design of the site.</p> <p>The suggested changes provide much needed clarification to the rule.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks that the amendment be retained as written.</p>

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
	<p><i>b) Where required to protect services, easements shall be provided.</i></p> <p><i>c) Rule 23.7 – Subdivision Design Standards shall not apply to subdivisions under this rule.</i></p>		
19	23.6.5 Leasehold Subdivision	Support in part	<p>The Submitter generally supports this rule but suggests the amendment below:</p> <p><i>Where an allotment <u>fee simple record of title</u> is subject to an application for subdivision consent by way of leasehold subdivision the following rules shall apply where relevant.</i></p> <p><i>a) Section 23.4 Application of the Transport Corridor</i></p> <p><i>b) Section 23.5 Rules - General Standards</i></p> <p><i>c) Section 23.6 Rules - Specific Standards</i></p> <p><i>d) Section 23.7 Subdivision Design Standards</i></p> <p>There can be many allotments in a Title and not always is a survey required to change allotment numbers.</p>
20	23.6.6 Boundary adjustments	Support in part	<p>Similar to the submission point above, the Submitter generally supports this rule however, the Submitter seeks that the word allotment is replaced with fee simple, unit title or leasehold records of title. Alternative wording is suggested below:</p> <p><i>a) Any boundary adjustment shall not result in the creation of additional allotments <u>records of title</u>, except in circumstances where a boundary adjustment creates an additional allotment <u>record of title</u> or allotments <u>records of title</u> which are required to be held together with another allotment <u>record of title</u> or allotments <u>records of title</u> by way of compulsory amalgamation condition.</i></p>

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
			<p><i>b) Any boundary adjustment shall not alter the size of an existing allotment record of title by greater than 10% of the registered allotment certificate of title size.</i></p> <p><i>c) Any allotment record of title subject to a boundary adjustment shall comply with all relevant development and performance standards.</i></p> <p>...</p> <p>There can be many allotments in a Title and not always is a survey required to change allotment numbers (Amalgamations wouldn't need to be described on that basis as an exception).</p>
21	<p>23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape</p>	Support	<p>The Submitter supports the proposed removal of the 650m² average lot size and 750m² maximum allotment size in the Rototuna Structure Plan Area; as well as removal of the 700m² average minimum NSA in the Rototuna East Character Zone.</p> <p>The Submitter's experience in responding to these standards has resulted in unnecessary constraints in designing complying subdivision layouts – with no discernible benefit to the local community or to the local amenity character.</p>
22	<p>23.7.3g) General Residential Zone, and All Special Character Zones</p> <p><i>g) Any vehicle access serving more than 6 fee simple lots to be formed and vested as public road with minimum widths as set out below:</i></p> <p><i>i. Public road serving 7 – 20 allotments: 16.0m</i></p> <p><i>ii. Public road serving more than 20 allotments (Local Road): 20.0m</i></p> <p><i>iii. Public road serving more than 20 allotments (Collector Road on structure plan): 23.0m</i></p>	Oppose	<p>The Submitter opposes the requirement for a minimum 16m public road and for 6 lots to be the 16m transition point.</p> <p>In the Submitter's experience, public roads can function at widths smaller than 16.0m. Shared environments have operated successfully for years at a 12m legal road width for up to 14 users.</p> <p>When constructing roads on slopes a smaller width may be more desirable to prevent steep driveways and excessively large retaining walls near the road boundary. A minimum 16.0m is unnecessarily restrictive, as Council will require road widths to be formed to full roading standards as</p>

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
			<p>per the ITS. The intended policy is massively wasteful of residential land, particularly for infill development.</p> <p>The Submitter suggests that the standards also align with the standards within the transportation chapter 25 (25.14.4.1(h)) where a private way can be 6m wide and service 20 residential units. There is room in the middle ground as long as there is a demonstrated maintenance plan for private users.</p>
23	<p>23.7.3i) General Residential Zone, and All Special Character Zones <i>hi) Maximum private way length: 50m 100m (with passing every 50m)</i></p>	Support	<p>The Submitter supports the revised performance standard permitting a private way length of 100m as it will limit superfluous infringements without increasing the potential for adverse environmental effects.</p>
24	<p>23.7.4(e) Large Lot Residential Zone <i>e) Public road serving 7 – 20 allotments: 16.0m</i></p>	Oppose	<p>The Submitter opposes the requirement for a minimum 16m public road and for 6 lots to be the 16m transition point.</p> <p>In the Submitter’s experience, public roads can function at widths smaller than 16.0m. Shared environments have operated successfully for years at a 12m legal road width for up to 14 users.</p> <p>When constructing roads on slopes a smaller width may be more desirable to prevent steep driveways and excessively large retaining walls near the road boundary. A minimum 16.0m is unnecessarily restrictive, as Council will require road widths to be formed to full roading standards as per the ITS. The intended policy is massively wasteful of residential land, particularly for infill development.</p> <p>The Submitter suggests that the standards also align with the standards within the transportation chapter 25 (25.14.4.1(h)) where a private way can be 6m wide and service 20 residential units. There is room in the middle ground as long as there is a demonstrated maintenance plan for private users.</p>

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
25	<p>23.7.5e)(i) Residential Intensification Zone <u>e) Any vehicle access serving more than 6 fee simple lots to be formed and vested as public road with minimum widths as set out below.</u> <u>i. Public road serving 7 – 20 allotments: 16.0m</u></p>	Oppose	<p>The Submitter opposes the requirement for a minimum 16m public road and for 6 lots to be the 16m transition point.</p> <p>In the Submitter’s experience, public roads can function at widths smaller than 16.0m. Shared environments have operated successfully for years at a 12m legal road width for up to 14 users.</p> <p>When constructing roads on slopes a smaller width may be more desirable to prevent steep driveways and excessively large retaining walls near the road boundary. A minimum 16.0m is unnecessarily restrictive, as Council will require road widths to be formed to full roading standards as per the ITS. The intended policy is massively wasteful of residential land, particularly for infill development.</p> <p>The Submitter suggests that the standards also align with the standards within the transportation chapter 25 (25.14.4.1(h)) where a private way can be 6m wide and service 20 residential units. There is room in the middle ground as long as there is a demonstrated maintenance plan for private users.</p>
26	<p>25.2.4.1h) Earthworks in All Zones</p>	Support	<p>The Submitter supports the amendment to this rule.</p> <p>The amendment provides needed clarification to what was previously not a clear rule. Specifically, the addition of the table makes the standards explicit.</p>
27	<p>25.8.3.10iv) Noise-sensitive Activities – Activities in all Zones except Ruakura Logistics Zone, Ruakura Industrial Park Zone and the Knowledge Zone <u>iv. The Rotorua North East Character Zone, where the residential activity is within the 55dB LAeq(24hr) contour line from the Waikato Expressway,</u></p>	Support	<p>The Submitter supports the addition of iv) to this rule.</p>

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
	<p><i>established via subdivision in accordance with 23.6.12c, where habitable rooms are located outside of the 55dB LAeq(24hr) contour, no acoustic treatment is required even if one or more boundaries of the lot is intersected by the noise contour.</i></p>		
28	<p>28.8.3.10h) Noise-sensitive Activities – Activities in all Zones except Ruakura Logistics Zone, Ruakura Industrial Park Zone and the Knowledge Zone <i>h) Within the Rototuna North-East Character Zone, any habitable rooms in new residential activities or the construction of new habitable rooms or extensions to habitable rooms in existing residential activities where constructed on a site within the applicable set back for the zone shall meet the following criteria:</i> ... </p>	Support	The Submitter supports the removal of point (h) from this rule.
29	<p>25.14.4.1h) Design and Access Widths <i>Vehicle crossing and internal vehicle access dimensions shall:</i> i. <i>Comply with the relevant dimensions identified in the Tables below</i> Internal vehicle access widths ... </p>	Oppose	<p>The Submitter opposes the requirement for a minimum 16m public road and for 6 lots to be the 16m transition point.</p> <p>In the Submitter’s experience, public roads can function at widths smaller than 16.0m. Shared environments have operated successfully for years at a 12m legal road width for up to 14 users.</p> <p>When constructing roads on slopes a smaller width may be more desirable to prevent steep driveways and excessively large retaining walls near the road boundary. A minimum 16.0m is unnecessarily restrictive, as Council will require road widths to be formed to full roading standards as</p>

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
			per the ITS. The intended policy is massively wasteful of residential land, particularly for infill development.
30	<p>1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan</p> <p>Integrated residential development</p> <p><i>Means a development containing a mixture of residential units, and specifically more than one of the following types: single dwellings, duplex dwellings and/or apartment buildings on a site which is designed in a comprehensive way to function as an integrated development. The development shall may include shared facilities such as open space, access, parking and manoeuvring, and may have other communal activities (e.g. recreational facilities, office administration) for the exclusive use of the residents of the development and their visitors.</i></p> <p><i>The development may include where relevant management structures which govern its day to day operation (such as for retirement villages or rest homes).</i></p> <p><i>An integrated residential development does not include a development that consists solely of one of the following activities:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One type of residential unit - Hospitals - Managed Care Facilities - Residential Centres. 	Support	<p>The Submitter supports this revised definition as it acknowledges that shared facilities may not always be desirable or practical.</p> <p>This definition allows developers the flexibility to not implement shared facilities in such instances.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks the amendment be allowed in full.</p>
31	<p>1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan</p> <p>Outdoor living area</p>	Support in part	The Submitter supports this amendment in part.

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
	<p><i>Means an on-site, outdoor area for the exclusive use of each residential unit, (unless otherwise stated, e.g., communal outdoor living areas for residential centres), free of any building or carparking, but which may include the area beneath eaves, and uncovered decks and terraces regardless of height. In the case of multi-storey apartments covered decks and balconies are included.</i></p>		<p>The Submitter generally supports the acknowledgment that there is a distinction between covered decks and buildings.</p> <p>This will allow homeowners with the flexibility to cover their outdoor living area without compromising the ability to meet the outdoor living area standards.</p> <p>The Submitter also seeks that the rule be clarified to make it clear whether elevated decks and balconies can contribute to this area.</p>
32	<p>1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan Permeable surface <i>Means any part of a site which is grassed or planted in trees or shrubs and is capable of absorbing water. It does not include impermeable surfaces or any area which:</i> <u>a) The use of permeable pavers for parking, access and manoeuvring areas associated with residential units; and</u> <u>b) Uncovered decks which allow water to drain through to a surface which can absorb water.</u> <i>It excludes any area which:</i> a) Falls within the definition of <u>building site coverage</u>. b) Is covered by decks which do not allow water to drain through to a permeable surface. <u>cb) Is occupied by swimming pools.</u> d) Is paved, sealed or formed to create a solid surface.</p>	Support	<p>The Submitter supports this revised definition as it provides much needed clarity around what constitutes a permeable surface.</p> <p>In particular the Submitter supports the acknowledgment that there are a number of other surfaces, other than grass and shrubs, that are permeable.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks that the amendment be allowed in full.</p>

No.	Provision	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought
	<i>ec) Is used for shared vehicle parking, manoeuvring or access.</i>		