

# ***Summary of Submissions***

## ***Proposed District Plan Change 60***

**Churton Park Suburban Centre rezoning**

5 November 2007

# Proposed District Plan Change 60

## Churton Park Suburban Centre rezoning

### Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
1	Churton Park Community Association	C/- John Nysse, CPCA Vice President 14 Sandy Brow Churton Park, Wellington	Does not indicate
<p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the Plan Change and believes there is general support within the community for a Neighbourhood Centre, which would create a focal gathering point and provide facilities required by the community.</p> <p>The submitter also acknowledges that some members of the community have concerns with the makeup and mix of retail activities – with larger activities perhaps requiring late night deliveries and takeaway premises that may create unpleasant odours. The submitter however acknowledges it is not up to them what activities ought to be accommodated, but express their desire for community based services and emphasise that the developers should consult with the community through the concept and planning stages and continue to take into account the views of the community.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> None stated.</p>			
2	Moorcroft Trust C/- Stephen G. Mairs, Trustee	17 Perth Street Ngaio, Wellington	No
<p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the Plan Change in its entirety and believes it is important for Churton park residents to have a shopping centre.</p> <p>The Moorcroft Trust owns properties at 59 and 61 Lakewood Avenue, Churton Park.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> Approve the Plan Change.</p>			
3	Michael Gordon Russell	33 Winsley Terrace Churton Park, Wellington	No
<p>The submitter fully <b>supports</b> the Plan Change as it is needed to provide necessary shops, fun local community and provide a 'hub' for the wider community.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> Approve the Plan Change.</p>			

4	Melanie Murray	87 Suncliffe Street Churton Park, Wellington	No
<p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the Plan Change in part, identifying that a community centre, supermarket and primary school would also be appropriate uses, but that the addition of more housing on this site and in the area would be detrimental.</p> <p>The submitter believes that additional housing would create overcrowding and place additional stress on infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>Approve the Plan Change with amendments limiting activities to school or community centre, supermarket and cafe. Require all structures to be reviewed.</p>			
5	Kathryn Kincaid Henderson	20 Caesars Place Churton Park, Wellington	No
<p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the Plan Change overall and believes that a mixed-use neighbourhood shopping centre would be excellent in Churton Park, but raises concern that the Plan Change does not require a community centre to be provided and that road safety could be compromised.</p> <p>The submitter is disappointed that the Plan Change has not specifically required the developer to provide a small, easy access, ground level community centre building that could be used for meetings, community development and special interest groups activities.</p> <p>The submitter also comments that speeding is a major issue in the area of the proposed shopping centre, particularly down Westchester Drive, and that with the increase of pedestrians that a shopping centre would bring changes need to be made to the roads, sufficient to lower vehicle speeds. The sort of interventions suggested are narrowing the road, adjacent to the shopping centre, with tree planting and islands and crating bands of different colour and texture in the road surface with alternative materials, and that Wellington City Council needs to commit to applying a range of such engineering interventions.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b></p> <p>Approve the Plan Change with the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend provision 6.2.2.7 to include provision of a community centre building as a required part of the development; and</li> <li>• That city engineers apply interventions to the roads adjacent the development to reduce drive speed and promote road safety for pedestrians, pets and property.</li> </ul>			
6	Stebbing's Farmlands Ltd	C/- Urban Perspective Ltd PO Box 9042, Wellington Attention: Peter Coop	Yes
<p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the Plan Change but seeks amendments to several of the proposed provisions including - the introduction section of appendix 8 to reduce the threshold for compliance with the Concept Plan; to reduce the green area shown on the Concept Plan map; to identify where the main pedestrian entrances should be in relation to the supermarket; to acknowledge the practical effects associated with a supermarket building; and to clarify the non-notification clause under proposed rule 7.3.11.</p>			

<p><b>Decision Requested:</b> Approve the Plan Change with the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete from the “Introduction” section the phrase <i>“for adherence to the Concept Plan”</i> and replace with <i>“for the extent to which the proposal reflects the indicative design principles illustrated by the Concept Plan”</i></li> <li>• Amend the Concept Plan so that the green coloured area is reduced in size by between 25-40%</li> <li>• Add to the “Requirements” section under item 1 the following sentence <i>“The main pedestrian entrance/exist to the supermarket is permitted to extend to the respective street frontages”</i>.</li> <li>• Add to the ‘Guiding Principles’ section the following paragraph under “Buildings” – <i>“For the proposed supermarket building, it is not practicable to incorporate interactive/active edges (i.e. windows/doors etc) for the side and rear ground level elevation. However blank walls are not anticipated and will require careful design. Options may include architectural treatment, artworks and landscaping.”</i></li> <li>• Under proposed rule 7.3.11, delete the second sentence (<i>“For the avoidance of doubt...”</i>) under Non-notification.</li> <li>• Such other change or amendment that might be required to give effect to the submission.</li> </ul>			
7	Wellington City Council	PO Box 2199 101 Wakefield Street Wellington	No
<p>The submitter <b>supports</b> the Plan Change but seeks amendments to several of the proposed provisions dealing with the W4 designation and related storm water issues for a 1 in 100 year flood event.</p> <p><b>Decision Requested:</b> Approve the Plan Change with the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend wording of ‘Requirement 14’ to include that a secondary overland flow path be provided; that the capacity of the W4 designation area (1 in 100year flood detention) is not exceeded; and require development proposals to show the secondary overland flow path.</li> <li>• Add a paragraph to Guiding Principles 5.1 ‘Design, external appearance and siting of buildings’ stating that all buildings shall be located clear of the secondary overland flow path for a 1 in 100 year storm event.</li> <li>• Amend the first paragraph under Guiding Principles 5.7 ‘Storm water management’ so that it is clear this provision applies to both developments <i>and</i> subdivision, and to clarify how storm water issues, in relation to the W4 flood detention area, will be assessed. The paragraph also needs to refer to the Wellington Regional Council as the requiring authority of the W4 designation.</li> </ul>			
8	Joint submission from: Jill Peterson Irene Peterson Margaret McKay Joyce Corrick David McNickle Phillippa Sherriff	C/- Margaret McKay 108a Westchester Drive Churton Park, Wellington	Yes
<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> the Plan Change for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When properties on Westchester Drive, owned by the submitters and located opposite the</li> </ul>			

development site, were purchased from 1996 onwards, Council advised at the time there were no plans to zone land across the road for commercial purposes, and that the land had recently been changed from commercial to residential;

- Views given during consultation rounds by the Churton Park Community Association and Wellington City Council have not taken on board responses from people opposing the proposed neighbourhood centre; and a 100 resident signature letter to Wellington City Council outlining concerns has been ignored;
- The proposed village concept put forward in the Plan Change is a commercial centre with a supermarket as its focal point, whereas the initial proposal involved building a Community Centre for Churton Park with associated café and deli type services, to provide a “Heart for Churton Park”. The present concept is not in keeping with the proposed village atmosphere or existing neighbourhood.
- Whilst the concept plan outlines ideas for beautification of spaces within the centre, there is no consideration given to the Neighbour Centre’s street frontages onto Westchester Drive and Lakewood Avenue.
- The proposal will have major impacts on the existing surrounding neighbourhood, and the submitters living across the road will be most affected. These impacts include:
  - Lack of buffer between the proposed shops and the present residential; properties on Westchester Drive, resulting in consequences of noise, intrusive lighting and traffic, a mere 15 paces from any of the submitter front doors and living/bedroom areas.
  - Servicing of the supermarket on a residential street. The use of A or B train trucks (articulated vehicles towing large trailers) will be unacceptable due to the potential safety, noise and traffic effects on surrounding residential properties.
  - Noise, lighting and traffic effects from the supermarket’s long hours of operation, including operating at night with obvious serious impact on neighbouring residential properties.
  - Increased traffic travelling through residential streets generated by the presence of the proposed centre.
  - No control on the types of operations that could seek to be included which would impact detrimentally on surrounding residential properties.
  - As residents most affected by the development, we need to be listed in the concept plan as affected parties who are required to give approval to any proposals.

**Decision Requested:**

The submitters seek that alternative sites be explored.

In particular the submitters have sought that a site 100 metres along on the new Westchester link road be considered that was discussed at a Churton Park Community Association AGM some years ago when it was indicated by the developer this site was where the shopping centre for Churton Park would be established. This site should be considered for the following reasons:

1. There would be an easier, quieter and safer meeting and flow of traffic to the centre with no impact on existing residential streets and dwellings.
2. Subsequent residential development would be planned to surround the centre and people would know from the outset what they were buying into.

9	Lynne Katrina Dellow and Stephen John Scott (Trustees)	112 Westchester Drive, Churton Park, Wellington	Yes
---	--	--	-----

The submitters **oppose** the Plan Change for several reasons:

- When the submitters purchased their property in 2003, they were at the time there were no plans to zone land across the road for commercial purposes. The property was purchased on this knowledge.
- Views given during consultation rounds by the Churton park Community Association and Wellington City Council have not taken on board responses from people opposing the proposed neighbourhood centre; and a 100 resident signature letter to Wellington City Council outlining concerns has been ignored;
- The proposed village concept put forward is not in keeping with the proposed village atmosphere or existing neighbourhood. In the Plan Change is a commercial centre with a supermarket as its focal point, whereas the initial proposal involved building a Community Centre for Churton Park with associated café and deli type services, to provide a “Heart for Churton Park”.
- Whilst the concept plan outlines ideas for beautification of spaces within the centre, there is no consideration given to the Neighbour Centre’s street frontages onto Westchester Drive and Lakewood Avenue
- The proposal will have major impacts on the existing surrounding neighbourhood, and the submitters living across the road will be most affected. These impacts include:
  - Lack of buffer between the proposed shops and the present residential; properties on Westchester Drive, resulting in consequences of noise, intrusive lighting and traffic, a mere 15 paces from any of the submitter front doors and living/bedroom areas.
  - Servicing of the supermarket on a residential street. The use of A or B train trucks (articulated vehicles towing large trailers) will be unacceptable due to the potential safety, noise and traffic effects on surrounding residential properties. The proposed service lane for the supermarket is directly opposite our bedroom, thus servicing will impact severely on our right to peace and quiet in our own home.
  - Noise, lighting and traffic effects from the supermarket’s long hours of operation, including operating at night with obvious serious impact on neighbouring residential properties.
  - Increased traffic travelling through residential streets generated by the presence of the proposed centre.
  - No control on the types of operations that could seek to be included which would impact detrimentally on surrounding residential properties.
  - Property values of those properties opposite and adjoining the subject site are likely to be affected negatively by the proposed rezoning.
- As residents most affected by the development, we need to be listed in the concept plan as affected parties who are required to give approval to any proposals.

**Decision Requested:**

The submitters seek that alternative sites be explored.

In particular the submitters have sought that a site 100 metres along on the new Westchester link road be considered that was discussed at a Churton Park Community Association AGM some years ago when it was indicated by the developer this site was where the shopping centre for Churton Park would be established. This site should be considered for the following reasons:

1. There would be an easier, quieter and safer meeting and flow of traffic to the centre with no impact on existing residential streets and dwellings.

2. Subsequent residential development would be planned to surround the centre and people would know from the outset what they were buying into.

10	Greater Wellington Regional Council	PO Box 11-646, Wellington Attention : Ling Phang	yes
----	-------------------------------------	---	-----

The submitter **supports** the Plan Change but seeks amendments to several of the proposed provisions relating to the W4 designation and related issues of access and flood protection; earthworks and lack of any controls; and public transport and lack recognition for integration within the Concept Plan.

**Decision Requested:**

Approve the Plan Change with the following amendments:

- Include an explanation of the purpose of the W4 designation area and an explanation of how the development would impact on the designation.
- Amend the extent of the designation as it is incorrectly shown on the concept plan.
- Include in Appendix 8 an explanation about Designation W4.
- Include a new requirement under section 4.0 Requirements for there to be a '3m wide access on the north side of No.61 Lakewood Avenue, with an easement created in favour of Greater Wellington'.
- Include a new requirement under section 4.0 Requirements for an 'alternative overland flow path'.
- Amend wording of requirement 14 under section 4.0 Requirements to refer to the W4 designation area as being for 'flood detention' not storm water detention; and expand the requirement to include 'The effect on the purpose of W4 designation and ensuring a secondary flow path is maintained between Stebbings Dam and the W4 'u' shaped designation'.
- Include a new requirement under section 4.0 Requirements seeking that any application for subdivision or land use demonstrates how storm water will be managed so that flows existing the village after the development will be the same as, or less than, pre development flows, and seeking proposal shall maintain or enhance water quality.
- Include a new guiding principle under section 5.0 Guiding Principles, for flood detention considerations.
- Include 'effects on the flood detention designation (W4)' as a matter of discretion under rules 7.3.11 and 7.3.12
- Include 'earthworks' as a matter of discretion under rules 7.3.11 and 7.3.12
- Include a new requirement under section 4.0 Requirements seeking an earthworks management plan detailing sediment control, erosion protection, measures to manage water quality in adjacent stream and construction management.
- Include a new requirement under section 4.0 Requirements seeking that the earthworks management plan shall be consistent with Greater Wellington's Erosion and Sediment Control guidelines and Small Earthworks, Erosion and sediment control for small sites.
- Include a new requirement under section 4.0 Requirements stating that no earthworks shall be carried out within 5m of a water body.
- Include a new requirement under section 4.0 Requirements stating that no earthworks be undertaken on slopes of more than 28<sup>o</sup> (erosion prone land under the Regional Soil Plan).
- Amend the vision statement so that it more directly refers to connections with pedestrian,

cycling and passenger transport connections.

- Include a new requirement under section 4.0 Requirements in relation to passenger transport services seeking that all developments include or consider opportunities to relocate bus stops or create new stops to provide direct access to the centre; provision of bus lay-bys, shelter and information and provision of secure, sheltered cycle racks or cycle storage facilities.
- Include additional wording under section 5.0 Guiding Principles, 5.5 Site Access, pedestrian, cyclist and vehicle to refer to integrating pedestrian access points and public transport services; and to access for cyclists.

11	David Ingram	45 Lakewood Avenue Churton Park, Wellington	No
----	--------------	--	----

The submitter **opposes** the Plan Change on the basis there is not need for a supermarket or shops at this stage in time as there are three supermarkets within 5 minutes drive from Churton Park.

The submitter believes there are road safety concerns that once Westchester Link Road is open (coupled with a supermarket) that there will be more traffic and congestion; and social problems of rubbish and graffiti and trouble with people congregating, drinking and causing trouble will occur.

**Decision Requested:**

Decline the Plan Change and maintain the site as a park.

12	Alison Lavin	66 Lakewood Ave Churton Park, Wellington	No
----	--------------	---	----

The submitter **opposes** the Plan Change due to the viability of the proposed use of the land and the impact such a proposed centre will have on the surrounding households and environment.

Particular concerns relate to viability when Johnsonville Mall is close to Churton Park, decrease in property values, noise, youths gathering/partying in the parking areas, increase in traffic, and impacts on environment such as rubbish, tidiness and outlook.

**Decision Requested:**

Decline the Plan Change and maintain the site in Outer Residential zone.

13	Warren and Sandra Pringle	66 Lakewood Ave Churton Park, Wellington	No
----	---------------------------	---	----

The submitters **oppose** the Plan Change as they do not believe Churton Park requires a shopping centre given its close proximity to existing commercial services provided in Johnsonville, Newlands and Tawa.

Issues raised include viability of the centre when Johnsonville is to be redeveloped; repeating mistakes made at Newlands; and overdevelopment of the site with all the activities that are proposed. The submitter also raises concern over quality of medium density housing, which would be more in line with less affluent areas around Wellington; a community/neighbourhood centre is superfluous to the needs of Churton Park where other amenities such as the school can be used; and a larger primary school is needed the site would be more suitable to that use.

**Decision Requested:**

Decline the Plan Change and consider the site for a new school instead.