

SUBMISSION ON A RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION THAT IS SUBJECT TO LIMITED NOTIFICATION BY THE KAPITI COAST DISTRICT COUNCIL

Pursuant to section 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Application Number:	RM220070
Applicant:	Gresham Trust
Proposal:	For a 139 two storey residential unit development in 18 blocks and associated 311 lot subdivision including 170 carparks and associated earthworks at 240 Kapiti Road, Paraparaumu.
Legal Description(s):	Lot 1 DP 88870

DUE AT COUNCIL OFFICE NO LATER THAN 4:00PM ON FRIDAY 26TH AUGUST 2022

This is a submission on an application from Gresham Trust for a 139 two storey residential unit development in 18 blocks and associated 311 lot subdivision including 170 carparks and associated earthworks at 240 Kapiti Road, Paraparaumu.

Please note: This form is only a guideline. If you don't wish to use this form please make sure your submission includes all the following details (see Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedure) Regulations 2003, Form 13 for official submission content requirements):

Please send your Submission to:

To:	Or:
The Chief Executive Officer	Email: submissions@kapiticoast.govt.nz
Kāpiti Coast District Council	
Private Bag 60 601	
Paraparaumu 5254	

Note: You are required to send a copy of your submission to the applicant as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the Kāpiti Coast District Council.

Please serve a copy of your submission to Gresham Trust (c/- Cuttriss Consultants Limited) as below:

Emma.Mclean@cuttriss.co.nz

Submitter/s Details:

Title:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mr <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mrs <input type="checkbox"/> Miss <input type="checkbox"/> Ms <input type="checkbox"/> Dr Other:		
My/Our Full Name(s):	Graham Leslie Thompson & Margaret Ann Thompson		
Address for service:	2c Cedar Drive, Paraparaumu Beach Paraparaumu	Post Code:	5032
Physical Address:	As above	Post Code:	
Home Ph:	04 905 3264	Work Ph:	

Home Fax:		Work Fax:	
Cell:	027 2854664	Email:	margraht@gmail.com

Note: Correspondence will be via email unless otherwise requested.

Submitter/s Position:

Trade Competition

- I am a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991.
 I am not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please use a clear tick in the appropriate box below (✓) to show whether you support the application in full or in part, or oppose the application in full or in part, or are neutral.

<input type="checkbox"/> I / We support the application in full	<input type="checkbox"/> I / We support part of the application *
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I / We oppose the application in full	<input type="checkbox"/> I / We oppose part of the application *
<input type="checkbox"/> I / We are neutral on all aspects of the application	<input type="checkbox"/> I / We are neutral on part of the application *

* If you indicate you support, oppose or are neutral for part of the application, please clearly set out the part(s) of the application you are submitting on (including reasons) in the 'My Submission Is' section of this form below.

Reasons for Submission:

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details:

[See attached pages hereunder](#)

Please use additional pages if required.

My Submission Is:

Include further detail on whether you support, oppose or are neutral on the application or specific parts of it; and the reasons for your views:

[See attached pages hereunder](#)

Please use additional pages if required.

Decision Sought:

I / we seek the following decision from the Kāpiti Coast District Council (provide precise details including the general nature of any conditions or changes sought):

That Resource Consent be declined for the reasons, but not limited to those reasons, set out in our attached Submission hereunder.

Please use additional pages if required.

Wish to Speak at Hearing:

Please indicate below whether you would like to speak at the hearing for the application (if a hearing is required). Use a clear tick in the appropriate box below (✓).

I / we do not wish to be heard and hereby make my / our submission in writing only.
(This means that you will not be advised of the date of the hearing and cannot speak at the hearing)

OR

I / we wish to be heard in respect of my / our submission (to speak at the public hearing)
(This means you can speak at the hearing. If at a later date you decide you no longer wish to speak at the hearing you can withdraw from being heard)

I / we intend to call expert witness(es). Please indicate the disciplines of expected expert witnesses.
(If you do not tick this box, you can change your mind later and decide to call experts to give evidence in relation to your submission, provided you do so in time to meet any procedural direction the Hearing Panel might make)

Pursuant to Section 100 of the Resource Management Act 1991, I / we request that the Council delegates its functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the Kapiti Coast District Council.

If you do wish to make a request for an Independent Commissioner pursuant to Section 100, please see notes below for potential cost implications to you.

I / we are aware that I / we are required to send a copy of my / our submission to the applicant as required under section 96(6)(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (please tick ✓).

Graham Thompson 25 Aug 2022 Margaret Thompson 25 Aug 2022

Signature

Date:

Signature

Date:

Please note: Signature of submitter, or person authorised to sign on their behalf is required. Signature is not required for electronic (email) submissions. If this is a joint submission by two or more individuals, each individual's signature is required.

Privacy Disclaimer

Please note: All submissions (including names and contact details) will be made publicly available at Council offices and public libraries. A summary of submissions including the name of the submitter may also be made publicly available and posted on the Kāpiti Coast District Council website. Personal information will also be used for administration relating to the subject matter of the submissions, including notifying submitters of subsequent steps and decisions. All information will be held by the Kāpiti Coast District Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Notes to Submitters:

- The Resource Management Act (RMA) 1991 prefers electronic methods of communication.
- The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.
- If you make a request for an independent commissioner(s) under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991, you must do so in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions and you may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners.
- You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant as soon as is reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the consent authority.
- If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in Part 11A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Submission – Proposed 240 Kapiti Road Development

Page 3. Reasons for Submission

Incompatibility with existing housing in the area.

Impact on environment and living conditions, in particular privacy for 2c Cedar Drive and surrounding residents. The majority of the neighbouring properties are occupied by retirees and it is a quiet area. The extra road traffic will create extra noise for Cedar Drive & Regent Drive residents.

Design and layout of proposed dwellings.

Page 3. My Submission is :

The Regent Estate and adjoining Cedar Drive consists of mainly single level housing and well-maintained small sections. The proposed 2-story development is incompatible with the character of existing homes.

Privacy

We at 2c Cedar Drive on the Western Boundary, would lose our privacy as our kitchen, dining, and main bedroom windows face east towards 240 Kapiti Road. With the height of the proposed buildings only 5m from our existing fence, the occupants would look directly into our main living areas. Our patio area would also be totally exposed to the top level windows of several units in what could be best described as a 6 metre + high wall. The proposed FFL of 6.16m will be about another 0.6m higher than our section.

Sunlight in the summer would be compromised with the height of the buildings blocking morning sun for a few hours for all the homes along the western boundary.

The development as planned of blocks of two-storey units which will dominate and impact on the existing houses is most intrusive. To call it medium density and low impact are gross understatements.

Design

We have concerns that the design of the stairs in the units does not provide adequate room to get furniture upstairs e.g. beds, drawer units.

The laundry space has no means of handwashing any clothing that is not machine washable. Leaving only the handbasin or kitchen sink for this purpose. For families with small children this is not acceptable.

It also appears that there is no provision in the units for the storage of bikes, sports and play equipment and push chairs.

There does not appear to be any provision of housing for disabled persons in this complex.

Page 4. Decision sought

We ask that the Resource Consent be declined for this development as the current format is incompatible with surrounding properties. Several of the proposed works are either non-complying or restricted discretionary activities according to the current district plan status. We are aware changes to the District Plan are proposed.

Privacy

A solution would be to reduce the units #1 to #23 on the Western boundary and units #24 to #36 on the North Western boundary to single level units which would not be as invasive, and would also attract residents unable to climb stairs.

This solution would be more in keeping with the surrounding properties.

Design

Provision should be made for handwashing facilities in the laundry if you intend this sort of housing for families.

As cycling is being promoted as a means of transport, provision should be made within the homes for storage of bikes, sports equipment etc. Nowadays these two items are costly and need to be kept secure.