

3. **MtCookMobilised's submission is that:**

- Sections 6.2.3.8 (zone interface), 6.2.3.9 (building height etc), and 6.2.5.2 (adverse traffic effects), and the rules associated with these policies, should be strengthened to require the Council, when assessing these aspects of consent applications, to specifically address:
 - Whether the effects on particular residents or the wider community in areas zoned residential surrounding or adjacent to centres are such that the developer should be asked to consult with those residents or a recognised group representing the community in which those residents live, to report back to the Council on the views expressed in those consultations, and to propose solutions to points of concern. There should be a further provision that where the solutions proposed by the developer do not meet the reasonable concerns of the affected residents, the Council will formally notify those residents of the consent application on the basis that those impacts are a “special circumstance”
 - The cumulative effects of current and planned developments in the Centre on the wider/adjacent residential community, not just those incremental and immediate effects triggered by the development for which consent is sought.
- Section 6.2.5.2 and Rule 7.6.1.7.1 state that new residential developments in Centres are not required to provide off street parking, in order to encourage use of public transport. While the motive is admirable, the reality is that some and probably most of the new residents will have cars and will need to put them somewhere. We recommend that these policies and the associated rules in the Plan include a provision that if the Council's assessment is that if a proposed development will create demand for parking either in the centre or place pressure on the adjacent residential community's access to on-street parking, the developer be required to provide off-street parking for residents in the development. {We are aware of the proposal to deny residents in centres the right to have residential parking permits, but this does not solve the problem that many of them will still have cars, nor the potential for rorts which enable them to get permits for adjacent residents parking zones.)
- Section 6.2.2.1 should be amended to require a regular three yearly review of the operation of the Plan in relation to Centres. Because of the increasingly limited ability for affected residents to be consulted in applications for consent to developments, the Council should write into the District Plan a requirement that every three years it formally review, with public consultation, the cumulative effects of the operation of the Plan and Consent rules and processes applicable to Centres, and the developments given consent under the Plan, on the immediate and adjacent residential communities.
- Section 6.2.2.1 to 6.2.2.8 and the associated rules should also be amended to ensure the objective of a mixed community is actually achieved. The objective

[MtCookMobilised submission, continued]

should be to avoid a community with a predominant single social group. At present this section (6.2) focuses on retail and commercial activities. The proposed Mt Cook Centre is also flagged as an area for intensive residential growth, but there are no provisions in the draft Plan to ensure that a mixed community will develop. There should be provision to require developers who undertake residential developments to develop a pattern of varied residential types and standards (either in one development, or by ensuring that different developments are not too similar), and associated amenities, to achieve that goal.

- We support the proposed provision in Rule 7.3.1 to reduce to 70 spaces the parking spaces threshold for activities deemed Discretionary (Restricted).