

Dear Chief Executive Officer at KCDC & Mat Marois, Housing New Zealand Ltd

@: submissions@kapiticoast.govt.nz & mat.marois@wsp.com

Application Number: RM190125

We reside at 7 Kaitawa Crescent, Paraparaumu. The property referred to as bordering north (although we would call this west) of the proposed subdivision Lot 62 DP23300, 35 Kaitawa Crescent, Paraparaumu.

We oppose the application and also support the submission by Paul Marlow, 33 Kaitawa Crescent, 5032 & other submissions by fellow neighbours. They've all included/raised multiple issues/impacts that we support and have not reiterated here.

Reason for submission:

Specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

1. Subdivision of the section - high density housing in low density area – increased person on smaller section
2. Two Lvl, 3+1 (4) bedroom home bordering our property – loss privacy, increase in noise level.
3. Storm water run-off / sewage disposal
4. Building consent has been approved?

My submission is:

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

1. Subdivision of the section – non-complying activity under Rule 5A.5(2)

The purpose of this bylaw is to ensure a healthy outdoor environment for its occupants and neighbours.

- **High density housing in a low density area** – Find it unusual that you would permit a section of this size to be split in this area and two new houses to be built, in particular the sizes of the houses p/land. Surely a single larger house with a garden section would be a better fit in the community. This isn't Auckland/Wellington CBD, we don't want to encourage small sections and mass populating. If this is permitted with one section, what is to stop others wanting to do the same thing? How will you control this? Seems to be a slippery slope for the Kapiti coast given we can safely assume population increases along with infrastructure improvements over time.

2. Proposed Lot 2 - Two Lvl, 3 +1 (4) bedroom home bordering our property – loss of privacy, increase in noise level.

- **This will 100% impact our environment and privacy.** Which will therefore impact the residents at the new build too. By having the proposed two-story and the placement of the outdoor deck/area, they will be elevated and have direct view over the back fence into our outdoor area and rear of our property. This is the area that we spend majority of our time, Garage, BBQ, sitting area for breakfast, lunch, dinners, grass area we play, swing in the tree litererary by the fence, vegetable areas (where we are planning on building our daughters

tree house), etc.. it also means they will have a clear view into our kitchen, laundry, bathroom, toilet, and two bedrooms windows. The beauty of this property and big part of the reasons with us purchasing it was that we loved the privacy and natural environment for birdlife. It will be a huge impact having to deal with people now being able to see what we are doing in our day-to-day life, or even been worried about them been able to see into the windows is an impact - after the fact that we bought the property. When I initially enquired with the Housing New Zealand, they advised that the impact would be minimal, after reviewing the plans we don't think they have correctly advised us, in that the deck area, leading into the lounge actually will be at such elevated and at a height that they will have a clear view into our property, as we will into there's. Let alone the second story windows.

- **We are also concerned around the additional noise** – backing up our decision to purchase this property was based on it being quiet, an opportunity for us to have a family (which we now have) in a quiet environment, having and encouraging birdlife in our garden. We are concerned that by permitting two new dwellings on such a small section would impede that. Having a two-story house so close to our fence, with their main outdoor area literary on our fence line would impact this, let alone the addition of two-dwellings with potentially 10-12 people on the section behind us. Would definitely impact this.
3. **Storm water/Sewage disposal** – We also would like to express concern around the storm water disposal and sewage disposal sustainability.
- **Storm water** - We already experience flooding during winter when it rains a lot, this has/can cause our garage to flood, our lawns to become 'wet' and a 'river of sort' down our driveway. Our concern is around water displacement by having two dwellings, concreted areas, etc... elevated and behind us. We've read about the pumps, proposed pathway/driveways, etc... However, one can logistically assume that the water run-off has one place to go, downhill, which will be directly into our already flood prone property. What happens then? Would we be responsible with the financial impacts of having to create sink pits, additional/new drainage etc... again, something that we have dealt with in our current environment, but don't deem a fair impact due to two new dwellings being built on an elevated section behind/above us. We can safely assume that the weather will only get worse as our environment changes.
 - **Sewage disposal** – Lot 2 would need to connect into the sewage on our property. Whilst we understand this, we do question the additional sustainability with this... it is safe to assume the infrastructure is old, by connecting a 3+1 bedroom house would add extra, what happens if it doesn't sustain, this will again impact us and our property. By having a single dwelling, this would be eliminated by using the current sewage disposal. Housing NZ has also confirmed that they would replace our fence and bordering mature trees if damaged, however it should be noted that our tree line is mature and provides privacy. The time it would take for new trees to grow sufficiently to provide the privacy required is questionable given there is already a current sewage line that could be used for a single dwelling.

Building consent has been approved?

I question how this could have been done, I find it even more interesting that Opus advised that there are no affected parties, I deem ourselves and other neighbours affected given:

- Our privacy will be hugely impacted
- There is potential for flooding due to water displacement with having 2 x dwellings on the property directly elevated behind us. We acknowledge the pump feature, however what happens if this stops working, we are already experiencing erratic weather conditions that will only get worse, why isn't this thought of?
- They need to dig up our land/garden to connect to the current sewage disposal, what about the current infrastructure fails, are we guaranteed that this won't cause further issues down the line. Ie: potential to have a burst pipe with waste in our garden – seriously what a family does not ever need. The potential of having our mature trees dug-up/impacted.
- Increased noise with having 2 x dwellings behind our section (where we spend a LOT of our family time together playing)

Conclusion

Creating a possibility of 10-12 people living on a 720m2 sections seems irresponsible and not in line with the community approach and strategy for the Kapiti Coast, let alone for Kaitawa Crescent. Perhaps it would be for a different demographic area where this is required and there is a shortage of land, however this seems to be a 'quick fix' plan by housing New Zealand to meet a quota instead of taking into account the surrounding area, consulting with neighbouring properties and just the general look/feel of the neighbourhood. Has the architect actually walked around Kaitawa, viewed what the surrounding houses look like? Will this new build fit into the current environment/community – I just don't think so. There seems to be no reason why a single dwelling couldn't be erected. A dwelling that doesn't impact neighbouring properties as much, this is a community of rate payers who work hard for what we have and have invested our money accordingly to support our lifestyles (which, lets ne honest is is no easy task now days). It would be hoped that the Kapiti Council would/could relate and 'protect' there current rate payers, their community, and consistently apply current restrictions, this is the reason why they were initially implemented right?

Hope the above gives something to think about, we love our neighbourhood, love the people here on the 'east side' of the tracks and would be fairly 'livid' if we had to start dealing with people being able to stare into our garden and rear of the house, as they would feel inhibited by us staring into there's. It would also be dis-hearting having the birdlife impacted and mature trees cut-down and garden dug up to accommodate something that could be done differently and better in our opinion.

Kind Regards, be safe & take care.

Mr & Mrs Peterson

(AKA Mr Richard Peterson & Miss Stevenie Brinkmann – recently got married in our garden)

7 Kaitawa Crescent, Paraparaumu, 5032

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:	RM190125
Applicant:	Housing New Zealand Ltd
Proposal:	To undertake a two lot residential subdivision that does not meet the shape factor, minimum and average lot sizes, requires consent for contaminants in soil and land use consent for the construction of two dwellings prior to the certification of the subdivision that do not meet the permitted activity standards for car parking, water demand management and accessory buildings encroaching the require yard setbacks
Legal Description(s):	Lot 62 DP 23300, 35 Kaitawa Crescent, Paraparaumu

DUE AT COUNCIL OFFICE NO LATER THAN 5PM ON 17 April 2020

This is a submission on an application from Housing New Zealand Ltd to undertake a two lot residential subdivision that does not meet the shape factor, minimum and average lot sizes, requires consent for contaminants in soil and land use consent for the construction of two dwellings prior to the certification of the subdivision that do not meet the permitted activity standards for car parking, water demand management and accessory buildings encroaching the require yard setbacks.

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	Fax: (04) 296 4830
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 Housing New Zealand Ltd (the Applicant) as below:

Housing New Zealand Ltd
C/- WSP Opus
PO Box 12 003
Thorndon
Wellington 6144

Or email: mat.marois@wsp.com

Attention: Mat Marois

Note: Pls excuse the scribble – our daughter took it upon herself to draw on it. 😊

Submission Form

Submitter's Details:

Title:	<input type="checkbox"/> Mr <input type="checkbox"/> Mrs <input type="checkbox"/> Miss <input type="checkbox"/> Ms <input type="checkbox"/> Dr Other: MR + MRS		
My/Our Full Name(s):	MR RICHARD GARY PETERSON MISS STEVENIE JOAN MARGARET BRINKMANN		Post Code: 5032
Address for service:			
Physical Address:	7 CAITANA CRESCENT PARAPARAUMU		Post Code: 5032
Home Ph:	RICH: 02102268538	Work Ph:	
Home Fax:	STEV: 02102937047	Work Fax:	
Cell:		Email:	STEVENIEBRINKMANN@HOTMAIL.COM → BLOODSWEATANDBEERS@HOTMAIL.COM

Note: Correspondence will be via email unless otherwise requested.

Submitter's Position:

Trade Competition
 I / am not* a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991.
 *Delete one

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.

*** PLS REFER TO EMAIL ATTACHMENT
 KCDC Submission Form RM190125**

Form

Submission Form



Page 3 of 5 Page 3 of 5

Reasons for Submission:

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

Give details:

1. Subdivision of the section - high density housing in low density area - increased person on smaller section.
2. Two W/L, 3+1 (4) bedroom home bordering our property - loss of privacy, increase in noise level.
3. Storm water run-off / sewage disposal
4. Building consent has been approved - unaffected parties? what about us - items 1-3 above.

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:

refer to email attachment 'KDC submissions form RM190125'

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):

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 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 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)

*If others make a similar submission, I / we will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.
(This is only for parties wanting to be heard)
* Delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case.

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 Kāpiti 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.

Submission Form



Page 5 of 5 Page 5 of 5

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

DCP
Signature

15/04/20
Date:

[Signature]
Signature

15/04/20
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 on Council's 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.

<END>