

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
S1: B W Cundle	Submitter requests Council to stop wasting good rate payer money on unnecessary things. No Mayor worth \$95k a year and expenses the Councillor's get is too much. Reduce spending and lower rates also. Don't include things that are of no interest or use to some of us.	No decision requested.	An extensive consultation process has been undertaken, in which it was determined that the current District Plan does not reflect the vision the community has for the Wanganui Central City. The benefits of the proposed Plan Change in guiding future development to achieve the community's vision are considered to outweigh the costs incurred. <b>Submission is declined.</b> <b>No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b>
S2: C R Hiles-Smith	Taupo Quay roadway narrowing - pedestrian flows not great except for Saturdays. Disagrees with restricting traffic flows as it is an important arterial (route through the city). City cannot afford changes as proposed to the Somme Parade/Taupo Quay area.	Retain the existing roading hierarchy to retain Taupo Quay as an Arterial Road.	Proposed Plan Change 21 seeks to implement the Wanganui District Council's Urban Transportation Strategy (WUTS) through changing the status of Taupo Quay from Secondary Arterial Road to a local road, with a Central City Street overlay. These changes are for the purpose of improving pedestrian and cycling links to the waterfront.  Objective 1.1 of the WUTS states that traffic management and road design is to match its function in the roading network. Under this objective, the function of arterial roads is <i>"to move traffic throughout the urban area. Safe and efficient movement for through traffic and heavy vehicles prioritised."</i>  The current Secondary Arterial status of Taupo Quay does not fit with Key Objective 2.1 of the WUTS, whereby <i>traffic management and road design in the central area (including the Riverfront) prioritises pedestrian movement and the high quality amenity values of the area.</i> Public consultation associated with proposed Plan Change 21 has identified that the Riverfront is currently underutilised as a public place.  The change in road hierarchy does not alter the use of Taupo Quay within the Plan Change area. In the future Council may promote alternative routes through the City, thereby reducing the volume of heavy traffic travelling along Taupo Quay.  <b>Submission is declined.</b> <b>No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b>
S3: Dr Alan Malcolm Donoghue Lucanus Gynaecology	Submitter objects to the re-zoning of Wicksteed Street. The activity and buildings in Wicksteed Street are better suited to the Central Commercial zone than the proposed Central Edge Commercial Zone. The proposed changes, including the height recession plane and the need to provide off-street car parks, are unnecessary and discriminatory against the long established commercial activity in the area. The redevelopment limitations would also reduce the market value of the properties to any potential purchaser.	Submitter seeks that the properties on the southwest side of Wicksteed Street between Guyton & Ingestre be retained in the current zone of Central Commercial Zone.	Proposed Policy P96 identifies the importance of maintaining a compact central commercial area. Although the properties on the southwest side of Wicksteed Street between Guyton and Ingestre Streets do not front a pedestrian street, Council considered that the character and amenity of this area was consistent with a Central Commercial zone rather than a vehicle oriented area, where on-site parking should be required. Sites are typically small with many residential scale buildings used for commercial purposes. For this reason Council determined that the status quo in terms of zoning should apply.  <b>Submission is accepted.</b>  <b>Amend Proposed Plan Change 21 as follows:</b> <b>1. Amend the Planning Maps to show that all properties on the southwest side of Wicksteed Street between Guyton Street and Ingestre Street shall retain the current zoning of Central Commercial Zone.</b>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
<p><b>S4:</b> Susan Cooke on behalf of The Guyton Group</p>	<p>The Guyton Group would like to submit in conjunction with all other submissions concerning the proposed Guyton Street redevelopment. Their submission relates to Policy P102 a, b, c, d and e. The Guyton Group seeks to work in partnership with Council to have their proposed Guyton Street development incorporated into the District Plan. The key components of this Guyton Street Development Plan include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3 roundabouts at intersections of Guyton &amp; Wicksteed, Guyton &amp; Victoria, Guyton &amp; St Hill Streets;</li> <li>- Traffic calming humps doubling as pedestrian crossings;</li> <li>- Angle parking on one side of the street;</li> <li>- A Gateway Sculpture corner of Wicksteed/Guyton;</li> <li>- Chain of lights linking the gateway sculpture;</li> <li>- Life-size James K Baxter bronze sculpture;</li> <li>- A river of poetry beginning at the sculpture;</li> <li>- Upright poetry plaque near St Hill Street.</li> </ul> <p>The submitters also provided photos and a powerpoint presentation as part of their submission.</p>	<p>Seek to have the proposed Guyton Street Development incorporated into the District Plan.</p>	<p>Proposed Plan Change 21 identifies Guyton Street from the intersection with Wicksteed Street to the intersection with St Hill Street as a Central City Street. Proposed Policy P102a, b, c and d outlines the characteristics sought through Proposed Plan Change 21 for central city streets. There are no changes to the form of Guyton Street detailed within Proposed Plan Change 21. In accordance with method M297 (Street Design Guideline), Council will develop a Street Design Guideline to ensure that street infrastructure development is in keeping with the characteristics of the street overlay.</p> <p>The submitters request to have the proposed Guyton Street Development plan incorporated into the District Plan is not considered the best way to achieve the design outcomes sought in this submission. While Proposed Plan Change 21 sets out the framework for incorporating good urban design principles for the future redevelopment of Central City roads, the District Plan is not the appropriate document for funding or implementing roading changes. Such design changes will be budgeted for through Council's Long Term Plan and Council Asset Management Plans.</p> <p><b>Submission is declined.</b> <b>No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b></p>
<p><b>S5:</b> Barbara Lett</p>	<p>Submitter objects to closing Taupo Quay which works extremely well and this will create more traffic in Glasgow, Guyton, Ingestre &amp; Dublin.</p> <p>The 'market people' use Taupo Quay for 2-4 hours per week only - not worth any consideration.</p>	<p>No explicit decision requested. Retain the existing roading hierarchy to retain Taupo Quay as an Arterial Road.</p>	<p>There are no road closures proposed within the area covered by Proposed Plan Change 21. Any road closures must go through a separate public consultation process under the Local Government Act. Taupo Quay will remain open for two way traffic.</p> <p>Proposed Plan Change 21 seeks to implement the Wanganui District Council's Urban Transportation Strategy (WUTS) through changing the status of Taupo Quay from Secondary Arterial Road to a Central City Street (in accordance with Method M279). The change in road hierarchy does not alter the use of Taupo Quay within the Plan Change area. In the future Council may promote alternative routes through the City, thereby reducing the volume of heavy traffic travelling along Taupo Quay. These changes are for the purpose of improving pedestrian and cycling links to the waterfront, making Taupo Quay more attractive for visitors on all days of the week.</p> <p>The current Secondary Arterial status of Taupo Quay does not fit with Key Objective 2.1 of the WUTS, whereby <i>traffic management and road design in the central area (including the Riverfront) prioritises pedestrian movement and the high quality amenity values of the area.</i></p> <p><b>Submission is declined.</b> <b>No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b></p>
<p><b>S6:</b> Stephen Paul Lace</p>	<p>Submitter objects to PC21 classification of a significant portion of the 8 block old CBD area to the proposed Central Edge Commercial Zone. The proposed characteristics of the Central Edge Commercial Zone would remove property rights that property owners believed they were acquiring when they purchased those properties. Those property rights included the current ability to build extensively on any site unaffected by height recession planes as now proposed.</p>	<p>Defer any decisions on Plan Change 21 until the implications of the Christchurch Earthquake can be taken into account.</p> <p>Oppose any change in the designation that would impose height recession planes as indicated in the consultation material to my and all affected properties and also oppose the implied obligation to provide parking at 199 Wicksteed Street, and also for other affected owners.</p>	<p>Council considered the proposed height recession plane requirements to be too restrictive, and would potentially prevent quality redevelopment of sites within the zone, particularly in the Wicksteed Street area, given the existing building design and sites layouts in the area. The Council did not accept that the setback requirements were necessary or would minimise potential adverse effects on streetscape and amenity such as bulk.</p> <p>Although proposed Rule R228 (Structures) would not affect existing buildings, landowners will be affected by the new height recession plane provisions if they wish to construct new buildings and structures, or undertake additions to existing buildings and structures. Council did not consider this to be reasonable or necessary.</p> <p>The review of the Built Heritage section of the District Plan (Phase 3) is currently underway. Implications of the Christchurch Earthquake with regards to earthquake strengthening of heritage buildings will be addressed as part of that review. Council has an existing Earthquake-prone Buildings Policy that sits outside of the District Plan. This policy is currently being reviewed by Council. Council considers that</p>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
Continued... <b>S6:</b> Stephen Paul Lace	<p>To require property owners to provide carparks on an individual ad hoc basis will inevitably result in multiple disruptions to a tidy and continuous street frontage. Such interruptions provide at risk spaces in and from which personal and property crimes and vandalism are more easily perpetrated.</p> <p>Before PC21 is seriously considered the implications of the Christchurch earthquake should be taken into account.</p> <p>Submitter opposes any change in designation that would impose height recession planes as indicated and also opposes the implied obligation to provide parking at affected owners in Wicksteed Street.</p> <p>Limiting the size of the CBD seems to take a less than optimistic view of Wanganui's potential for growth.</p>	<p>Defer any decisions on Plan Change 21 until the implications of the Christchurch Earthquake can be taken into account.</p> <p>Oppose any change in the designation that would impose height recession planes as indicated in the consultation material to my and all affected properties and also oppose the implied obligation to provide parking at 199 Wicksteed Street, and also for other affected owners.</p>	<p>implications of the Christchurch earthquake are being appropriately dealt with through these other processes and therefore do not need to be addressed at this time as part of Proposed Plan Change 21.</p> <p>To remain successful, the Central Commercial area needs to maintain a compact form that encourages people to walk, therefore creating opportunities for social and commercial interaction. This Plan Change recognises that further expansion of the existing commercial area, or creation of alternative commercial areas, can detract from the vitality of the central core.</p> <p><b>Submission is accepted in part.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Proposed Plan Change 21 as follows:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend the Planning Maps to show that all properties on the southwest side of Wicksteed Street between Guyton Street and Ingestre Street shall retain the current zoning of Central Commercial zone.</li> <li>2. Delete the height rules (Rule R228 Structures) from the proposed Central Edge Commercial zone.</li> </ol>
<b>S7:</b> George William Powell	<p>Submission is that any decision that Council makes should ensure normal domestic &amp; light commercial vehicles can continue to pass through the arts and commercial zone without hindrance or obstacle particularly along Taupo Quay which is an important inner city route.</p>	<p>Do not impede the normal domestic and light commercial vehicle use of Taupo Quay through the Arts and Commerce zone. Large Commercial vehicles have other options.</p>	<p>Proposed Plan Change 21 proposes to alter the status of Taupo Quay from a secondary arterial road to a local road with a Central City Street Overlay. This is to assist in achieving Objective 3.1 of the Wanganui District Council's Urban Transportation Strategy (WUTS), which states that "<i>pedestrians and cyclists are the prioritised modes of transport in the riverfront development. Road design traffic management reduces traffic volumes, enforcing this priority.</i>"</p> <p>Two way movement on Taupo Quay is to be maintained, as this is recognised in the WUTS as helping to maintain activity in the area, and providing passive surveillance that will help to contribute towards a sense of personal safety. Proposed Plan Change 21 is therefore considered to be generally consistent with the submitter's request.</p> <p>Proposed Plan Change 21 seeks to implement the WUTS through changing the status of Taupo Quay from Secondary Arterial Road to a Local Road with a Central City Street Overlay (in accordance with Method M279). These changes are for the purpose of improving pedestrian and cycling links to the waterfront, making Taupo Quay more attractive for visitors on all days of the week.</p> <p><b>Submission is declined.</b> <b>No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b></p>
<b>S8:</b> G J Lambert	<p>Submitter (owner at 190 St Hill Street) objects to any changes PC21 and believes he should have been contacted about any changes.</p>	<p>Opposed to any changes introduced by Plan Change 21.</p>	<p>Council did not accept the Planning Officer's recommendation that, the current zoning of 190 St Hill Street change from Central Commercial to Central Edge Commercial. Council did not accept that the proposed policy framework was necessary to maintain and enhance the diversity that exists within the Central Commercial Zone.</p> <p>Given the roading hierarchy, Council accepts that current and future activities are likely to be vehicle dominated. However Council considered that this could be accommodated easily within the existing Central Commercial zone framework and an additional zone was not necessary.</p> <p>Consultation was undertaken between February and May 2010, prior to drafting Proposed Plan Change 21. Consultation on the Draft Plan Change was undertaken in October and November 2010. This proposed Plan Change was publically notified on 23 June 2011, with the period for submissions closing 21 July 2011. Council has followed due process, and have provided plenty of opportunity for the community to participate.</p> <p><b>Submission is accepted in part.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Proposed Plan Change 21 as follows:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend the Planning Maps to show that the property at 190 St Hill Street shall retain the current zoning of Central Commercial.</li> </ol>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
<p><b>S9:</b> G E Bullock</p> <p>Further Submission NZHPT</p>	<p>Submission is in regards to the old town heritage overlay zone and earthquake proofing.</p> <p>Insurance rates for pre-1936 buildings have gone up. The submitter considers that there is very little demand for upstairs accommodation due to slow economic growth.</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Upgrading old buildings to new standards may not be the best option for Wanganui.</li> <li>- 2 storied buildings no longer required.</li> <li>- More economic to build new buildings and not to earthquake proof existing buildings.</li> <li>- The flexibility of Town Plan is too rigid and needs relaxing to accommodate the owners of these.</li> <li>- Future wellbeing of Wanganui cannot be based on the public wish list but must take into account property owners and tenants economic needs.</li> <li>- If buildings must be retained and earthquake proofed, true and genuine features should be all that is taken into consideration.</li> <li>-</li> </ul> <p>NZHPT made a <b>further submission</b> opposing the decisions requested, they consider the Old Town Heritage Overlay Zone is imperative to protect its historic heritage; and that the protection of heritage buildings is a public good.</p>	<p>No explicit decision requested.</p>	<p>Historic heritage has been identified as one of the key characteristics that contribute to the amenity of the Central Commercial, Arts and Commerce and Riverfront Zones of Proposed Plan Change 21. Proposed Plan Change 21 is not proposing to alter the existing old town heritage overlay zone or any of the provisions relating to this area.</p> <p>WDC has an existing Earthquake-prone Buildings Policy that sits outside of the District Plan. This policy is currently being reviewed by Council, the outcomes of which may lead to a review of this policy.</p> <p>These matters are more appropriately dealt with through the review of the Built Heritage Section of the District Plan (Phase 3), which is currently underway.</p> <p><b>Submission is declined and the Further Submission is accepted. No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b></p>
<p><b>S10:</b> Collective of Taupo Quay Building Owners (#35-49)</p>	<p>This submission has been prepared by a collective of Taupo Quay Building owners and specifically relates to the Riverfront Zone.</p> <p>Understand that the proposed changes are in line with Council's vision for this area and that there has been extensive public consultation. Agree in principle with the vision for the Riverfront Zone. However, Plan Change 21 imposes restrictions that they believe impinge on their existing rights as property owners and will affect their ability to generate revenue that can be used to support further development, and will decrease the commercial value of their properties.</p> <p>Some aspects of the proposed Riverfront Zone seem to be inconsistent with the vision for the area. It is hard to understand how visitor accommodation can have a negative impact on this area. There is a restriction of residential accommodation at ground</p>	<p>No explicit decision requested.</p> <p>No explicit decision requested.</p>	<p>Council noted that 35 Moutoa Quay is located within the Riverfront Zone of Proposed Plan Change 21, and is currently zoned "Outer Commercial". Under the current zoning, buildings within the proposed Riverfront Zone have a maximum building height of 13 metres. As the submitters have noted that the existing buildings within this area have a height of at least 10 metres, the proposal to limit building height to 7.5m would not be consistent with the existing character. Council therefore determined that buildings fronting Taupo Quay should retain the current maximum building height of 13 metres through changes to Rule R223 (structures).</p> <p>However, Rule R223 should introduce a maximum building height of 7.5m to new buildings that are constructed between existing buildings on Moutoa Quay and the Whanganui River, due to their proximity to the River and public open space areas. This reduced building height is considered appropriate within this area of the Riverfront Zone, to minimise potential shading and amenity effects from tall buildings on the public open space along the riverfront.</p> <p>Property owners within the Riverfront Zone will retain the right to use their existing parking areas on their properties in accordance with Section 10 of the Resource Management Act 1991 through existing use rights, unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the character, intensity or scale of the activity being undertaken on that site changes;</li> <li>- the current use of the property is discontinued for a continuous period of more than 12 months after the rule becomes operative; or</li> <li>- The building is reconstructed, altered or extended so as to increase the degree to which the building fails to comply with any rule in a district plan or proposed district plan.</li> </ul>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
<p>Continued...</p> <p><b>S10:</b> Collective of Taupo Quay Building Owners (#35-49)</p> <p>Further Submission NZHPT</p>	<p>level facing the street but there are two buildings on their block that have private yards and ground floor residential accommodation would be perfectly feasible.</p> <p>Also the restriction on height for new buildings also seems incongruous with the vision for the zone and is unnecessarily restrictive. A height of 7.5m is short for a two storey building in a heritage zone. Most buildings in our block are two storeys and 10 metres high or more.</p> <p>Do not agree with the restrictions on parking/housing vehicle on their properties because it is a clear breach of existing rights. Owners also have access to parking at the river/Moutoa Quay end of their buildings and want to make it known to Council that this needs to be retained as does their access in to this area and into their properties.</p> <p>Submitters support the Council to value and develop the riverfront as a natural focus for their community, but want to make the point that they do not wish this to be at their expense.</p> <p>NZHPT made a <b>further submission</b> opposing the relief sought by the submitter for reasons that protection is required for 'built historic heritage' and it is acknowledged as an important characteristic within the Riverfront Zone.</p>		<p>Visitor accommodation is included in the definition of "Commercial Activities." Commercial Activities reliant on pedestrian movement are listed as one of the characteristics of the Riverfront Zone (Z18). Proposed Rule R222 lists those activities that are permitted within the Riverfront Zone, including some of those activities listed within the definition of "commercial activities." Visitor accommodation is considered to be consistent with the proposed characteristics for the Riverfront Zone, and is likely to contribute towards lively street activity and higher pedestrian numbers. Council determined that proposed Rule R222 be altered to include "Visitor accommodation" as a permitted activity.</p> <p>The vision for the Riverfront Zone is to create a pedestrian focussed central commercial area that provides for the social, cultural, and economic needs of the community. As residential activities on the ground floor of buildings within the Riverfront Zone is not entirely consistent with this vision, Council accepted that such applications should be considered on a case-by-case basis through a consent process.</p> <p><b>Submission and Further Submission are accepted in part.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Proposed Plan Change 21 as follows:</b></p> <p>1. <b>Amend R222 as follows (changes are underlined):</b></p> <p><b><i>R222 Permitted Activities</i></b> <i>The following are permitted activities within the Riverfront Zone:</i></p> <p>a. <i>Boutique retail activities with a maximum gross floor area of 200m<sup>2</sup>;</i>  b. <i>Professional and administrative offices;</i>  c. <i>Food and beverage outlets;</i>  d. <i>Community activities;</i>  e. <i>Manufacturing activities relating to the arts;</i>  f. <i>Artists studios;</i>  g. <i>Recreational activities and facilities;</i>  h. <i>Tourist facilities, excluding camping grounds and vehicle parking, other than vehicle parking provided by Wanganui District Council;</i>  i. <i>Vehicle and cycle parking area developed and managed by, or on behalf of, the Wanganui District Council;</i>  j. <i>Network utilities as provided by General Rule – Utilities (Rule R15), which contains some exemptions from the zone rules for network utilities;</i>  k. <i>Residential activities not located on the ground floor;</i>  l. <u><i>Visitor Accommodation;</i></u></p> <p><i>which comply with the relevant zone rules.</i></p> <p>2. <b>Amend Rule 223(d) (Structures) as follows:</b></p> <p>1. <i>Within the Riverfront Zone, structures shall be required to meet the following conditions and terms:</i></p> <p>.....</p> <p>d. <b><i>Building Height</i></b> <del>Building height* shall be a maximum of 7.5 metres.</del>  i. <u><i>Buildings with direct frontage to Taupo Quay shall have a maximum height of 13 metres</i></u>  ii. <u><i>Buildings that do not have direct frontage to Taupo Quay shall have a maximum height of 7.5 metres.</i></u> <i>Height shall be measured to the top of the eaves or parapet.</i></p> <p><i>Reason</i> <i>To maintain the scale and amenity of the Riverfront Zone.</i></p>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
<p><b>S11:</b> Bruce Henry Dickson (DLA Architects)  Further Submission NZHPT</p>	<p>Submitter does not believe that the creation of the Central Edge Commercial Zone is necessary as the previous zones were sufficient to manage development and objects to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new requirement to provide parking to area previously zoned Central Commercial; and</li> <li>2. The new requirement to impose a height restriction on street boundaries established by 2 metre height and 45 degree angle.</li> </ol> <p>The submitter believes that these two rules will dramatically alter the form of future development which has been established historically and detract from the Wanganui Heritage environment. The rules will disadvantage current landowners and reduce potential site development and options.</p> <p>NZHPT made a <b>further submission</b>, opposing this submission in part. NZHPT does not agree that the height to boundary rule will dramatically alter the Wanganui heritage environment. However, agrees with the submitter that the parking requirement may result in parking lots creating dead space. NZHPT recommends that parking requirements should be 'waived' where alternative parking or public transport options are available.</p>	<p>No explicit decision requested.</p>	<p>Council concurred with the submitter and did not accept that the proposed policy framework for the new Central Edge Commercial zone was necessary to maintain and enhance the diversity that exists within the Central Commercial Zone.</p> <p>Given the roading hierarchy, Council accepts that current and future activities are likely to be vehicle dominated. However Council considered that this could be accommodated easily within the existing Central Commercial zone framework and an additional zone was not necessary. Council has determined to delete the Central Edge Commercial zone as a result of other submissions.</p> <p>Council considered the proposed height recession plane requirements to be too restrictive, and would potentially prevent quality redevelopment of sites within the zone, particularly in the Wicksteed Street area, given the existing building design and sites layouts in the area. The Council did not accept that the setback requirements were necessary or would minimise potential adverse effects on streetscape and amenity such as bulk.</p> <p>Although proposed Rule R228 (Structures) would not affect existing buildings, landowners will be affected by the new height recession plane provisions if they wish to construct new buildings and structures, or undertake additions to existing buildings and structures. Council did not consider this to be reasonable or necessary.</p> <p>The recommendation by NZHPT to waive parking requirements where alternative parking or public transport options are available is considered to extend the scope of the original submission and so cannot be considered in accordance with Clause 8 of the 1st Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p><b>Submission is accepted and the Further Submission is declined.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Proposed Plan Change 21 as follows:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Amend the Planning Maps to by deleting the proposed Central Edge Commercial zone and retain the current zoning of Central Commercial zone for all properties.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Remove all references to the proposed Central Edge Commercial zone in the District Plan.</b></li> </ol>
<p><b>S12:</b> Janet Baddeley</p>	<p>Submitter (Apartment 25/2 Victoria Avenue) objects to Plan Change 21 raising the noise level. The submitter considers that higher noise levels will not make the area more vibrant. The submitter also considers that, as Council has issued Resource Consents for apartments in the Victoria Avenue block, they should sound proof them all and double glaze the windows. Otherwise the noise levels should stay as they are.</p>	<p>To leave the noise levels as they are, as noise can already be heard across the river by several homes.</p>	<p>The promotion of inner city residential development is consistent with urban design principles in that it enables the creation of a more vibrant central city through 24 hour per day activity. As the key characteristics of the Central Commercial and Arts and Commerce Zones include "<i>higher levels of sound emitted from activities</i>" and "<i>lively street activity</i>," retaining the current noise levels would unduly limit activities operating within these zones; and prevent new activities from establishing. Through acknowledging the higher noise levels of this zone in the District Plan, Council is alerting current and future residential owners and tenants to expect high noise levels.</p> <p>While new dwellings are required to mitigate for increase sound through sound insulation, existing dwellings have existing use rights under Section 10 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and so are not required to make these changes (but may choose to upgrade their existing noise insulation).</p> <p><b>Submission is declined.</b> <b>No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b></p>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
<p><b>S13:</b> Bruce Henry Dickson on behalf of Mainstreet Wanganui</p>	<p>Submitter does not believe that the creation of the Central Edge Commercial Zone is necessary as the previous zones were sufficient to manage development and objects to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new requirement to provide parking to area previously zoned Central Commercial; and</li> <li>2. The new requirement to impose a height restriction on street boundaries established by 2 metre height and 45 deg angle.</li> </ol>	<p>The submitters believe that the two rules identified above will dramatically alter the form of future development and will alter the current situation and established environment.</p> <p>The submitters also believe that these rules will disadvantage landowners and reduce potential for site development.</p>	<p>Council concurred with the submitter and did not accept that the proposed policy framework for the new Central Edge Commercial zone was necessary to maintain and enhance the diversity that exists within the Central Commercial Zone.</p> <p>Given the roading hierarchy, Council accepts that current and future activities are likely to be vehicle dominated. However Council considered that this could be accommodated easily within the existing Central Commercial zone framework and an additional zone was not necessary. Council has determined to delete the Central Edge Commercial zone.</p> <p>Council considered the proposed height recession plane requirements to be too restrictive, and would potentially prevent quality redevelopment of sites within the zone, particularly in the Wicksteed Street area, given the existing building design and sites layouts in the area. The Council did not accept that the setback requirements were necessary or would minimise potential adverse effects on streetscape and amenity such as bulk.</p> <p>Although proposed Rule R228 (Structures) would not affect existing buildings, landowners will be affected by the new height recession plane provisions if they wish to construct new buildings and structures, or undertake additions to existing buildings and structures. Council did not consider this to be reasonable or necessary.</p> <p><b>Submission is accepted.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Proposed Plan Change 21 as follows:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Amend the Planning Maps to by deleting the proposed Central Edge Commercial zone and retain the current zoning of Central Commercial zone for all properties.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Remove all references to the proposed Central Edge Commercial zone in the District Plan.</b></li> </ol>
<p><b>S14:</b> Glenn Young - Universal College of Learning (UCOL)  Further Submission NZHPT</p>	<p>UCOL's Whanganui Campus occupies almost the entire block of land bounded by Rutland Street, Drews Avenue, Taupo Quay and Market Place. This land comprises a quarter of the land to be zoned "Arts and Commerce." Nowhere within Plan Change 21 is there any mention or acknowledgement of the significant role that UCOL plays in ensuring "...that development and activities in the central city area contribute positively to the social, cultural, economic and environmental wellbeing of the Wanganui Community" (Objective O20).</p> <p>Proposed Rules R243 and R221 introduce categories of non-compliance relating to the external appearance of sites and buildings. Whilst UCOL understands the intent of such rules, it does not consider them to be an effective or efficient way of enabling or ensuring a high level of amenity value. It also considers such rules would be difficult to enforce.</p> <p>Rules R217 f in 'Z18.1 Riverfront Zone – Outline Plan' and R223 g 'Z18 Riverfront Zone' both relate to Flood Hazard Mitigation. No such rule applies to the proposed Arts and Commerce Zone, yet part of the land to be subject to this zone is also subject to flooding.</p> <p>The relationship between the Riverfront Zone and</p>	<p>That recognition and acknowledgement of the significance of UCOL's educational activities and facilities to the Central City and Riverfront areas of Wanganui be provided in the policy and/or explanatory sections of PPC21. UCOL seeks that explicit reference be made to UCOL's educational activities in "Policy P89" and the introduction to "Z20 Arts and Commerce" in the list of important characteristics in the "Arts and Commerce Zone".</p> <p>That Proposed Rule R243 c, R243 d, R221F and R221g be deleted or withdrawn.</p> <p>That the relevance and/or applicability of the Flood Level Event Lines, shown on the Operative Planning Maps, to the provisions (in particular the rules) proposed by Plan Change 21 for the Arts and Commerce Zone, be stated or otherwise confirmed that they do not apply to this Zone.</p> <p>That an explanatory statement or policy be introduced to the District Plan which makes the nature and extent of the relationship between the Riverfront Zone and the Riverfront - Outline Plan unequivocally clear.</p>	<p>Council noted that the list of permitted activities (proposed Rule R235) within the Arts and Commerce Zone includes "Community Activities." The definition of Community Activities includes "educational facilities," which are defined as "<i>a place of learning and instruction, at pre-school, primary, intermediate, secondary or tertiary level.</i>" However Community activities, and more specifically educational facilities, are not listed as important characteristics in the Arts and Commerce Zone (Z20 Arts and Commerce Zone) or in proposed Policy P89. Council recognised that UCOL is an important landowner and educational provider within this zone, and as such should be given adequate recognition within the list of key characteristics of the Arts and Commerce Zone, and in Policy P89.</p> <p>As educational facilities are only one type of Community Activity that would be provided for as a permitted activity within the Arts and Commerce Zone, the list of important characteristics in the introductory section of the Arts and Commerce Zone (Z20) and Policy P89 should refer to Community Activities, with specific reference to UCOL.</p> <p>Council concurred with the submitter, that Rules 243c, 243d, 221f and 221g should be deleted and the planning officers recommendation of the inclusion of proposed Policy 106 be abandoned. The rules are too subjective and likely to be difficult to enforce.</p> <p>The flood level event lines on the Planning Maps mark the extent of the 1 in 200 year flood event (as specified in Horizons Proposed One Plan as amended by decisions). All properties located within the 1 in 200 year flood event line are required by the Proposed One Plan, to avoid or mitigate the flood hazard. Council acknowledged that a rule similar to Rule 223(1g), requiring consideration of flood hazards impacts for permitted activities in the Arts and Commerce zone is required to safeguard people and property located within the 1 in 200 year flood hazard area.</p> <p>Council accepts UCOL's submission that there is overlap between the Riverfront Zone and the Riverfront Zone – Outline Plan, leading to ambiguity and uncertainty. For these reasons, it is recommended that the Riverfront Zone – Outline Plan be withdrawn from proposed Plan Change 21. The provisions for the Riverfront Zone will remain. As such, proposed Section Z18.1 riverfront Outline Plan, including rules R211, R212, R213, R214, R217, R218 and R221(d) in the (Riverfront zone) be withdrawn from proposed Plan Change 21. The removal of the Riverfront Outline Plan would inadvertently mean that public open space and market activities would no longer be provided for as permitted activities within the Riverfront zone. To address this definitions of these activities are proposed to be included and provision for them made under rule R222( Permitted activities in the Riverfront zone).</p> <p>Policy P103 is to be amended, by deleting reference to the riverfront area and instead referring to the riverfront zone. This will avoid confusion about whether these might be two distinct areas.</p>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
<p>Continued...</p> <p><b>S14:</b> Glenn Young - Universal College of Learning (UCOL)</p> <p>Further Submission NZHPT</p>	<p>the Outline Development Plan is unclear. Is 'Z18.1 Riverfront Zone – Outline Plan' a separate zone or is it an overlay of the Riverfront Zone? Conflict or ambiguity results in uncertainty which in turn may delay or prevent positive development in the central area and Riverfront Zones.</p> <p>NZHPT made a <b>further submission</b> opposing the submitters request to delete rules R243c, R243d, R221f and R221g.</p>	<p>Repeated.....</p> <p>That recognition and acknowledgement of the significance of UCOL's educational activities and facilities to the Central City and Riverfront areas of Wanganui be provided in the policy and/or explanatory sections of PPC21. UCOL seeks that explicit reference be made to UCOL's educational activities in "Policy P89" and the introduction to "Z20 Arts and Commerce" in the list of important characteristics in the "Arts and Commerce Zone".</p> <p>That Proposed Rule R243 c, R243 d, R221F and R221g be deleted or withdrawn.</p> <p>That the relevance and/or applicability of the Flood Level Event Lines, shown on the Operative Planning Maps, to the provisions (in particular the rules) proposed by Plan Change 21 for the Arts and Commerce Zone, be stated or otherwise confirmed that they do not apply to this Zone.</p> <p>That an explanatory statement or policy be introduced to the District Plan which makes the nature and extent of the relationship between the Riverfront Zone and the Riverfront - Outline Plan unequivocally clear.</p>	<p>Council did not accept the view of the further submitter in relation to Rules 243c, 243d, 221f and 221g. The rules are too subjective and likely to be difficult to enforce.</p> <p><b>Submission is accepted and the Further Submission is declined.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Proposed Plan Change 21 as follows:</b></p> <p><b>1. Amend Policy P89 by inserting a clause (o) as follows (changes underlined)</b></p> <p><i>Policy P89: Define an Arts and Commerce Zone with the following characteristics:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>The presence of heritage sites and buildings;</i></li> <li>b. <i>Natural and cultural heritage features;</i></li> <li>c. <i>Good urban design;</i></li> <li>d. <i>Central city limits are defined by the Whanganui River and three Parks and Gardens;</i></li> <li>e. <i>Low speed vehicle movement;</i></li> <li>f. <i>Higher levels of sound emitted from activities;</i></li> <li>g. <i>Higher numbers of commercial signs;</i></li> <li>h. <i>Lively street activity;</i></li> <li>i. <i>Pedestrian oriented street layout, design, and quality;</i></li> <li>j. <i>High number of pedestrians in the streets;</i></li> <li>k. <i>Consolidated on-street and mid-block car parks;</i></li> <li>l. <i>A range of transport options;</i></li> <li>m. <i>A mix of boutique, commercial and arts activities reliant on pedestrian movement;</i></li> <li>n. <i>Buildings built to a high standard, up to the street frontage, reflecting the historic rhythm and with no gaps between them;</i></li> <li>o. <u><i>Community activities, including UCOL.</i></u></li> </ul> <p><b>2. Amend Z20 Arts and Commerce Zone by inserting clause (o) as follows:</b></p> <p><b>Z20: Arts and Commerce</b> <i>Zoning is a technique for managing the effects of activities and for maintaining or creating the places that the community value. By identifying the characteristics that combine to make a place successful, the zones guide development. Important characteristics in the Arts and Commerce Zone are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>The presence of heritage sites and buildings*;</i></li> <li>b. <i>Natural and cultural heritage features;</i></li> <li>c. <i>Good urban design;</i></li> <li>d. <i>Central city limits are defined by the Whanganui River and three Parks and Gardens;</i></li> <li>e. <i>Low speed vehicle movement;</i></li> <li>f. <i>Higher levels of sound emitted from activities;</i></li> <li>g. <i>Higher numbers of commercial signs*;</i></li> <li>h. <i>Lively street activity;</i></li> <li>i. <i>Pedestrian oriented street layout, design, and quality;</i></li> <li>j. <i>High number of pedestrians in the streets;</i></li> <li>k. <i>Consolidated on-street and mid-block car parks;</i></li> <li>l. <i>A range of transport options.</i></li> <li>m. <i>A mix of boutique, commercial and arts activities reliant on pedestrian movement;</i></li> <li>n. <i>Buildings* built to a high standard, up to the street frontage, reflecting the historic rhythm and with no gaps between them;</i></li> <li>o. <u><i>Community activities, including UCOL.</i></u></li> </ul>



**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
<p>Continued...</p> <p><b>S14:</b> Glenn Young - Universal College of Learning (UCOL)</p> <p>Further Submission NZHPT</p>		<p>Repeated.....</p> <p>That recognition and acknowledgement of the significance of UCOL's educational activities and facilities to the Central City and Riverfront areas of Wanganui be provided in the policy and/or explanatory sections of PPC21. UCOL seeks that explicit reference be made to UCOL's educational activities in "Policy P89" and the introduction to "Z20 Arts and Commerce" in the list of important characteristics in the "Arts and Commerce Zone".</p> <p>That Proposed Rule R243 c, R243 d, R221F and R221g be deleted or withdrawn.</p> <p>That the relevance and/or applicability of the Flood Level Event Lines, shown on the Operative Planning Maps, to the provisions (in particular the rules) proposed by Plan Change 21 for the Arts and Commerce Zone, be stated or otherwise confirmed that they do not apply to this Zone.</p> <p>That an explanatory statement or policy be introduced to the District Plan which makes the nature and extent of the relationship between the Riverfront Zone and the Riverfront - Outline Plan unequivocally clear.</p>	<p>3. Z18.1 Riverfront Zone – Outline Plan be withdrawn.</p> <p>4. Insert new definitions in the Definitions section of DP online as follows:</p> <p><u>Public Open Space</u> Means land or a water body that is administered and owned by a territorial authority to provide public access to open land, foreshore, rivers and streams and areas of heritage significance for the purpose of heritage and biodiversity protection, landscape enhancement, recreational opportunities, education, and environmental protection.</p> <p><u>Market Activities</u> Means any food and beverage outlets, retail activities and artist's studios located in a temporary structure within the Riverfront zone.</p> <p>5. Amend Rule 222 (Permitted activities) by adding new clauses as follows:</p> <p>(m) <u>Public open space</u>; and (n) <u>Market activities</u> which comply with the relevant zone rules and relevant permitted activity standards:</p> <p>6. Insert a new rule 246:</p> <p><b>Rule 246 Market Activities</b> <u>Market activities within the Riverfront zone shall comply with the following permitted activity conditions:</u></p> <p>a. <u>Operate only between 7.00am and 2.00pm on Saturdays, and</u> b. <u>Operate only in the land bounded by Moutoa Quay, Drews Avenue and Taupo Quay, and</u> c. <u>Comply with all other relevant rules for the Riverfront zone.</u> d. <u>Market activities ancillary to temporary activities such as sporting recreational, entertainment, cultural or similar events and outdoor gatherings, with prior approval of the territorial authority, are not subject to standards (a) and (b) above.</u></p> <p>7. Amend Rule 220 (Restricted Discretionary Activities- Riverfront Zone) by inserting a new clause (b) after clause (a) and renumbering remaining clauses as required: <u>(b) Market activities that do not comply with the permitted activity conditions specified in Rule 246, or any other relevant zone rules.</u></p> <p>8. Delete Rules 221f , 221g, 243c and 243d.</p> <p>9. Delete reference to the riverfront area in Policy P103, and reason for Rule 223(1g) and replace with reference to the Riverfront zone. Renumber Rule 223 as required.</p> <p>10. Insert the following clause into Rule 238 as (1e):</p> <p>e. <u>Flood Hazard</u> <u>New buildings and additions to buildings are required to be designed and constructed to either:</u> i. <u>Be protected from inundation; or</u> ii. <u>Be able to recover efficiently following inundation.</u></p> <p><u>Reason</u> <u>Alternative techniques for flood hazard mitigation are preferred, but a variety of flood hazard avoidance or mitigation methods may be used in the Arts and Commerce zone.</u></p>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
<p><b>S15:</b> Mr Russell Buchanan of Buchanan Gray on behalf of Wanganui Motors (1963) Limited</p>	<p>Wanganui Motors opposes PC21 insofar as it proposes to rezone the land because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Wanganui Motors 1963 Ltd is the owner/occupier of the land.</li> <li>(2) Wanganui Motors 1963 Ltd's aspirations for possible future redevelopment of the land would be unreasonably constrained as a consequence of the proposed rezoning.</li> <li>(3) The land should appropriately retain its current zoning as St Hill Street provides the most practical and established zone boundary position between the Central Commercial Area and the Outer Commercial Area within this part of Wanganui City.</li> <li>(4) It is neither warranted, or necessary, to propose rezoning of an area of land along one side of Ridgway Street within the current Outer Commercial Zone.</li> <li>(5) Retaining the Outer Commercial zoning of the land will not preclude achievement of both the protection and enhancement of central city area amenity values as sought by PC21 should the identified land be redeveloped in accordance with the operation District Plan zoning provisions applying to it.</li> </ol>	<p>Wanganui Motors 1963 Ltd's submission is to keep the 'Outer Commercial Zone' in place for the land on the north-western side of Ridgway Street between St Hill Street and Trafalgar Place.</p>	<p>Council accepted that as St Hill Street is a Secondary Arterial Road, it forms a logical boundary between the Central Commercial and Central Edge Commercial Zones, and the Outer Commercial Zone. Council agreed that those properties on the north-western side of Ridgway Street between St Hill Street and Trafalgar Place should retain their Outer Commercial zoning.</p> <p><b>Submission is accepted.</b> <b>Amend Proposed Plan Change 21 as follows:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Amend the Planning Maps to show that the block on the north-western side of Ridgway Street between St Hill Street and Trafalgar Place is to retain its current zoning of Outer Commercial.</b></li> </ol>
<p><b>S16:</b> L M Terry</p>	<p>Submission is that Wanganui cannot afford to remove Somme Parade from being a main arterial route. If Somme Parade and Taupo Quay are closed to through traffic the congestion on alternative routes will result in increased travelling time. Taupo Quay as a pedestrian precinct is not justified as the greatest volume of traffic occurs during the weekdays. During the weekend traffic volumes are less. Fuel wastage will increase pollution and the result is a poorer city both economically and socially if the proposed plan to impede traffic flow is proceeded with.</p>	<p>No explicit decision requested.</p>	<p>There are no road closures proposed within the area covered by Proposed Plan Change 21. Any road closures must go through a separate public consultation process under the Local Government Act. Taupo Quay will remain open for two way traffic.</p> <p>Council noted that proposed Plan Change 21 proposes to alter the status of Taupo Quay from a secondary arterial road to a Central City Street. This is to assist in achieving Objective 3.1 of the Wanganui District Council's Urban Transportation Strategy (WUTS), which states that "<i>pedestrians and cyclists are the prioritised modes of transport in the riverfront development. Road design traffic management reduces traffic volumes, enforcing this priority.</i>"</p> <p>Council also noted that proposed Plan Change 21 seeks to implement the WUTS through changing the status of Taupo Quay from Secondary Arterial Road to a Local Road with a Central City Street Overlay (in accordance with Method M279). These changes are for the purpose of improving pedestrian and cycling links to the waterfront, making Taupo Quay more attractive for visitors on all days of the week.</p> <p><b>Submission is declined.</b> <b>No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b></p>
<p><b>S17:</b> Stephen Palmer  Further Submission NZHPT</p>	<p>Submission is that creating new planning zones, with defined rules, is undesirable and has not worked in the past. Believes there should be a single Central Commercial Zone with policies that set out general principles for maintaining a compact CBD, encouraging adaptive re-use of heritage buildings, creating new buildings that are in harmony and scale with the existing environment, preserving the waterfront and making a pleasant pedestrian environment.</p>	<p>No new planning zones and delete the existing Old Town and Riverbank Overlay zones.</p> <p>Replace most rules with policies that allow the planners to engage with developers through discussion rather than the adversarial resource consent applications and to make mutually agreed decisions that will maintain a compact CBD, encourage adaptive re-use or heritage buildings, create new buildings that are in harmony and scale with the existing</p>	<p>Council has taken a prescriptive approach through creating new zones, objectives, policies and rules, to guide future development in the Wanganui Central City. An extensive consultation process has been undertaken, which identified that the operative District Plan does not reflect the vision that the Community has for the Wanganui Central City, particularly the Old Town and riverfront area. Council accepted that having a single Central Commercial zone does recognise the varied character of the Wanganui CBD and is sufficient to enable development to maintain or enhance this diversity.</p> <p>Artists studios are permitted within the Arts and Commerce Zone (R235), and within the Riverfront zone. The definition of "artist's studio" includes both a workroom for artistic pursuits and may include an area for the display and sale of art. While the production and sale of artistic works could be established within the other commercial zones, these activities may require resource consent. The District Plan enables arts related activities within the Arts and Commerce and Riverfront zones, consistent with the current "feel" of these areas. To allow such activities in other central city zones undermines the purpose of the Arts and Commerce and Riverfront zones.</p>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
	<p>Production and sale of artistic works should be allowed anywhere in the commercial zones. Market is anarchic - trying to govern it with formal rules will probably be its death knell. Covered market area not viable unless it operates full time - who is going to pay the rent for a permanent covered market?</p> <p>Taupo Quay is a major traffic artery that interconnects with other arterial roads, so why upset that in favour of pedestrians who do not exist except on Saturday. Submitter agrees with proposal to discourage traffic from Somme Parade.</p> <p>NZHPT made a <b>further submission</b> opposing the relief sought by this submitter, namely the deletion of the Old Town and Riverbank Overlay zones.</p>	<p>environment, preserve the waterfront and make a pleasant pedestrian environment. (Formal consent applications would still be required where agreement could not be reached or where a proposed development will conflict with the policies or have significant adverse effects).</p> <p>Delete rules relating to set backs and gaps between buildings.</p> <p>Encourage the use of Dublin Street, Bell Street, Taupo Quay and St Hill Street as a two-way ring road system to circumnavigate and access the CBD.</p>	<p>Council noted that it has commenced a review of the District Plan provisions relating to Built Heritage (Phase 3 of the District Plan review) and the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings is an issue that is being considered.</p> <p>The Riverfront Outline Plan identifies a covered market area, that will also function as a car park when the market is not in operation. As a result of UCOL's submission, which considered that the relationship between the Riverfront Zone and Riverfront Zone – Outline Plan is unclear and ambiguous, the Riverfront Outline Plan will be withdrawn from Proposed Plan Change 21. The submitter's comments with regards to the viability of a permanent covered market are therefore no longer relevant to proposed Plan Change 21.</p> <p>Council noted the submitters support for the proposal to alter the status of Taupo Quay from a secondary arterial road to a central city street.</p> <p>The rules regarding setbacks and gaps between buildings are consistent with Policy P94 (incorporate CPTED principles in all development) and are consistent with the heritage character of the Riverfront and Central Commercial zones, whereby buildings were built to the front and side boundaries of the sites.</p> <p><b>Submission and Further Submission are accepted in part. No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b></p>
<p><b>S18:</b> David Sidney Burnham</p>	<p>Designating the area from 5A Putiki Drive.</p>	<p>That the area from 5A Putiki Drive south be designated as residential because the Council and roads board have spent a large sum of money to make the area beautiful and should be clear of all commercial activity except the section used by Totalspan Limited.</p>	<p>Council did not accept the Planning Officer's recommendation that, the current zoning of the property at 5A Putiki Drive change from Outer Commercial to Central Edge Commercial. Council did not accept that the proposed policy framework was necessary to maintain and enhance the diversity that exists within the Central Commercial Zone.</p> <p>Given the roading hierarchy, Council accepts that current and future activities are likely to be vehicle dominated. However Council considered that this could be accommodated easily within the existing Outer Commercial zone framework and an additional zone was not necessary.</p> <p><b>Submission is accepted in part. Amend Proposed Plan Change 21 as follows:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Amend the Planning Maps to show that the property at 5a Putiki Drive shall retain the current zoning of Outer Commercial.</b></li> </ol>
<p><b>S19:</b> Kritzo Venter on behalf of WDC Infrastructure</p>	<p>Submission on behalf of Infrastructure regarding the new building on the waterfront which currently runs over Council's main interceptor waste water line. Council wishes to be consulted on any future design/development of these buildings.</p>	<p>No explicit decision requested.</p>	<p>Council noted that its reticulated network is mapped on its website. The proximity of proposed buildings to existing pipelines is a matter that is more appropriately considered through the building consent process. Council's pipelines should also be marked by easements on the relevant Certificates of Title. It is then up to the developers and Council's Network Utility Managers to agree on appropriate "no build" setbacks from the pipelines. Proposed Plan Change 21 is not the appropriate mechanism with which to deal with the matters raised by WDC Infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Submission is declined. No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b></p>
<p><b>S20:</b> Steve Ellis c/- Old Town Properties  Further Submission NZHPT</p>	<p>This submission relates to 26 St Hill Street and the Central Edge Commercial Zone. The new proposal penalises the useable land size for a commercial site and retail activity. Along that frontage are 5 sites, 3 of which go to the front boundary edge already - one is a 60-70 space car park and the other being 26 St Hill Street. It makes no sense to limit the activity on that one site.</p> <p>NZHPT made a <b>further submission</b> opposing the relief sought by the submitter.</p>	<p>We would like R228 not to apply to the bottom end of St Hill Street, currently under the Heritage Overlay zone. This should be a discretionary ruling.</p>	<p>Council noted that in requesting that Rule R228 not apply to the block of St Hill Street that is under the Heritage Overlay, the submitter recognises the existing heritage character of this block, with most sites already built to the front boundary edge.</p> <p>Council noted also that the current District Plan requires recognition be given to the cultural significance of the Old Town area. As "the presence of heritage sites and buildings" and "natural and cultural heritage features" are not listed as key characteristics of the Central Edge Commercial Zone (Policy P86), the proposed rezoning of these properties does not appropriately recognise the existing heritage character of this St Hill Street block. As such, the proposed rezoning to Central Edge Commercial is considered to be inconsistent with existing Objective O15 and existing policies P64 and P65 for the Old Town "Overlay" Zone. It is therefore considered that the current Central Commercial Zoning is a better fit for the bottom end of St Hill Street.</p> <p>However the decision sought by the submitter is that Council not apply rule R228 to these properties, so Council has no power to rezone these properties to satisfy this submission. It can only exclude R228 from applying to sites within the Old Town Heritage Overlay zone. Having said that Council wishes to advise the submitter that it has determined to withdraw the Central Commercial Edge zone entirely as a result of other submissions so the effect will be, that the submitter's properties will retain their current Central Commercial zone, with no height recession plane rule applying.</p> <p><b>Submission is accepted in part and Further Submission is declined. Amend Proposed Plan Change 21 as follows:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Delete the height rules (Rule R228 Structures) from the proposed Central Edge Commercial zone.</b></li> </ol>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
<p>S21: Julian Harkness  Wanganui District Council</p>	<p>Planning Maps Urban 21,22 Rural 18 and the Map Legend - colour on the maps identifying the properties proposed to be zoned Central Edge Commercial is the same as that identifying the Coastal Residential Zone. This will lead to confusion.</p> <p>Rule R218 Parking Loading and Access - This rule limits the establishment of car parking for residential activities. The inability to have a place to store a private motor vehicle may limit the establishment of new residential activity within the Riverfront Zone. As long as the car parking does not compromise the active frontage to the Open Space, this should not adversely affect the character desired for the area.</p>	<p>That the land zoned Central Edge Commercial be identified with a colour that clearly identifies it as a specific zone.</p> <p>That Rule 218 be amended to read: "R218 Parking, Loading and Access (Outline Plan) Rules Number: R218.</p> <p>1. Parking - Vehicle parking is not permitted, except within the car parking area identified on the Outline Plan. <u>This rule does not apply to car parking that is required for residential activity by Rule R24, which is accessed from a service lane.</u></p> <p><i>Reason</i> <i>To encourage the Riverfront Zone to be built intensively, and to be developed in an integrated and comprehensive way.</i></p> <p>2. Loading and Access - Every activity that adjoins a service lane* shall provide one loading bay* that complies with the loading bay standards in General Rule - Transportation (Rule R24).</p> <p><i>Reason</i> <i>To ensure traffic flow is not impeded by service vehicles.</i></p>	<p>Council accepted that having two zones the same colour on the District Plan legend may lead to confusion. However it noted that after consideration of other submissions the Central Commercial Edge zone will be withdrawn and so the issue of map colours disappears also.</p> <p>Rule R218 controls parking, loading and access within the Riverfront Zone – Outline Plan. As Council has determined that the Riverfront - Outline Plan shall be withdrawn from proposed Plan Change 21, as a result of the UCOL submission, the requested changes to Rule R218 are no longer relevant. The equivalent rule to R218 that is being retained for the Riverfront Zone is Rule R224. Council decided that Rule R224 should be amended to address the concerns around residential parking within the Riverfront Zone raised by the submitter.. For consistency, a consequential change is also proposed to Clause 2 of Rule R224, clarifying that residential activities are also exempt from having to provide a loading bay.</p> <p><b>Submission accepted in part.</b> <b>Amend Proposed Plan Change 21 as follows:</b></p> <p>1. Amend rule R224 as follows (additions are underlined):</p> <p><b>R224 Parking, Loading and Access</b></p> <p>1. Parking</p> <p>i. <i>Vehicle parking is not permitted.</i></p> <p>ii. <u><i>This rule does not apply to car parking that is required for a residential activity by Rule R24, which is accessed from a service lane.</i></u></p> <p><i>Reason</i> <i>To encourage the Riverfront Zone to be built intensively, and to be developed in an integrated and comprehensive way.</i></p> <p>2. Loading and access</p> <p>i. <i>Every activity that adjoins a service lane shall provide one loading bay that complies with the loading bay standards in General Rule – Transportation (Rule R24).</i></p> <p>ii. <u><i>This rule does not apply to car parking that is required for a residential activity by Rule R24, which is accessed from a service lane.</i></u></p> <p><i>Reason</i> <i>To ensure traffic flow is not impeded by service vehicles.</i></p>
<p>S22: James Leon Ennis</p>	<p>This submission relates to the reduction of the status of Taupo Quay from Bates Street to Victoria Avenue to less than arterial, and developing a pedestrian controlled environment in Taupo Quay. The submitter considers that the loss of arterial function in Taupo Quay is unnecessary and will have a significant detrimental effect on the traffic flows on alternative routes.</p> <p>Taupo Quay is set up so that it can be fully/partially closed when required. Pedestrian count across Taupo Quay will remain low.</p> <p>Lack of suitable parking for caravans or vehicles with trailers near the Information Centre.</p>	<p>Retain the current status and function of Taupo Quay.</p> <p>The solution sought by the submitter is as follows: Development of the riverbank area is to be encouraged. The arterial status and function of Taupo Quay is retained. Additional off-street parking is required. Moutoa Quay can be used as a servicing street for the riverfront developments and should be the pedestrian controlled environment. Traffic improvements to Taupo Quay intersection next to the riverboat centre desired.</p>	<p>Proposed Plan Change 21 seeks to implement the Wanganui District Council's Urban Transportation Strategy (WUTS) through changing the status of Taupo Quay from Secondary Arterial Road to a local road (with a central city street overlay). These changes are for the purpose of improving pedestrian and cycling links to the waterfront. In the future Council may promote alternative routes through the City, thereby reducing the volume of heavy traffic travelling along Taupo Quay.</p> <p>The list of important characteristics for the Riverfront zone includes "consolidated on-street and mid-block car parks." Additional off-street parking areas would reduce the amount of space available for other activities, and would detract from the overall amenity of the Riverfront zone. The list of permitted activities for the Riverfront Zone under Rule R222 therefore lists "vehicle and cycle parking areas developed and managed by, or on behalf of, the Wanganui District Council." Rule R224 manages parking in the Riverfront zone. Providing more off-street parking would be inconsistent with the character of the Riverfront zone.</p> <p>Moutoa Quay is a legal road. This road cannot be closed to traffic without going through a formal road closure through the Local Government Act. It is Council's intention that Moutoa Quay will provide some access for vehicles servicing the riverfront, but that access will be controlled through some mechanism such as removable bollards. These changes will be implemented through the Local Government Act.</p> <p>Intersection upgrades and parking for caravans and trailers are not being considered as part of Proposed Plan Change 21 – these are part of Council's Long Term Plan and Asset Management planning.</p> <p><b>Submission is declined.</b> <b>No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b></p>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
<p><b>S23A &amp; S23B:</b> Andrew &amp; Lynda Deighton</p>	<p>Submitters are opposed to the increased sound emissions proposed within the Arts and Commerce Zone (Rule R236 – Noise). They are opposed to the increased sound emissions of 65dBA at ALL times. Increasing the sound emissions allowed at all times will not be conducive to residential/apartment living. By restricting the level and hours of noise emissions would be a compromise between vibrancy and quality of lifestyle in this zone. The present noise levels are not enforced. How do you soundproof a 1925 Heritage building without destroying its heritage features of wooden doors and windows that have had drawn/decorative glass? Plus cost.</p> <p>The second submission relates to Rule R235 and R238 in the Arts and Commerce Zone. Submitters are also opposed to only allow buildings to a Gross Size of 200m<sup>2</sup>. This will greatly reduce the value of the land and certainly any redevelopment.</p>	<p>Restrict the level and hours of noise emissions within the Arts and Commerce Zone.</p> <p>To allow buildings larger than 200m<sup>2</sup> to be built, or to allow more than one building per lot within the Arts and Commerce Zone.</p>	<p>Proposed Plan Change 21 proposes a single noise limit that applies 24 hours per day. Council considered the submitter's request that the level and hours of noise emissions be restricted. Council has proposed to increase the noise limits within the Central Commercial zone and Arts and Commerce zone so as to not unduly restrict activities that contribute to a vibrant central city.</p> <p>While new dwellings are required to mitigate for increase sound through noise insulation, existing dwellings have existing use rights under Section 10 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and are not required to make these changes (but may choose to upgrade their existing noise insulation). Council wishes to signal to existing and future residential dwellers that the central city is a noisy place to live, but has other benefits such as good access to commercial areas. Council noted that submitters had concerns about enforcement and monitoring of existing noise rules and Councillors have asked the Environmental Health team to investigate these concerns.</p> <p>Rule 235 permits "<i>Boutique retail activities with a maximum gross floor area of 200m<sup>2</sup></i>". Boutique retail activities are defined as "<i>a small business, with a maximum floor area of 200m<sup>2</sup>, offering specialist products and/or services.</i>" The gross floor area limits apply to activities not buildings. Council noted that a building owner is therefore able to accommodate more than one boutique retail activity within a single building, or to construct more than one building per lot, provided the floor area of each individual retail activity is 200m<sup>2</sup> or less.</p> <p><b>Submission is declined.</b> <b>No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b></p>
<p><b>S24:</b> Keith G Cullimore (A.N.Z.I.M.)</p>	<p>Submitters amendment to PC 20 &amp; 21 is that every property owner should have "Laissez faire" which means "let alone". Recognise right of every citizen to do what he/she wants to do with their property.</p>	<p>No explicit decision requested.</p>	<p>Council noted that an extensive consultation process has been undertaken, which identified that the operative District Plan did not reflect the vision that the community have for the Wanganui central city, particularly the Old Town and riverfront area. Council considered that the move away from regulation sought by the submitter would not lead to a high amenity outcome, or the maintenance of those key characteristics of the central city that the community values.</p> <p><b>Submission is declined.</b> <b>No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b></p>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
<p>S25: Wendy Pettigrew</p> <p>Further submission NZHPT</p>	<p>The submitter has no overall objection to the re-zoning as proposed but there is little recognition that the whole of the original Wanganui Borough was surveyed and planned by NZ Company surveyors. Town layout and streets, including many street names, all date from 1842. Section sizes and orientation have all contributed to the development of the character of the central part of Wanganui so is just as important as the heritage buildings. PC also makes no mention of the Old Town Conservation Overlay Zone. There are inconsistencies in the definitions of the zones and their characteristics.</p> <p>The policies for Central Commercial and Arts &amp; Commerce Zones both define the areas as having no gaps between buildings. There are existing "gaps" in both these zones. Central Edge Commercial Zone does not mention heritage buildings and yet there are a number already in this zone.</p> <p>The permitted activities in the Central Commercial and Central Edge Commercial Zone do not include Professional and Administrative Offices - yet these are permitted in the Arts &amp; Commerce Zone. There are already a large number of Professional &amp; Administrative Offices already in both these 2 zones. Important to have mix of permitted activities in all 3 zones.</p> <p>Identification of a few view shafts - most views down to the Whanganui River - there are many more which should be identified. Maintaining these view shafts and not obstructing them with signage or buildings is important.</p> <p>NZHPT made a <b>further submission</b> in support of the submitters relief sought, in particular the need for reference to be made to the heritage characteristics of each zone.</p>	<p>No explicit decision requested. Plan change should have mentioned the Old Town Overlay zone.</p> <p>Reconsider why are gaps between buildings are seen as bad.</p> <p>The Central Edge Commercial zone should reference heritage buildings.</p> <p>The Central Commercial and Central Edge Commercial should permit Professional and Administrative Offices.</p> <p>There are more View Shafts that require protection.</p>	<p>The Old Town Conservation Overlay zone is not altered by Proposed Plan Change 21. Section sizes and orientation will be considered as part of the Built Heritage Phase of the District Plan Review (Phase 3), which has just commenced. The "presence of heritage sites and buildings" is listed as one of the key characteristics of the Central Commercial Zone and the Arts and Commerce Zone under Proposed Plan Change 21.</p> <p>The characteristics listed for each zone are both a reflection of the current characteristics of the developments, and the desired environment sought for this zone. Future developments will therefore be required to be consistent with the characteristics of the zone in which they are operating.</p> <p>While there may be existing gaps between buildings within the Central Commercial and Arts and Commerce Zone, as Rule R33 (Structures within the Central Commercial Zone) and Rule R238 (Structures within the Arts and Commerce Zone) require new buildings to be built up to the street boundary and side boundaries should result in a more efficient built form. This style of development is more sympathetic to the heritage values that are characteristic of this zone. In addition, spaces between buildings are undesirable from a CPTED point of view as they create spaces with low public surveillance. As parts of the Arts and Commerce Zone are subject to the 1:200 year flood, these gaps reduce the effectiveness of the buildings to act as a barrier for flood protection.</p> <p>Council wishes to advise the submitter that, after consideration of other submissions it determined to withdraw the Central Edge Commercial zone, thus addressing concerns about the lack of acknowledgement of heritage values in that zone.</p> <p>Professional and Administrative Offices are listed under the definition of "Commercial Activities". Commercial Activities are listed as permitted activities within the Central Commercial and Central Edge Commercial Zones. Proposed Plan Change 21 therefore already provides for professional and administrative offices within the Central Commercial and Central Edge Commercial Zones, as per the submitters request.</p> <p>The view shafts that have been identified in Proposed Plan Change 21 are defined by the boundaries of road ways. By following roadways, these view shafts are easily identifiable and can be more easily maintained. Identifying additional view shafts may unduly limit future development within the Riverfront zone.</p> <p><b>Submission and Further Submission are declined. No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b></p>
<p>S26: E M Lewin</p> <p>Further Submission Tony Kale</p>	<p>Submitter supports in principle PC21 but have concerns in the following areas:</p> <p>5.1 (Issues) Acknowledges the importance of the Whanganui River and the need to create a Premier Public Space but the Riverfront Plan allows for the erection of buildings 2 1/2 storeys high.</p> <p>5.2 (Objective O30) Concern with the loss of visual</p>	<p>That any plan for the development of the Riverfront area be publicly notified.</p> <p>That a re-think of the "extra" buildings in a Public Space should be considered.</p>	<p>The construction of two storied buildings within the Riverfront zone is not inconsistent with Objective O24 which requires development and activities to reflect the importance of the Whanganui River to the community. New buildings constructed within the Riverfront zone are required to reflect the importance of the Whanganui River, through having active frontage to the Whanganui River as well as Taupo Quay. Physical and visual connection to the River shall be maintained through the view shafts identified on the Planning Maps. Rule R244 requires any activity or development within the identified view shafts that modifies the view of the Whanganui River requires consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.</p> <p>Objective O30 of Proposed Plan Change 21 requires development of the Wanganui Riverfront to recognise and mitigate against the potential flood hazard of the Whanganui River. The maximum building height proposed for the Riverfront zone does not preclude</p>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
<p>Continued...</p> <p><b>S26:</b> E M Lewin</p> <p>Further Submission Tony Kale</p>	<p>and physical connections between the central city area and the Whanganui River is at odds with Riverfront Plan which permits new buildings of 2 1/2 storey height.</p> <p>5.4 (Permitted Activities)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- R211 (new buildings) – If new buildings are allowed in the Public Space they should NOT be party or wholly residential (k)</li> <li>- R221 (Non-complying activities) - Not sure what criteria is for (e) on site vehicle parking. The Riverfront Plan makes some provision for parking.</li> <li>- R218, 224, 231, 240 (Parking, loading and access) - Great concern about parking arrangements.</li> <li>- R219 (Controlled Activities) - It is essential that any plan for this area should be publicly notified.</li> </ul> <p>A further submission was made by Tony Kale (Wanganui Potters Society) in support of this submission, in particular the requirement for any plan for subdivision and development of the Riverfront area to be publically notified and that a re-think of the "extra" buildings in a Public Space be considered.</p>	<p>Repeated...</p> <p>That any plan for the development of the Riverfront area be publicly notified.</p> <p>That a re-think of the "extra" buildings in a Public Space should be considered.</p>	<p>developments from complying with Objective O30, particularly as Policy P103 requires new buildings to utilise alternative flood hazard mitigation techniques, such as resilient building design.</p> <p>Council has determined the Riverfront Outline Plan should be withdrawn from Proposed Plan Change 21, as it is still only a draft proposal subject to change, creates confusion and has yet to be confirmed by Council. As such, the submitters concerns regarding Rule R211 are addressed. The equivalent rule that is retained in proposed Plan Change 21 is Rule R222(k). Likewise, the submitters concerns regarding proposed Rule R218 (parking outside of the specified car parking area within the Riverfront zone – Outline Plan) are addressed.</p> <p>Rule R222(k) provides for residential activities as a permitted activity within the Riverfront zone, provided they are not located on the ground floor. Council considered residential activities to be consistent with the characteristics of this zone, as residents will contribute towards lively street activity and high pedestrian numbers. Residents within the Riverfront zone will also assist in making this area safer through passive surveillance 24 hours per day.</p> <p>Rule R221 as currently worded makes on-site vehicle parking a non-complying activity. As residential activities are required to provide for resident parking. Rule R221(e) is to be amended to clarify that this does not apply to parking for residential activities.</p> <p>Rule R224 controls parking within the Riverfront zone. Council determined that this rule should be amended to clarify that car parking rules do not apply to residential activities that are accessed via a rear service lane. For consistency, a consequential change is also proposed to Clause 2 of Rule R224, clarifying that residential activities are also exempt from providing a loading bay.</p> <p>Council noted that as Rule R231 is to be deleted via other submissions this submitters concerns are addressed.</p> <p>Rule R219 provides for subdivision as a Controlled Activity. The proposed wording of this Rule is consistent with the wording of subdivision rules in the other sections of the District Plan. Applications for subdivision will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p><b>Submission and Further Submission are accepted in part.</b> <b>Amend Proposed Plan Change 21 as follows:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Amend Rule R221(e) (Non-complying Activities) as follows:</b> <p><i>The following are non-complying activities in the Riverfront Zone:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>Manufacturing activities*, other than as provided for as a permitted activity.</i></li> <li>b. <i>Vehicle sales*.</i></li> <li>c. <i>Visitor accommodation*.</i></li> <li>d. <i>Any activity that does not comply with the Riverfront Outline Plan.</i></li> <li>e. <i>On-site vehicle parking, other than car parking that is required for a residential activity by Rule R24, which is accessed from a service lane.</i></li> <li>f. <i>.....</i></li> </ol> </li> <li>2. <b>Amend Rule 223(d) (Structures) as follows:</b> <p><i>Within the Riverfront Zone, structures shall be required to meet the following conditions and terms:</i></p> <p><i>.....d. Building Height</i></p> <p><del>Building height* shall be a maximum of 7.5 metres.</del></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u><i>Buildings with direct frontage to Taupo Quay shall have a maximum height of 13 metres</i></u></li> <li>ii. <u><i>Buildings that do not have direct frontage to Taupo Quay shall have a maximum height of 7.5 metres.</i></u></li> </ol> <p><i>Height shall be measured to the top of the eaves or parapet.</i></p> <p><i>Reason</i> <i>To maintain the scale and amenity of the Riverfront Zone.....</i></p> </li> </ol>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
Continued...  S26: E M Lewin  Further Submission Tony Kale			<p>3. Amend Rule R224 as follows:</p> <p><i>R224 Parking, Loading and Access</i></p> <p>1. <i>Parking</i></p> <p>i. <i>Vehicle parking is not permitted.</i></p> <p>ii. <i><u>This rule does not apply to car parking that is required for a residential activity by Rule R24, which is accessed from a service lane.</u></i></p> <p><i>Reason</i> <i>To encourage the Riverfront Zone to be built intensively, and to be developed in an integrated and comprehensive way.</i></p> <p>2. <i>Loading and access</i></p> <p>i. <i>Every activity that adjoins a service lane shall provide one loading bay that complies with the loading bay standards in General Rule – Transportation (Rule R24).</i></p> <p>ii. <i><u>This rule does not apply to car parking that is required for a residential activity by Rule R24, which is accessed from a service lane.</u></i></p> <p><i>Reason</i> <i>To ensure traffic flow is not impeded by service vehicles.</i></p>
S27: Kenneth Lance Crafar	Submission is that a pedestrian crossing is unjustified and will be a traffic hazard with blind corners adjacent. It will promote further road closures due to Treaty claims. Treaty of Waitangi claims can only be between Sovereign nations by definition, not ethnicities and is contrary to international law and human rights and democratic principle.	Provision of a pedestrian crossing or road closure or diversion between the Whanganui River and Moutoa gardens will lead to the loss of a major and essential link between city and suburbs and is unjustified and should NOT occur.	<p>There are no road closures proposed within the area covered by Proposed Plan Change 21. Any road closures must go through a separate public consultation process under the Local Government Act. Taupo Quay will remain open for two way traffic, albeit with road treatments to discourage heavy traffic.</p> <p>Proposed Plan Change 21 seeks to implement the Wanganui District Council's Urban Transportation Strategy (WUTS) through changing the status of Taupo Quay from Secondary Arterial Road to a local road, with a central city street overlay. The change in road hierarchy does not alter the use of Taupo Quay within the Plan Change area. In the future Council may promote alternative routes through the city, thereby reducing the volume of heavy traffic travelling along Taupo Quay. These changes are for the purpose of improving pedestrian and cycling links to the waterfront.</p> <p>Proposed Plan Change 21 recognises that the central city is made up of a number of distinct places, including the riverfront and Moutoa Gardens. Objective O29 is "To ensure that the key areas in the central city are well connected." The proposed changes to Taupo Quay are therefore to improve physical and visual connection between these key places.</p> <p><b>Submission is declined.</b> <b>No changes are made to Proposed Plan Change 21.</b></p>
S28: Sonia Dolanon behalf of New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga  Further Submission UCOL	<p>Submitter supports the general intention of the Plan Change. Notes that the Plan Change has little regard to heritage issues. Seeks that the Plan Change is amended to provide for the protection of historic heritage as an issue. Commends the change where the objectives for the Arts and Commerce align with the Old Town Overlay zone. Objectives O20 and O21 do not refer to heritage values.</p> <p>O23 is not consistent with each of the zones characteristics in relation to heritage. Seeks the inclusion of a new objective within the zones that provides for the identification and protection of historic heritage as an essential part of the</p>	<p>That heritage issues be identified given the importance of historic heritage with the CBD. The heritage values be acknowledged in the objectives within all of the zones that make up the central city.</p> <p>Policies 85,86,87,89 and 90 should recognise heritage places and areas which form part of the defined character of these zones. Policies 93 and 95 require non-regulatory methods.</p> <p>There needs to be consistency with the description characteristics for each of the zones to adequately reflect the heritage elements in all zones. Additional criteria in relation to heritage</p>	<p>Proposed Plan Change 21 is not amending any of the existing heritage provisions within the District Plan. Objective O13 (Identification and recognition of cultural heritage values as a District Resource) and O14 (An effective, realistic, and financially viable system of conservation of identified heritage resources) are unaltered by Proposed Plan Change 21. Heritage provisions are being reviewed as part of Phase 6 of the District Plan Review (scheduled for 2013).</p> <p>Proposed Objective O20 refers to the need to ensure that development and activities contribute to the wellbeing of Wanganui community, including cultural wellbeing. Heritage values are considered to contribute to cultural wellbeing, and so this Objective requires that the effects of new developments are assessed to ensure they do not detract from cultural wellbeing.</p> <p>Proposed Objective O21 requires the adverse effects of development or activities within the Central City to be managed effectively. All relevant adverse effects would be considered for any new development, including heritage values, particularly where heritage is a key characteristic of the zone.</p> <p>Through other submissions the Central Edge Commercial zone has been deleted and this addresses the submitters concerns.</p>



**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
<p>Continued...</p> <p><b>S28:</b> Sonia Dolanon behalf of New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga</p> <p>Further Submission UCOL</p> <p>Continued...</p>	<p>characteristics of the area.</p> <p>Policies 86,87,88, 89, and 90 do not recognise the heritage characteristics that are apparent within the zones. Policy 85 also does not identify that there are individual heritage places that should be formally recognised. Policies 93 and 95 should also identify non-regulatory tools that can achieve these policies.</p> <p>District Plans need to provide positive incentives for owners of listed heritage items. The range of non-regulatory incentives include: heritage grants and loans; rates relief; tax relief; public purchase and revolving acquisitions; insurance rebates; and urban design, events and promotions. Supports the introduction of the View Shafts. Supports the definition of Display Frontage Streets. Zone descriptions need to be consistent to adequately reflect the heritage elements of all zones.</p> <p>NZHPT request that the following text be added to the important characteristics: Important characteristics in the ____ zone are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presence of heritage sites and buildings;</li> </ul> <p>And for where appropriate the zone may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural and cultural heritage features.</li> </ul> <p>Under Plan change 21 - restricted discretionary activities for signage – there are no criteria in relation to heritage matters. Needs assessment criteria to consider the effect on heritage matters.</p> <p>Blanket rule for inadequately maintained buildings as a Non-complying activity - NZHPT supports the maintenance of buildings but considers that non-regulatory methods such as incentives are a better way.</p> <p>Suggests that a vacant lot or car park is made a Non-complying activity.</p> <p>Encourages consideration of adding further individual buildings, located in the Old Town Overlay, in the heritage list. The proposed plan change does not provide a coherent framework for management or protection of significant archaeological sites. NZHPT request that a map of probable pre-1900 settlement within the CBD is prepared and new development in the historic town centre is assessed for its potential effect on archaeological values. This can be integrated with Heritage Policy 12.</p>	<p>matters for the signage rules.</p> <p>Greater attention should be given to incentives to avoid neglect or demolition of heritage features, rather than applying a non-complying status.</p> <p>Consider a new rule making the creation of vacant land or open parking lots non-complying as is the case in Wellington.</p> <p>There needs to be a stronger linkage between the individual heritage rules, the Old town Conservation overlay and the commercial zoning.</p> <p>List more individual heritage buildings that are presently covered by the Old Town Conservation Overlay zone.</p> <p>Include much more cross referencing to ensure readers are alerted to other relevant chapters of the District Plan.</p> <p>That Council implement Heritage Policy 12 and a map of probable pre-1900 settlement within the CBD should be created. Any development within the historic zone should automatically require an archaeological assessment.</p> <p>Use the predictive layer approach adopted by Gisborne CBD. There should be corresponding changes to issues, objectives, policies and rules to better manage significant archaeological sites.</p>	<p>Historic heritage has been identified as one of the key characteristics that contribute to the amenity of the Central Commercial, Arts and Commerce and Riverfront zones of Proposed Plan Change 21 through Policies P85, P89 and P90. By listing “the presence of heritage sites and buildings” as a key characteristic of the Central Commercial and Arts and Commerce and Riverfront zones, new developments will be assessed as to how they contribute or detract from these characteristics. The rules developed for these zones are designed to ensure that future developments reflect heritage characteristics of the existing heritage buildings within these zones, such as through height and setback controls and by limiting on-site parking.</p> <p>Individual heritage sites and buildings are given formal recognition through the District Planning Maps and Heritage Inventory. These are not being altered by Proposed Plan Change 21. Policy 85 lists the general characteristics of the Central Commercial zone. As individual heritage sites and buildings are dispersed throughout Wanganui Council did not consider it appropriate to make specific reference to individual sites within the policy for a single zone.</p> <p>While tools such as design guides may assist in achieving the urban design outcomes sought by Policy P93, they are non-regulatory documents. Given the importance of achieving good urban design outcomes, Council's preference is to imbed urban design principles within the rules, standards and other statutory documents such as Reserve Management Plans, to achieve these outcomes. Despite this, the methods listed under Policy P93 are not an exhaustive list and does not prevent such non-regulatory methods from being used to assist in achieving good urban design outcomes.</p> <p>Likewise, the methods to achieve the CPTED principles sought by Policy P94 are those that are preferred by Council due to having an immediate control over future development. While not being specifically listed in the methods to implement Policy P94, non-regulatory methods may still be employed to assist in guiding development that is in line with CPTED principles.</p> <p>The list of key characteristics under Policies P85 (Central Commercial Zone), P89 (Arts and Commerce Zone) and P90 (Riverfront Zone) include “Natural and cultural heritage features” and “the presence of heritage sites and buildings.” Council noted that NZHPT submitted that these policies should recognise individual heritage places and precincts within the zones that should be formally recognised as part of the defined character. Until such time as more comprehensive cultural assessments can be undertaken, Council does not have the necessary evidence to support the inclusion of specific places or precincts within the District Plan. Further research is required before changes can be made to the existing heritage provisions within the District Plan. A project to make these assessments has been commissioned and will be incorporated into the Plan in Phase 3 of the District Plan review which is also currently underway.</p> <p>All signs to be located within the Central City are subject to the existing General Rule for Advertising (R16). This rule is not altered Proposed Plan Change 21. Any new signage proposed to be attached to a registered heritage building is assessed as modifying the heritage building, and so would be referred to the Historic Places Trust. There is considered to be existing scope within the General Rule for Advertising (R16) to consider potential effects on heritage matters.</p> <p>NZHPT support the maintenance of buildings, but consider that non-regulatory methods such as incentives should be preferred over the non-complying rules in Proposed Plan Change 21. While it may be possible to apply incentive schemes to heritage buildings, Council felt it was unclear how these incentives would benefit other building owners. The proposed maintenance rules apply equally to all building owners within the relevant zones of the central city.</p> <p>Proposed Plan Change 21 introduces new rules regarding parking within the central city. These new rules are designed to provide sufficient parking, while ensuring that parking areas do not significantly detract from amenity. Car parking is also being considered through the draft Parking Management Plan which is being undertaken alongside the District Plan review.</p> <p>The submitters request to make vacant lots or car parking a non-complying activity is not supported. It is not clear under what circumstances such a rule would apply. This would create uncertainty for developers and landowners. There are maximum parking standards of 1 space per 100m<sup>2</sup> of site area in the Arts and Commerce Zone; and parking within the Riverfront Zone is limited to residential parking, and parking that is developed and managed by Council. Activities within the Central Commercial Zone are required to comply with the parking standards in General Rule R24, with a maximum of 1 parking space per 100m<sup>2</sup> of site. Given the existing controls over car parking, Council did not consider the inclusion of a non-complying rule for new parking areas or vacant sites was necessary.</p>

**APPENDIX THREE: Minutes of the Meeting of the WDC held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 (Decisions relating to Plan Change 21).**

Submission No. & Name	Summary of Submission and Further Submission	Decision Requested	Council's decisions and reasons for decisions on submissions
<p><b>S28:</b> Sonia Dolanon behalf of New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga</p> <p>Further Submission UCOL</p>	<p>There needs to be a stronger linkage between the heritage issues, objectives, policies methods and rules within the current chapters of the Plan, namely the general rules chapter, cultural heritage chapter and old town chapter, and the proposed new chapters. Cross referencing is an essential tool for achieving this.</p> <p>UCOL (submitter number 14) made a <b>further submission</b> opposing this submission. In particular, UCOL is opposed to the submitter's request to make the creation of vacant land or open parking lots a non-complying activity.</p>		<p>The submitters requests regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- adding further individual buildings to the heritage list;</li> <li>- providing a coherent framework for the management and protection of significant archaeological sites;</li> <li>- a map of pre-1900 settlement area; and</li> <li>- stronger linkages between the heritage issues, objectives, policies methods and rules within the current chapters of the Plan</li> </ul> <p>are matters that are best addressed as part of Phase 3 (Built Heritage) of the District Plan review. Proposed Plan Change 21 is not a review of the heritage provisions of the District Plan.</p> <p>Council further determined that as a minor amendment under Clause 16 of the First Schedule that all references to 'cultural heritage' in the Plan be amended to refer to 'historic heritage' to be consistent with the terminology used in the Resource Management Act.</p> <p><b>Submission is accepted in part and the Further Submission is accepted.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Proposed Plan Change 21 as follows:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Replace all references to 'cultural heritage' in the Arts and Commerce, Central Commercial and Riverfront zones, with the term 'historic heritage'.</li> </ol>