

PC50 Residential Focus Group – Meeting 3 Notes



30 JAN 2020, 7-9PM – ROTARY LOUNGE, UPPER HUTT LIBRARY

Introduction and task explanation:

Meeting began with a review on the progress of Plan Change 50 and what the next key stages of the process are, including when Issues and Options public consultation will likely take place.

Council Officers asked the Group whether there were any comments on the operation of the Focus Groups. The release of the Focus Group members' names to the public was mentioned, with one member suggesting that the demographic information for the group was released instead of the names themselves, as the members were not in favour of the names being released.

Council Officers then provided a brief overview on reporting work which has been completed on PC50. This mainly focused on the recently completed Residential Character Assessment. The members were shown a summary of the findings from this report, and given a brief rundown on the areas within Upper Hutt where there is considered to be a higher sensitivity to infill development based on character, and areas where there is the potential for infill development based on character.

One member enquired as to why Pinehaven isn't considered as a character area within the Residential Character Assessment, to which Council Officers provided further details regarding the finding of the assessment. A brief discussion then followed regarding the infill development potential within the Pinehaven area, as well as the history of holiday cottages in Pinehaven, and the sensitivity of the Pinehaven area to future growth.

Te Marua was also mentioned as an area where although it was highlighted as an area with infill potential by the assessment, the members believed that the potential for infill in this area was low. However, they agreed that the character of the area would not be significantly damaged by infill development, although they noted the value that the trees had on local character.

One member also mentioned the character of the Trentham Military camp and associated structures.

Issues & Options Review Session:

Council Officers explained the objective and activity of the focus group session. The session would focus on the draft Issues and Options which have been developed for the residential area. The focus group session would allow the members to provide their thoughts on the so far developed Issues and Options.

The members were split into pairs and were encouraged to write down their thoughts and opinions on the so far developed Issues and Options. Once this activity was completed the group reformed, and there was a quick summation of the Issues and Options to allow the members to provide any specific feedback. The summation feedback is summarised below:

- One member mentioned their preference that if the permitted family flat size was increased then then the lot would need to be subdivided, but also highlighted the linkages with family flats and multigenerational living. Council Officers explained the current rules relating to family flats, where if a family flat is larger than 55m² than it is considered a second dwelling.
- AirBnBs were discussed, with a common consensus among members that the Council would find it difficult to monitor and ensure compliance with any rules seeking to control AirBnBs.
 - The members all stated that they had not experienced any issues with AirBnBs in the area, but there were potential concerns regarding security due to the lack of knowledge regarding who could be staying, and

potential traffic issues as well. Council officers mentioned the potential for a rule restricting the number of days that an AirBnB could be used for.

- Members enquired to whether Papakāinga housing could be opened up to different cultures and ethnicities, and what could be the potential effects of this.
- With regards to communal housing, members were curious on how the shared and communal spaces may work, but envisioned them to be similar to student accommodation. Council officers highlighted that there are examples of this type of housing in other areas of the country (Dunedin and Auckland), and that they can be beneficial for younger people especially, while also potentially addressing housing affordability.
- Foothill development was not objected against, but the members stated that the development would need to be sensitive to the surrounding landscape characteristics and suitably located to reflect this consideration, with regard to transport effects also key. Members noted that current residential hill development was quite isolated, with only a single road access, meaning that any residential hill development should seek better integration with the existing urban area.

Future consultation:

Council Officers were keen to hear the opinions of members on how council should undertake consultation on PC50 to maximise public participation. The members responded with a number of different options, as shown below:

- Creation of a series of videos which visually demonstrated the different options available
- The use of social media, with a specific mention of Facebook
- Information disseminated via radio
- The use of visual examples to help people better understand the types of development which may occur as a result of the likely changes, which could be influenced by examples within other parts of New Zealand
- Paper advertising, including a prominent advertisement in the Upper Hutt Leader
- The use of static displays at railway stations, the mall, or other community spaces
- Potential for signage to be placed on local buses
- A specific focus on engaging youth, potentially through targeting schools in the local area.

Next meeting:

Council Officers enquired to whether the group would be happy to run a group session with the rural focus group. However, the consensus was that this would probably not be beneficial, with concerns raised about how much the members would be able to contribute to the rural issues and options.