

**From:** info@waipadc.govt.nz  
**Sent:** Friday, 30 September 2022 2:33 pm  
**To:** Policy Shared  
**Subject:** External Sender: Waipā District Plan - Plan Change Submission Form 5 - Kevin Honiss

**CYBER SECURITY WARNING:** This email is from an external source - be careful of attachments and links. Please follow the Cybersecurity Policy and report suspicious emails to Servicedesk

**Full name of submitter** Kevin Honiss  
**Contact name (if different from above)**  
**Email address** [REDACTED]  
**Address for service** [REDACTED]  
**Contact phone number** [REDACTED]

**This is a submission on the following proposed plan change to the Waipā District Plan**  
 Plan Change 26 - Residential Zone Intensification

**Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission?** I could not

**Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter that - (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition?** I am

**Do you wish to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of your submission?** I do

**If others make a similar submission, will you consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing?** No

**Do you support the proposed change(s)?** I support in part

**The specific provisions of the plan change my submission relates to are (give details):**  
 The overall Plan Change 26 Document

**My submission is**  
 Please see attached Document

**I seek the following decision/s from Council**  
 Please see attached Document

#### Attachments

[Plan Change 26 Submission on behalf of Kevin Honiss.pdf](#)

Plan Change 26 Submission on behalf of Kevin Honiss

To whom it may concern,

I wish to make a submission on the overall Plan Change 26 document, which I support in principle subject to certain matters being clarified / addressed.

**Submission:**

The PC26 document has not placed any emphasis on good urban design or what this looks like. In high density residential situations, good urban design is key in creating spaces that people are proud to live, work and play in that have good interfaces with both the streetscape and surrounding land uses as well as connections for walking & cycling. As such, urban design should become a major criterion for planning approval when undertaking higher density residential developments. With these guidelines, Waipa District Council can front foot this issue and outline criteria that will achieve desirable outcomes in relation to higher density developments that will be consistent across the district.

The urban design criteria should include graphic illustrations and strong guidance within the District Plan that illustrates the desired outcomes when undertaking a medium to high density residential development. This will go a long way in addressing concerns around character & amenity that come with building at a higher density. Greenfield subdivisions and new dwellings should also be included in these criteria, so a consistent approach is taken towards development.

**Seek the following Decision:**

Introduction of the above criteria to the PC 26 documents that applies to both higher density developments and greenfield subdivisions.

**Reference:** Character Street Road Boundary Setback

**Submission:**

Cambridge Street character comes from the appearance of the streetscape - provision of mature street trees, wide berms and footpaths, rather than development within private property.

The idea of 'character streets' is supported, however there must be a clear sense of character within the streetscape and development within private property should not dictate the 'character' of a street.

Hall Street is an excellent example of streetscape providing the character of the street, where the wide road reserve creates spacious grassed berms and mature trees line the street. Hall Street has a mix of dwelling types and Lot sizes and also has varying road boundary setbacks

within private property – this demonstrates that it is the streetscape of Hall Street that provides character, not development within private property.

While I agree that built development can create a sense of character within a street, the road boundary setback is not relative to the character of the street, (the attached images show examples of street character with no road boundary setbacks), as a sense of character can be created through good urban design.

As such, introducing a set of urban design guidelines into PC 26 will help achieve a sense of character for new developments regardless of the boundary setback distance and achieve desired outcomes.

As such, a 6m road boundary setback along an identified character street is excessive and does not create a sense of either historic & special character. This is demonstrated by Hall Street having a specific character, despite the mix of dwelling styles and road boundary setback distances.

**Seek the following Decision:**

Reduce the 'Character Street' setback from 6m to 4m to be consistent with the rest of the plan.

Or

New urban design guidelines could be formulated to apply to character streets, negating the need for road boundary setbacks over and above the standard 1.5m setback

Kind Regards,

Kevin Honiss



THOMSON

88

WIDE OPEN

