

Thursday, 4 April 2024

Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga
Hastings District Council
Hearings Committee Meeting

Kaupapataka

Topic 5 - Assessment Criteria, Medium Density Design Framework

(Plan Change 5 - Medium Density Housing)

Te Rā Hui:
Meeting date: **Thursday, 4 April 2024**

Te Wā:
Time: **9.00am**

Te Wāhi:
Venue: **Council Chamber
Ground Floor
Civic Administration Building
Lyndon Road East
Hastings**

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
2.	PLAN CHANGE 5 - "RIGHT HOMES, RIGHT PLACE" - MEDIUM DENSITY HOUSING	
	<u>Document 3</u> Containing this attachment	
	S42A Report - Topic 5 - Assessment Criteria, Medium Density Design Framework	Pg 3

TOPIC 5, KEY ISSUE 1 – HASTINGS MEDIUM DENSITY DESIGN FRAMEWORK 2022

1. SUBMISSION POINTS

Sub Point	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision / Section of the Hastings District Plan	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Recommendation
004.2	S Angus	Shading Diagrams	Oppose	Daylight controls should be included in the design guide.	Reject
004.4	S Angus	Design Statement Requirements	Oppose	States that there is no mention of vehicle movement and parking calculations; and that Design Statements are not needed.	Reject
008.18	Bike Hawke's Bay	Cover page and Page 7 of the Design Framework	Support with amendment	Amend cover image to exclude red car on driveway	Minor Amendment accepted
008.19	Bike Hawke's Bay	Design Checklist 2.8 - Page 9	Support with amendment	Seeks the inclusion of the following: <u>Do vehicle accessways minimise their impact on pedestrian / cyclist safety or accessibility?</u>	Reject
008.20	Bike Hawke's Bay	CRD Assessment Matters – page 11	Support with amendment	Seeks the following changes: Consider whether access, parking and manoeuvring dominates the front of the site. Carparking is best located <u>near, away from the street further within the site and accessed from the rear of the site.</u> Minimise vehicle crossings, <u>use rear lanes and combine vehicle accessways when possible to and provide a safer pedestrian environment. By combining vehicle accessways or using rear lanes.</u>	Reject
020.4	J Cowman	CRD Assessment	Oppose	Opposes changes to the District Plan regarding ... 4. Turning the design guide into a district plan assessment tool.	Reject
034.8	A Galloway	Medium Density Design Framework / Design Panel	Not stated	Seeks the assurance that the Medium Density Design Framework be sufficiently strengthened, given that medium density projects will be non-notified.	Accept
FS19.20	Residents of Kaiapo Road etc	Submission point 034.8	Support	Seeks that A Galloway's submission be accepted.	Accept
037.4	B E Harrison	CRD Assessment Matters	Not stated	Believes the Medium Density Framework (and PC5) negates current Homeowner choices.	Reject
FS09.4	B Harrison	Submission point 037.4	Support	Allow submission.	Reject
050.4	Kāinga Ora	Hastings Medium Density Design Guide	Oppose in part	1. Seeks that Design Guidelines remain a non-statutory tool. 2. Delete all references to the Design guide and any	Accept in part

**Plan Change 5 - "Right Homes, Right Place" - Medium Density Housing
S42A Report - Topic 5 - Assessment Criteria, Medium Density Design Framework**

Section 42A Report for Plan Change 5: Right Homes, Right Place
Topic 5, Key Issue 1 – Hastings Medium Density Design Framework 2022

				<p>requirement to meet or follow the guidelines from the District Plan.</p> <p>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, they should be specifically stated in policies and matters of discretion.</p> <p>4. If the relief sought is not granted in deleting the design guidelines and references to the guidelines, Kāinga Ora seeks that the guidelines are amended, simplified and easier to follow. Outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site.</p> <p>5. If relief sought is not granted, Kāinga Ora seek the opportunity to review the guidelines if they remain a statutory document.</p> <p>6. Kāinga Ora seek all necessary consequential changes to give effect to other relief sought.</p>	
FS11.10	Development Nours	Submission point 050.4	Support in part	Agrees with KO Points regarding Design Framework.	Reject
FS17.4	Retirement Villages of NZ Association	Submission point 050.4	Support	Supports KO in seeking that the Design Guide be removed from the District Plan.	Reject
FS18.4	Ryman Healthcare Ltd	Submission point 050.4	Support	Supports KO in seeking that the Design Guide be removed from the District Plan.	Reject
FS19.30	Residents of Kaiapo Road etc	Submission point 050.4	Oppose all	Opposes all aspects of the KO submission.	Accept
055.1	Lifemark	Design Framework	Not stated	Seeks that the Design Framework incentivise Universal Design Standards instead of referencing Access Standard NZS 4121:2001	Reject
FS13.1	Kāinga Ora	Submission point 055.1	Oppose in part	Whilst KO support Universal access design they do not think it appropriate to regulate via District Plan.	Accept
081.4	Retirement Villages Association of NZ	Design Framework	Oppose	The Design Framework includes 2 pages for Co-Housing and Retirement Villages (section 3.8). Whilst the Design Framework is not specifically referenced in this submission, the submitter wants retirement villages to be removed from the definition of comprehensive residential development.	Accept in part
085.4	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Design Framework	Not stated	As per above.	Accept

**Plan Change 5 - "Right Homes, Right Place" - Medium Density Housing
S42A Report - Topic 5 - Assessment Criteria, Medium Density Design Framework**

Section 42A Report for Plan Change 5: Right Homes, Right Place
Topic 5, Key Issue 1 – Hastings Medium Density Design Framework 2022

100.18	Te Kāhui Whaihanga	Design Framework	Not explicitly stated but supportive	Design Guide – this is a good publication that the council has produced. It has good information in an easy format and is great for client discussions.	Noted
100.19	Te Kāhui Whaihanga	N/A	Other Considerations	The Branch encourages Council to consider using the established Aesthetic Design Panel and mandatory for Commercial and MDZ properties.	Noted
133.6	J Jackson	Medium Density Design Framework	Oppose	Opposes the use of the Hastings Medium Density Framework as a key assessment tool.	Reject
137.4	K M Naylor	Medium Density Framework	Oppose	Remove medium density framework as a key assessment tool.	Reject
138.7	P Rawle	Medium Density Framework	Oppose	Remove medium density framework as a key assessment tool.	Reject
146.2	TW Property	Reduce Uncertainty in the Resource Consent Process – Medium Density Design Framework	Support with amendment	Design assessment criteria from the Medium Density Design Framework should be retained as non-statutory guidance only, to avoid subjectivity and uncertainty. Tensions between urban design drivers and engineering requirements such as the width of jointly owned access lots should be resolved and clearly set out in the criteria.	Accept in part

2. ANALYSIS

2.1 This analysis outlines the context for the proposed plan change in relation to the RMA 1991 and Section 32 in relation to the views put forth in the submissions and whether the amendments proposed in relation to Density are the most appropriate way to achieve the objective of the Plan Change which is:

- *“To make it easier to build more houses on existing residential land within Hastings, Havelock North and Flaxmere.*
- *To provide certainty through a less onerous rule framework that encourages high quality comprehensive residential development (medium density housing)”*

2.2 SUBMISSION POINTS 004.2 AND 004.4 (S. ANGUS)

2.3 This submission is seeking that daylighting controls be included in the design guide; that there is no mention of vehicle movement and parking calculations; and that Design Statements are not needed (as part of resource consent applications).

2.4 In response to these matters, daylight controls are regulated in the Hastings District Plan with the Height and Height in Relation to Boundary performance standards and the assessment of effects if there are breaches. Therefore, it is not necessary to include this in the Design Framework document. The same can be said for vehicle

- movements and parking calculations, which are regulated under Section 26.1 Transport and Parking.
- 2.5 A written design statement is considered a useful tool to help understand the design process and reasons behind the proposed development design & layout (and explains why other ideas did not progress). It does not need to be lengthy and can assist with the assessment of resource consent applications. Therefore, recommend the submission points be rejected.
- 2.6 **SUBMISSION POINTS 008.18 AND 008.19 (BIKE HAWKE'S BAY)**
- 2.7 Bike Hawke's Bay are supportive of the Design Framework but seek minor amendments to it including:
- an amendment to the cover illustration and the same image on page 7 (removal of red car); and
 - the addition of a question to consider pedestrian/cyclist safety or accessibility when designing driveways (Checklist (pg 9).
- 2.8 Removal of the red car from the illustration is sensible as it appears to straddle the footpath, which is not good practice, this will be addressed as a minor amendment when the Design Framework is updated.
- 2.9 The second request is not considered necessary as sightlines and safety are regulated by the Section 26.1 Transport and Parking.
- 2.10 **SUBMISSION POINTS 133.6 (J JACKSON), 138.7 (P RAWLE), AND 137.4 (K N NAYLOR)**
- 2.11 The above-mentioned submissions oppose the use of the Hastings Medium Density Framework as a key assessment tool. In a broader context the submissions raise concern over having a Medium Density Strategy approach for Hastings and more specifically the over the quality, appearance and repetitive nature of developments done by Kāinga Ora or for Kāinga Ora by local development companies whom they engage to purchase land and build the houses for Kāinga Ora.
- 2.12 The Hastings Medium Density Design Framework itself is intended to provide visual and written guided and examples and assist with the expected outcomes.
- 2.13 The Hastings Residential Intensification Design Guide (the Guide) was adopted by Council on the 19th November 2020 as a non-regulatory document. Council officers were instructed to monitor the effectiveness of the guide in improving design outcomes of more intensive residential developments for a period of 12 months.
- 2.14 Officers provided a paper to the District Plan and Bylaws Subcommittee on 23 March 2022 to report back on the monitoring of effectiveness. A survey of users was done, with 60% of respondents who reported that the Guide had made housing intensification either, somewhat, or a lot easier to understanding the District Plan assessment criteria.
- 2.15 Over half of respondents stated that using the Guide had increased development yield with none reporting that it had resulted in a decrease, other comments are in the report which is publicly available.
- 2.16 Part of the reason for updating the provisions in Plan Change 5 is to further improve the housing outcomes for the district, whilst creating greater opportunity for more

