

Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submission on notified proposed plan change



About preparing a further submission on a proposed plan change

You must use the prescribed form

- [Clause 8](#), Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) requires further submissions to be on the prescribed form.
- The prescribed form is set out in [Form 6](#), Schedule 1 of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedure) Regulations 2003.
- This template is based on Form 6. While you do not have to use this template, your submission must be in accordance with Form 6.

Certain persons may make further submissions

- Under clause 8, Schedule 1 of the RMA the following persons may make a further submission, in the prescribed form, on a proposed plan to the relevant local authority:
 - any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest
 - any person that has an interest in the proposed policy statement or plan greater than the interest that the general public has
 - the local authority itself.
- You will need to explain why you meet one of these categories (space is provided in the form for this below).

Your further submission and contact details will be made publicly available

- [Section 352](#) of the RMA allows you to choose your email to be your address for service. If you select this option, you can also request your postal address be withheld from being publicly available. To choose this option please tick the relevant boxes below.

Note to person making the submission

- A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority (Kāpiti Coast District Council).

Reasons why a further submission may be struck out

Please note that your further submission (or part of your further submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the further submission (or part of the further submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further
- it contains offensive language
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

To Kāpiti Coast District Council

Further Submission in Support of (or Opposition to) a Submission on Proposed Plan Change to the Operative Kapiti Coast District Plan 2021

Plan Change Number: 2

Plan Change Name: Intensification

Further submitter details

Full name of person making further submission: Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc

Contact person (name and designation, if applicable): Luke Hinchey

Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the RMA):

c/o Chapman Tripp, Level 34, 15 Customs Street West, PO Box 2206, Auckland 1024

Telephone: +64 9 357 2709

Electronic address for service of person making further submission (i.e. email):

I would like my address for service to be my email *[select box if applicable]*

I have selected email as my address for service, and I would also like my postal address withheld from being publicly available *[select box if applicable]*

State whether you are *[select appropriate box]*

a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest.

In this case, also please specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category

a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has.

In this case, also please explain the grounds for saying that you come within this category

Please see attached submission.

the local authority for the relevant area.

Scope of further submission

I support **oppose** **the submission of:** *[select the appropriate wording]*

Original Submitter's Name and Address for Service:

Please see attached submission.

Submission number of original submission: Please see attached submission.

Particular parts of the submission I support (or oppose) are:

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal. While it is not a requirement, it would be helpful if you could state the submission point number as listed in the summary of decisions requested document.

Please see attached submission.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

The reasons for my support (or opposition) are:

[give reasons]

Please see attached submission.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

I seek that [select appropriate box]

The whole or part of the original submission be allowed disallowed

[describe precisely which part below]

Please see attached submission.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Hearing Submissions [select appropriate box]

I wish to be heard in support of my further submission.

I do not wish to be heard in support of my further submission.

If you wish to be heard, please tick one of the following

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

If others make a similar submission, I will not consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

24/11/22

Signature of person making a further submission
(or person authorised to sign on behalf
of person making further submission)

Date

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

Email your further submission to district.planning@kapiticoast.govt.nz or
post/deliver to:

Attn: District Planning Team
Kāpiti Coast District Council
175 Rimu Road
Paraparaumu 5032

For office use only
Further submission No:
S197.FS.1



Form 6

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

24 November 2022

To Kāpiti Coast District Council (*Council*)

Further submitter details:

Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (*RVA*)

The RVA made a submission on the Council's Proposed Plan Change 2 (*PC2*) to the Operative Kāpiti Coast District Plan (*District Plan*). The RVA's submission number is S197.

Introduction

- 1 This is a further submission on PC2 to the District Plan.

Interest in the submissions

- 2 The RVA represents a relevant aspect of the public interest and has an interest in PC2 greater than the general public for a number of reasons, including (without limitation):
 - a. The RVA represents the interests of the owners, developers and managers of retirement villages throughout the Kāpiti Coast District. The RVA, on behalf of its members, has a significant interest in how the District Plan, including amendments proposed by PC2, provides for retirement village and aged care provision in the Kāpiti Coast District, given the existing and predicted demand by our members for such accommodation.
 - b. Retirement villages make a substantial contribution to housing and healthcare for older people in the region, providing for the social and economic wellbeing of communities. The ability of RVA members to provide villages that contribute to the social and economic wellbeing of Kāpiti Coast will depend on the reasonableness and appropriateness of the District Plan provisions, including amendments proposed by PC2.
 - c. Given the RVA's broad membership, history and representation in the Kāpiti Coast District, the RVA has specialist experience and expertise relevant to determining the merits of the Kāpiti Coast District Plan provisions, including amendments proposed by PC2.

d. The RVA made a submission on PC2.

Decisions sought

3 The decisions sought are detailed in the table **attached** to this form as **Appendix 1**.

4 The RVA has not referenced all original submissions it supports or opposes on the basis that its own submission is clear as to what the RVA seeks for retirement villages in the region. To the extent that other submissions seek relief which “challenges the relief sought” in the RVA’s primary submission (i.e. new or amended provisions that are inconsistent with or in conflict with the RVA’s submission), the RVA generally opposes those submissions. To the extent that other submissions seek relief which aligns with the RVA’s primary submission, the RVA supports those submissions.

Request to be heard in support of further submission

5 The RVA wishes to be heard in support of its further submission.

6 If others make a similar submission, the RVA will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

John Collyns
Executive Director
24 November 2022

Address for service of submitter:
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated
c/- Luke Hinchey
Chapman Tripp
Level 34
15 Customs Street West
PO Box 2206
Auckland 1140

Email address: luke.hinchey@chapmantripp.com / marika.williams@chapmantripp.com

APPENDIX 1 - FURTHER SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF THE RVA

Submitters Name and Address who you are further submitting on	Particular parts of the submission supported/opposed	Support (S) or Oppose (O)	Reason for Support or Opposition	Decision Sought
Rachel Ryan (S027)	S027.02	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow submission point.
Infill Tapui Limited (S028)	S028.22	Support in part	The RVA supports the relief sought subject to the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission, as it is consistent with the NPSUD.	Allow submission point subject to the relief sought in the RVA primary submission.
Cuttriss Consultants Ltd (S043)	S043.06	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief, as it is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act or the NPSUD.	Disallow submission point.
Waka Kotahi (S053)	S053.08	Oppose	The RVA does not oppose this submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, the RVA considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Allow submission point, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provision.
Waka Kotahi (S053)	S053.09	Oppose	The RVA does not oppose this submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, the RVA considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Allow submission point, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provision.
Cancer Society of NZ (Wellington Division) (S073)	S073.07	Oppose in part	The RVA oppose this relief as it is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act or the NPSUD.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.06	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as the new policy sought is unnecessary given the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.	Disallow submission point.

Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.08	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.10	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.12	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.14	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.15	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.17	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.19	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.20	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.21	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow submission point.

Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.23	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.25	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.27	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.28	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.30	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.32	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.34	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.35	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.37	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow submission point.

Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.39	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow submission point.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S089)	S089.41	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow submission point.
Kiwirail (S094)	S094.05 - S094.07	Oppose	The RVA acknowledges that acoustic insulation for the purpose of noise and vibration controls may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to a railway boundary with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. The RVA considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from these activities rather than from the boundaries.	Disallow submission points.
Greater Wellington Regional Council (S097)	S097.03	Oppose	<p>The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The matters addressed in the submission point should be properly considered under the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. - Further, the effects of subdivision, use and development on water quality, waterway values, including hydrological and ecosystem processes, riparian margins, water users and cultural values are not suitable as a matter of discretion as they do not respond to any adverse effects of allowing the activity on the environment. - To the extent the reasons given on this submission point refer to financial contributions (although no specific relief is sought) Council's development contributions policy already 	Disallow the submission point.

			requires contributions for Network Infrastructure, which includes stormwater.	
Greater Wellington Regional Council (S097)	S097.04	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as the relief sought is not clear and has the potential to slow down the provisions of housing to respond to demand, contrary to the intent of the NPSUD. The RVA also questions whether some of the matters outlined in the submission points are more appropriately considered under the Proposed Natural Resources Plan, and whether a requirement to 'achieve outcomes additional to flood control such as providing amenity spaces...' is appropriate as it does not appear to respond to any adverse effects of allowing the activity on the environment.	Disallow the submission point.
Greater Wellington Regional Council (S097)	S097.06	Support in part	The RVA does not oppose this submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, the RVA considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Allow submission point, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provision.
Greater Wellington Regional Council (S097)	S097.07	Oppose	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD in that it will slow down, not speed up intensification and has the potential to affect the consenting requirements of retirement villages.	Disallow the submission point.
Greater Wellington Regional Council (S097)	S097.20	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point, as it has the potential to affect the consenting requirements of retirement villages. The RVA opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, and that do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and do not take into account	Disallow submission point, and allow relief sought in the RVA's primary submission, being a clear and proportionate financial contributions regime that prevents double

			retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	dipping, provides clarity as to contributions payable, and provides a retirement-village specific regime that takes into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.
Greater Wellington Regional Council (S097)	S097.26	Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it recognises and provides for retirement villages.	Allow the relief sought.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S122)	S122.01	Support in part	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it will achieve consistency across the Wellington Region, however it seeks that the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission is carried over to any new zone provisions.	Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S122)	S122.17	Support in part	The RVA supports in part the relief sought in this submission relating to the removal of design guides as this is consistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Allow part of the submission where the design guides are removed, but otherwise disallow the submission in relation to retaining design guidelines as a non-statutory tool.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S122)	S122.18	Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Allow the submission point.

Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S122)	S122.41	Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act, subject to the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.	Allow the submission point, along with the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S122)	S122.45	Support in part	The RVA supports the relief sought as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD, and will enable consistency across the greater Wellington region, subject to the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission being applied to any new MRZ and HRZ chapters.	Allow the submission point, along with the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S122)	S122.106	Support in part	The RVA supports the relief sought as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD, subject to the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.	Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S122)	S122.112	Support in part / Oppose in part.	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD and the RVA's primary submission regarding the inclusion of design guides as a non-statutory tool. The RVA does not otherwise oppose the changes to LCZ-P6 sought by the submitter, subject to the RVA's primary submission point on LCZ-P6 being granted.	Disallow the submission point in relation to the design guides being retained as a guidance tool but otherwise allow submission point, subject to granting the relief sought in the RVA's submission.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S122)	S122.151	Support in part / Oppose in part	The RVA supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in this submission point (inclusion of design outcomes in matters of discretion and objectives and policies) as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Allow submission point regarding removal of Design Guidelines in full, but otherwise disallow the submission point.

Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (S122)	S122.163	Support in part / Oppose in part.	The RVA supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in this submission point (inclusion of design outcomes in matters of discretion and objectives and policies) as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Allow submission point regarding removal of Design Guidelines in full, but otherwise disallow the submission point.
Leith Consulting Limited (S202)	S202.10	Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it provides for the benefits of retirement villages, recognises their functional and operational needs and is consistent with the NPSUD.	Allow the relief sought.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161)	S161.39	Oppose in part	The RVA does not oppose the relief sought in this submission in principle, but seeks that the reference to the Centres Design Guide is excluded in relation to retirement villages, as per its primary submission.	Allow submission point subject to the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161)	S161.42	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow submission point.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161)	S161.43	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow submission point.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161)	S161.44	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow submission point.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161)	S161.45	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow submission point.

Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203)	S203.53	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow submission point.
Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203)	S203.54/	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow submission point.
A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira) (S210)	S210.18	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow submission point.
A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira) (S210)	S210.18 (should be S210.19)	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow submission point.

From: [Marika Williams](#)
To: [Mailbox - District Planning](#)
Cc: [Luke Hinchey](#); [Alice Hall](#)
Subject: Further submission PC2 - RVA
Date: Thursday, 24 November 2022 4:52:57 pm
Attachments: [Further Submission - PC2 - RVA.pdf](#)
[Further submission form - PC2 - RVA.pdf](#)

Good afternoon

Please find **attached** further submissions from the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (and the accompanying form) on Plan Change 2 to the Kāpiti Coast District Plan.

Kind regards
Marika

MARIKA WILLIAMS (she/her)

SOLICITOR

Chapman Tripp

D: +64 9 358 9847

LEGAL ADMINISTRATOR: Paula Norman | D: +64 9 357 2732

www.chapmantripp.com

Disclaimer

This email is intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is confidential or subject to legal professional privilege. If you receive this email in error please immediately notify the sender and delete the email.