

Chapter/Rule	Support/Oppose	Reasons
Chapter 4		
4.3.1A – activity status table	Support in Part	<p>The proposed amendments will reduce the number of consent applications for residential units which will reduce compliance cost and assist with provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>Requiring resource consent (RD) for duplex development on a front site is important to ensure residential character and amenity of established neighbourhoods can be managed, however they should be permitted when they are located behind a single detached dwelling. Proposed amendment as follows:</p> <p><u>iv) One duplex dwelling on a front site located wholly behind the rear building line of a single detached dwelling.</u></p> <p><u>v) 4 or more...</u></p>
4.4.3 – permeable surface	Support	The amendment will make the rule easier to administer and reduce the occurrence of minor resource consents due to minor infringements.
4.4.5 – height to boundary	Support	The amendment will make the rule easier to administer and reduce the occurrence of minor resource consents due to minor infringements.
4.4.6 – Internal access	Oppose	There should be no building setback requirement from an internal access, regardless of the number of residential units it serves.
4.4.6 – building setbacks	Support	The amendment will make the rule easier to administer and reduce the occurrence of minor resource consents due to minor infringements.
4.4.7 – interface between public and private	Oppose	The amendment would allow accessory buildings and garages to have doors facing the transport corridors with no control over the remainder of the building facade. The rule should be amended to make the maximum garage door width 50% of the front building line of the dwelling for a frontage less than 15m wide, but include upper floor areas in the calculation to encourage/support two-storey dwellings.

4.4.10 – outdoor living area	Support in part	<p>The amendment with respect to north-facing outdoor living areas will make the rule easier to administer and reduce the occurrence of minor resource consents due to minor infringements.</p> <p>It is not clear why there needs to be an increase in the outdoor living areas for units of more than 2 bedrooms in the Residential Intensification Zone.</p> <p>The scope of the change should extend to Chapter 5 which is also a residential zone and the same changes should be made to Rule 5.4.11. The amenity expectations for a dwelling do not change between zones.</p>
4.4.11 – service areas	Support in part	<p>The amendment will make the rule easier to administer and reduce the occurrence of minor resource consents due to minor infringements.</p>
4.4.12 – residential unit sizes	Oppose	<p>It is not clear why an additional definition is required for “indoor living area” and why this needs to be controlled for units with 3 or more bedrooms.</p>
4.8.3(c) – interface between public and private	Support in part	<p>Whilst not part of PC6 in terms of the notified version, consistency across the residential environments should be achieved. In order to better recognise the purpose of PC6 in the Residential Intensification Zone, we suggest amending this rule as follows.</p> <p>“Maximum garage door width of 50% of the front building line of the dwelling on a site with a frontage less than 15m wide, <u>taking into account total building frontage at ground and first floor level</u>”.</p>
4.8.5(a)(iv) – outdoor living area	Oppose	<p>This rule should be amended to ensure consistency between residential zones to enable south facing outdoor living areas in appropriate circumstances. A suggested amendment is:</p> <p>“Located on a side of the residential unit which faces north of east or west, <u>or located to the south where adjacent to a significant natural feature which enables additional onsite amenity (e.g. lake, river, stream, reserve).</u>”</p>
Appendix 1.1.2 “Self-contained house-keeping unit”	Oppose	<p>Clauses a) and b) appear to contradict.</p> <p>The term “household unit” is used throughout the rule but this is not a defined term.</p> <p>There will likely be difficulty in interpreting whether a kitchen is “capable” of being occupied and used by more than one household unit</p>

Chapter 5		
General submission point	Oppose	<p>The proposed changes by REEP will result in disparity between Chapters 4 and 5. Unless there is good reason; provisions should be standardised to aid with administration of the district plan. E.g. standards for outdoor living areas, service areas etc.</p> <p>It is submitted that all consequential amendments to changes in Chapter 4 should be made to Chapter 5. This is most evident for the Special Natural Zone – Lake Waiwhakareke Landscape Character Area which enables a minimum density of 350m² per single detached dwelling, therefore being more dense than the General Residential Zone. Consequential amendments to Chapter 5 will ensure the same efficiencies and reductions of minor resource consents due to minor infringements.</p>
Chapter 23		
23.3	Support in part	Fee simple subdivision of apartments can be an appropriate tenure. The activity status should be Restricted Discretionary.
23.7.1	Support	Deletion of average minimum net site area requirements will assist with achieving a compact city.
23.7.2	Support	The amendment will make the rule easier to administer
23.7.3	Oppose in part	<p>(e) and (f) and (g) should be aligned as it should not matter whether an access serves fee simple or unit titles. If up to 20 units is suitable for unit titles, this should also be suitable for fee simple.</p> <p>Limiting a private way to only 6 fee simple lots and requiring public roads to vest can lead to inefficient use of land, sprawl and increase Council's long term maintenance costs.</p> <p>An amendment to private way length and number of private ways accessing a cul-de-sac is supported.</p>
23.7.4	Oppose	Limiting a private way to only 6 lots and requiring public roads to vest can lead to inefficient use of land, sprawl and increase Council's long term maintenance costs.

		<p>It is not clear what the rationale is for requiring roads serving more than 20 lots to be collector standard and have a minimum width of 23m. This does not assist with goals of achieving a compact city and will increase Council's long term maintenance costs.</p> <p>Amendments to the number of private ways accessing a cul-de-sac are supported.</p>
23.7.5	Oppose	<p>(c) and (d) and (e) should be aligned as it should not matter whether an access serves fee simple or unit titles. If up to 20 units is suitable for unit titles, this should also be suitable for fee simple.</p> <p>Limiting a private way to only 6 fee simple lots and requiring public roads to vest can lead to inefficient use of land, sprawl and increase Council's long term maintenance costs.</p> <p>It is not clear what the rationale is for requiring roads serving more than 20 lots to be collector standard and have a minimum width of 23m. This does not assist with goals of achieving a compact city and will increase Council's long term maintenance costs.</p>
Chapter 25		
25.14.4.1(h)	Oppose	<p>Limiting a private way to only 6 lots and requiring public roads to vest can lead to inefficient use of land, sprawl and increase Council's long term maintenance costs.</p> <p>It is not clear what the rationale is for requiring roads serving more than 20 lots to be collector standard and have a minimum width of 23m. This does not assist with goals of achieving a compact city and will increase Council's long term maintenance costs.</p> <p>Rather than an arbitrary number, the requirements should have minimum standards as to why a certain width is needed, for example subject to providing appropriate berms, footpaths, carriageway, parking and manoeuvring and stormwater controls are more appropriate than a single number without consideration between sites with different characteristics.</p>
Miscellaneous		
		<p>Consequential amendments are also sought as a result of any suggested amendment above needing to be amended/reflected in the remainder of the District Plan to ensure consistency in the document.</p>