



When replying please quote: 8294676

Date: 5 June 2020

**SUBJECT: Decision report on Private Plan Change PLC18/00048**

At their meeting on Tuesday 2 June 2020, New Plymouth District Council resolved:

- a) That the Independent Commissioner's recommendation for Private Plan Change PPC18/00048 (Appendix 1) be adopted as the Council's decision and be publicly notified in accordance with Clause 29 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- b) That the Independent Commissioner's recommendation for the application to vary a Consent Notice (Appendix 1) be adopted as the Council's decision.

A copy of the recommendations (which now become the Council's decision) is attached.

Julie Straka  
GOVERNANCE LEAD

# **Resource Management Act 1991**

## **New Plymouth District Plan Private Plan Change PPLC48**

**Rezoning of Land at Wairau Road, Oākura from Rural Environment Area to Residential Environment Areas, Proposed Rural Lifestyle, OpenSpace B and C Environment Area and Business C with specific provision for subdivision and development of 399 lots and subsequently reduced in scale to 144 lots**

**Independent Commissioner Report and  
Recommendations  
22 May 2020**

<b>Interpretation- Terms Used</b>	
<b>PPC48</b>	Private Plan Change 48
<b>NPDC/ Council</b>	New Plymouth District Council
<b>OFPL</b>	Oākura Farm Park Limited (applicant)
<b>SH45</b>	State Highway 45
<b>FUD</b>	Future Urban Development (Overlay)
<b>ODP/ District Plan</b>	Operative New Plymouth District Plan
<b>RMA/ ACT</b>	Resource Management Act 1991
<b>NPS-UDC</b>	National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity
<b>RPS</b>	Regional Policy Statement
<b>OL</b>	Outstanding Landscape
<b>TIA</b>	Traffic Impact Assessment
<b>CIA</b>	Cultural Impact Assessment
<b>SIA</b>	Social Impact Assessment
<b>s42A Report</b>	Section 42A Report
<b>NZTA</b>	New Zealand Transport Agency
<b>OSP</b>	Oākura Structure Plan
<b>Reporting Officer</b>	Mr Wesney and Ms Stevens

# **Rezoning of Land at Wairau Road, Oākura from Rural Environment Area to Residential Environment Areas, Proposed Rural Lifestyle, OpenSpace B and C Environment Area and Business C with specific provision for subdivision and development of 399 lots and subsequently reduced in scale to 144 lots**

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. This recommendation is made to New Plymouth District Council by Independent Hearing Commissioner Bill Wasley appointed and acting under delegated authority pursuant to s34 and s34A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act or RMA).
2. The plan change was heard by me acting under delegated authority of the Council. I was appointed a commissioner pursuant to section 34A of the RMA, to hear and consider all matters related to the private plan change and the application to vary or cancel the consent notice. This included considering all submissions and the Council's section 42A reports ("the planning reports"), and to then make recommendations in respect of the submissions. If recommended for approval, I was to consider any associated amendments to the Proposed Private Plan Change to the Council and to provide a recommendation on whether the consent notice should be varied or cancelled or remain as is.
3. Mr Coffin had originally been appointed as a commissioner but due to a family bereavement could not attend until day 3 of the hearing. Consequently, he withdrew from being a commissioner and assisted during the remaining hearing days, reading all the evidence and submissions, and asking questions, attending site visits, and provided assistance in the preparation of this report. There were no objections to this approach from any of the parties, and the hearing proceeded on that basis.

## **BACKGROUND**

4. PPC48 is a private plan change by Oākura Farm Park Limited (the applicant) that has been prepared following the standard RMA Schedule 1 process. The request was lodged in March 2018, then subsequently accepted by the Council, and publicly notified on 29 June 2018, with submissions closing on 10 August 2018, and further submissions closing on 15 October 2018. An addendum to

the summary of submissions was publicly notified on 3 December 2018 with further submissions closing on 14 December 2018.

5. Of the 436 submissions received, 12 were in support or support in part; 2 were neutral and 393 were in opposition and a further 3 opposing in part. The submissions were summarised and notified for further submissions and 38 further submissions were received.
6. The Commissioner issued several minutes and directions throughout the period confirming matters and generally keeping parties up to-date including dates for circulation of expert evidence, responses and closing statements.
7. The hearings were held for 5 days from Monday 22 July 2019 to Friday 26 July 2019 and one further day on Monday 2 December 2019 (referred to as the reconvened hearing).
8. PPC48 was changed considerably in size and scale following the first hearing of the plan change from that notified. Details of these changes are provided below.

## **SUMMARY OF THE PLAN CHANGE**

### **Location and Site Description**

9. The land subject to the private plan change is located to the south of the Oākura township, with the main access being located off Wairau Road. The subject land is in the ownership of Oakura Farm Park Ltd (Lot 29 DP 497629); LM Thurman and JM Williams (Lot 3 DP 21111); and Powerco Ltd (Part of Pt Section 14 Oakura District). The combined landholdings comprise 64.38 hectares in area.
10. The site is situated on the rural ring plain and is located on the foothills of the Kaitake Range, situated to the south of the site, and is separated from the ranges by an adjacent farm. The Wairau Stream passes through the subject site along the northern part of it as does its tributary to the south. A QEII National Trust covenanted area of land runs along the gully of the Wairau Stream in the eastern part of the site.
11. It is noted that there are a number of easements affecting the property including an easement for gas and petroleum products as there are high pressure gas and LPG pipelines within the plan change area, together with electricity and gas assets.

### **Immediate Environment**

12. State Highway 45 is located along the western boundary of the site and across the highway lies large open rural land. The Kaitake Range are a bush clad range which forms part of the Egmont National Park and are a dominant feature in the immediate environment. The site is located at the foothills of the range. The bush clad range forms a

backdrop to the site and rise approximately 682m above sea level.

13. To the north east of the site along the lower portion of Upper Wairau Road, is the fringe of Oākura township containing land that has a Residential C Environment zoning. There is open rural land to the west of the site used for agricultural purposes, primarily dairy farming.

### **Oākura Village**

14. Oākura village is a coastal settlement that is approximately 15 kms from New Plymouth. It has a resident population of 1400 people and contains a number of permanent and non-permanent residents, including those who have retired, or work either locally or in New Plymouth.
15. The village contains a range of commercial activities such as shops, hotel, cafes/ restaurants, a play-centre, volunteer fire brigade, sports fields (Corbett Park) and Oākura Primary School, which has a current roll of 360 pupils.
16. Oākura River is located to the north east of the town and the landform rises from sea level along the coastal margin up toward the Kaitake ranges in a north-north easterly direction that affords for many properties views of both Mt Taranaki and the ranges and out to the coast and beyond.

### **Existing Zoning**

17. The subject site is zoned Rural Environment Area with approximately 12 hectares of it being subject to a Future Urban Development (FUD) Overlay known as part of the South FUD for Oākura, as shown on District Plan Maps A61 and Rural E2. Land to the west of the site, across the state highway is also FUD land referred to as Oākura's West FUD.
18. The site is also subject to a Ponding Area Hazard, and the Wairau Stream which straddles the northern boundary of the site, identified as a Priority Water Body.

### **Purpose and Scope of Plan Change**

19. The Private Plan Change seeks to rezone the subject site land from Rural Environment Area to a range of urban and lifestyle purposes. In summary the proposal seeks to:
  - Change the zoning from Rural Environment Area to Residential Environment Areas (proposed Residential A, C and Medium Density) where the applicant proposes to create 399 residential lots ranging in size from 300m<sup>2</sup> to 700m<sup>2</sup>.
  - Change the zoning from Rural Environment Area to a proposed Rural Lifestyle Area where 12 lifestyle sections are proposed to act as a buffer between the residential sections and rural land. The proposal indicates these sections can be for equestrian lifestyle living.

- Change in zoning from Rural Environment Area to Open Space B and C Environment Area for local parks and natural spaces.
  - Change in zoning from Rural Environment Area to Business 'C' Environment Area for a small business area.
  - Introduction of a proposed structure plan to direct the overall form and layout of subdivision and development.
  - Change the Areas for Future Urban Development provisions and insert additional policies and methods of implementation for the Wairau Estate Structure Plan. These are proposed to enable the application site land to be comprehensively planned for urban development in its entirety and to provide for a safe and efficient road transportation network to meet the long-term needs of the Oākura urban area by planning for the provision of a roundabout.
  - Change the Residential Environment Area provisions to provide for the height, bulk, location and reflectivity of the buildings and structures in the structure plan area.
  - Change the Rural Environment Area provisions to provide for the height, bulk, location and reflectivity of the buildings, structures, and traffic generation in the structure plan area.
  - Change the Business Environment Area C provisions to provide for the height of the proposed buildings and structures in the structure plan area.
  - Install a roundabout on the intersection of Wairau Road and SH45.
20. The applicant seeks the rezoning of the site so that a continual supply of serviced residential lots can be provided in the long term, which would contribute to supporting and sustaining present and future generations at Oākura. In addition, a concurrent application was made to vary Consent Notice 9696907.4, which had been imposed in respect of 'The Paddocks' subdivision approval in March 2011.

#### **Amendments to Plan Change**

21. The s42A report<sup>1</sup> noted that following pre-hearing meetings the applicant put forward modifications to the plan change request as detailed below:
- Confirmed Bridal Path and signage with added service access and easement.
  - A new/alternative access via SH45 has been investigated with an alternative for sequencing of development.
  - Possible Super Staging Plan with alternative for sequencing of development with the proposed roundabout linked in with provision of infrastructure.

---

<sup>1</sup> S42A Report- Para 3.5

- Proposed overlay rules relating to staging. Conditions placed on Stages 2-4. Stage 2 is not to proceed until 75% of lots created within Stage 1 subdivision have been sold. Stages 3 and 4 are not to proceed until the traffic roundabout and pedestrian underpass have been installed.

### **Further Amendments to Plan Change**

22. During the hearing and in response to evidence presented at the original hearing, the proposal was further amended by the applicant in further evidence. Key amendments are outlined as follows:

- a) A revised scheme, reduced from 399 lots to 144 lots, across 15.9ha; including 1.3ha of the adjoining Thurman land currently Rural Environment Area with FUD Overlay in the Operative District plan, and zoned General Residential in the Proposed District Plan.
- b) Change the zoning from Rural Environment Area to Residential Environment Area C with average lot sizes of 800m<sup>2</sup>.
- c) The removal of the Residential A and Medium Density areas.
- d) Removal of the Rural Lifestyle Area (12 lots).
- e) Removal of the proposed Bridle Trail and Equestrian Arena.
- f) The removal of the Business C Environment area.
- g) The reserves/open space areas shown on the Structure Plan to change in zoning from Rural Environment Area to Open Space B and C.
- h) Development to occur over five stages, with each stage comprising 24 – 33 lots, with an average and median of 29 lots.
- i) An amended structure plan for inclusion in the District Plan to direct the form and layout of subdivision and development.
- j) A Landscape Framework Plan directing where plantings and landscaping is to occur across the site.
- k) Removal of the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Wairau Road and SH45.
- l) Removal of the proposed Noise Attenuation Bund adjacent to SH45.

23. Mr Wesley<sup>2</sup> outlined that the further evidence from the applicant was silent on what District Plan provisions in the original plan change request are to be retained, amended or deleted for the revised proposal, apart from a new structure plan and new staging rule as appended to the evidence of Mr Comber. He further stated that given the substantive issue to be determined was whether the land should be rezoned from Rural to Residential and the variation to the Consent Notice accepted, the plan provisions could be determined subsequent to any decision to re-zone

---

<sup>2</sup> Wesley: Response to Further Evidence for Reconvened Hearing 22.11.19

the subject land.

24. The amended proposal has therefore been the focus of my consideration and is the subject of this report and recommendations, together with the application to amend or vary the consent notice.

#### **MATTERS REQUIRING CONSIDERATION - PLAN CHANGE & VARIATION OF CONSENT NOTICE**

25. In respect of the considering the application to vary the consent notice, s221(3) of the RMA provides for applications to vary or cancel consent notices. A consent authority may review any condition specified in a consent notice and vary or cancel the condition, and s104 applies when considering such an application.

26. A local authority's power for a plan change, including a private plan change request, is set out in Clause 29(4) of Schedule 1 of the Act. It states:

*"29(4): After considering a plan or change, the local authority may decline, approve, or approve with modifications, the plan or change, and shall give its reasons".*

27. In making its decision, the local authority must undertake the further evaluation required under s32AA of the Act and have regard to that evaluation. The structure of this report is aligned with the statutory framework for evaluation under this section of the Act, which then enables this report to be adopted as the Council's decision.

28. In addition, s74 of the RMA states that the Council shall prepare and change the District Plan in accordance with its functions under s31, the provisions of Part 2 and its duty under s32.

29. Under s74, when preparing or changing a plan, a territorial authority is required to have regard to:

*"(b) any –*

*(i) management plans and strategies prepared under other Acts,"*

30. It is considered that the Oākura Structure Plan and Kaitake Community Board Plan were relevant strategies and had been prepared under the Local Government Act 2002.

31. In respect of s74 (2A) a territorial authority:

*"must take into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with the territorial authority, to the extent that its content has a bearing on the resource management issues of a region".*

32. I was advised<sup>3</sup> that in respect of the proposal a relevant iwi management plan is the Taiao, Taiora Taranaki Iwi Environmental Management Plan and had been considered by the reporting officer.

---

<sup>3</sup> S42A Report- Para 7.4

33. Section 75 (3) of the RMA requires that district plans must give effect to—
- “(a) any national policy statement; and*
  - (b) any New Zealand coastal policy statement; and*
  - (c) any regional policy statement”*
34. and under s75 (4), district plans must not be inconsistent with –
- “(b) a regional plan for any matter specified in section 30(1)”.*
35. The decision in *Long Bay Okura Great Parks Society Incorporated v North Shore City Council* (Decision A 078/2008), and amended in *High Country Rosehip Orchards Ltd and Ors v Mackenzie DC* ([2011] NZEnvC 387) at pages 17-18 to reflect the changes made by the Resource Management Amendment Act 2005, sets out the mandatory requirements for district plan (changes).

#### **SITE VISITS**

36. Several visits were made to the site and Oākura generally. I undertook a contextual site visit prior to commencement of the hearing to familiarise myself with the location of the subject site, and its relationship to the existing Oākura urban area and the general environment such as location of the Kaitake Range and State Highway 45.
37. On Wednesday 24 July, both Mr Coffin and myself undertook a site visit where we were driven over the subject site by Mr Simon McKie, with a representative of New Plymouth District Council in attendance. A submitter representative was invited to attend but did not participate in the site visit.
38. The site visit took in the subject site and various features of the proposed development were pointed out to us. After completion of this visit, Mr Coffin, and I (no other parties were in attendance) drove to the end of Wairau Road; through the Paddocks subdivision; Ahu Ahu Road, and throughout the Oākura township.
39. Subsequently we also undertook a visit to Oākura Primary School where the Board Chair Paul Veric, and Principal Lynne Hepworth, showed us through the school grounds and outlined access to and from the school.

#### **HEARING, ADJOURNMENTS & CLOSURE**

40. The hearing commenced on Monday 22 July 2019 at 1pm and conducted through to Friday 26 July 2019. It was then adjourned to allow the reporting officer time to provide a formal response to the matters raised by the applicant and submitters.

41. Subsequently Mr Muldowney sought an extended adjournment to allow the applicant to respond to matters raised at the hearing particularly by submitters with supplementary evidence. Various directions were subsequently issued in respect of the process.
42. The hearing was reconvened on Monday 2 December commencing at 9am. It included the presentation of the supplementary evidence by the applicant, and then further evidence from submitters on that supplementary evidence. The hearing was subsequently adjourned at 7:15pm after all parties had been heard.
43. I had requested that the applicants closing submissions be in writing. These were subsequently received by me on Friday 20 December 2019.
44. The hearing was closed on 15 May 2020.

## **SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED**

### **Original Submissions**

45. 426 submissions were received of which 12 were in support or partial support, 2 were neutral, 393 submissions were in opposition and 3 in part opposition, to the proposal. Submissions and submission points per topic were outlined in Appendix 4 to the s42A report dated 31 May 2019. All submissions including further submissions and late submissions are on the NPDC website. A list of those who made original submissions, further submissions, and the late submissions, is contained in Appendix 1.

### **Further Submissions**

46. Thirty-eight further submissions were received.

### **Late Submissions**

47. Nine late submissions were received, and consideration of these in respect of a waiver of timeframes for their receipt is contained in paragraphs 53-55 of this report.

## **HEARING ATTENDANCE**

48. Those in attendance at the hearing and presented were as follows:

### **Applicant**

- Mr Lachlan Muldowney- Counsel

- Mr Simon McKie-Presented evidence on behalf of Mr Mike McKie- Applicant
- Mr Mike McKie- Applicant (reconvened hearing)
- Mr Cees Bevers- Ecologist
- Mr Shaun King- Acoustic Consultant
- Mr Andrew Skerrett- Traffic Engineer
- Mr Richard Bain- Landscape Architect
- Mr Colin Comber- Planning Consultant
- Mr Ivan Bruce-Archaeologist
- Mr Alan Doy-Registered Surveyor
- Mr Kim Jansen-Civil Engineer

### **Submitters**

49. An extensive number of submitters presented at the hearing and the list of those submitters is contained in Appendix 2. This list also outlines those people who presented on behalf of some submitters.

- Mr Scott Grieve- Counsel
- Mr Richard Rollins- Environmental Engineer (Pesticides & Health Effects)
- Mr Nic Gladstone - Road Safety Engineer
- Mr Matt Peacock - Civil & Structural Engineer (Infrastructure Engineering)
- Mr Peter Kensington- Landscape Architect
- Mr Cam Twigley- Planning Consultant

### **Council**

- Mr Hamish Wesney- Planner & Reporting Officer
- Ms Anna Stevens- Planner & Reporting Officer
- Ms Emma McRae- Landscape Architect (original hearing)
- Mr Boyden Evans- Landscape Architect (reconvened hearing)
- Mr Graham Doherty-Traffic Engineer
- Mr Mark Hall- Manager Three Waters

## **PROCEDURAL MATTERS AND DIRECTIONS**

### **RMA 2-Year Decision time limit**

50. PPC48 was publicly notified for submissions on 29 June 2018. The RMA (First Schedule) requires any decisions on plan changes to be made within 2 years from the date of public notification.

51. Any timeframe extension beyond the 2- year period requires Ministerial approval, as s37 of the RMA cannot be utilised to extend time limits on plans and plan change decisions.
52. No extension to the timeframe was sought.

### **Late Submissions**

53. There had been nine late submissions received after the closing date for submissions. S37 of the RMA provides for the ability to recommend whether or not to waive a failure to comply with particular timeframes. The consent authority can only decide to waive any failure to comply with a timeframe after taking into account the following matters:
  - the interests of any person, who in its opinion, may be directly affected by the waiver
  - the interests of the community in achieving adequate assessment of the effects of the Plan Change; and
  - its duty under s21 of the RMA to avoid unreasonable delay.
54. Mr Wesley advised that in considering whether to waive the failure to comply with the timeframe for the nine late submissions, the Commissioner may wish to take into account the following:
  - The late submissions were received shortly after the submissions closed and were included in the summary.
  - The plan change process has not been held up in any way to date by these submissions.
  - The late submissions mainly raise issues that have been addressed by other submitters and do not seek any new decisions from Council which would compromise its ability to fairly assess the effects of the Plan Change.
55. Accordingly, it was recommended that the requirement to comply with the timeframe for these late submissions be waived. It is noted that the applicant did not raise any objection to consideration of the late submissions.

### **Directions**

56. Several directions had been issued in respect of the hearing process including amended hearing dates, pre-circulation of evidence, adjourned hearing, and evidence to be presented to the December hearing. All directions were provided to all parties by the Council and were placed on the Council website relating to PPC48 matters.

## STATUTORY CONTEXT

57. In respect of the considering the application to vary the consent notice, s221(3) of the RMA provides for applications to vary or cancel consent notices.
58. A local authority's power for a plan change, including a private plan change request, is set out in Clause 29(4) of Schedule 1 of the Act. It states:
- "29(4): After considering a plan or change, the local authority may decline, approve, or approve with modifications, the plan or change, and shall give its reasons".*
59. Section 74 of the RMA sets out the matters to be considered by a territorial authority, in the preparation and undertaking of changes to a district plan. Such changes are required to be in accordance with its functions under s31, the provisions of Part 2 and its duty under s32 and further, having regard to other documents to the extent that their content has a bearing on resource management issues of the District.
60. Section 75 of the Act, in addressing the contents of district plans, requires that a district plan must give effect to any regional policy statement and must not be inconsistent with a regional plan.
61. Section 31 addresses the functions of territorial authorities under the Act and includes:
- 1. the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district:*
  - 2. the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, ...*
62. Section 32 of the Act provides for the consideration of alternatives, benefits, and costs and requires that an evaluation must be carried out and that an evaluation must examine:
- a) the extent to which each objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of this Act; and*
  - b) whether having regard to their efficiency and effectiveness, the policies, rules, or other methods are the most appropriate for achieving the objectives.*
63. For the purposes of this examination, an evaluation must take into account the benefits and cost of policies, rules, or other methods.
64. Part 2 of the Act, being the purpose and principles of the statute, is the overarching part of the Act. Regard is to be given to all matters within it. Section 5 defines the purpose of the Act while sections 6, 7, and 8 outline the principles of the Act. Sections 6, 7, and 8 contain principles that are intended to give direction to assist with the achievement of matters.

## SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE HEARD

65. The Council reporting officer's s42A report and all expert evidence was circulated as directed prior to the hearing, had been pre-read, and largely taken as read at the hearing. Witnesses typically provided a written summary and update at the hearing followed, in the applicant's case, by a limited number of statements of rebuttal evidence.
66. As that evidence was extensive, I have decided, in the interest of brevity, to provide short summaries, and then dealing with that evidence by way of issues where those have been found to be determinative of my overall decisions on submissions on the private plan change request, and the consent notice variation and submissions.
67. For the record we note that we received evidence from the following persons (as noted at the head of this decision):

### **Applicant - Oākura Farm Park Limited**

**Mr Simon McKie**, appeared on behalf of his father, Mr Michael McKie who was absent due to medical reasons. He read Mr Michael McKie's statement providing an overview of the development and the families connection with the area.

**Mr Cornelis Bevers**, ecologist was the author of the Ecological Values and Impact Assessment 26 July 2017, included in the AEE. He presented his evidence and a summary which detailed the native flora and fauna of the site, exotic weed species, the significance of the stream habitat, likely effects of the earthworks associated with the plan change development, effects of cats and dogs on wildlife.

**Mr Ivan Bruce**, archaeologist, who presented evidence on his archaeological survey and his experience in the area.

**Mr Alan Doy**, presented evidence on the structure plan, survey, and lot yield.

**Mr Andrew Fraser and Ms Kim Jansen** presented evidence on three waters and site feasibility.

**Mr Shaun King**, an acoustic consultant, presented evidence on behalf of his colleague, Damian Ellerton who was out of the country. The evidence focussed on the expected performance of a noise barrier, a 2-metre-tall earth bund to be constructed along the western property boundary adjacent to SH45 as well as other measures such as dwelling setbacks, other barriers and modification to building facades.

**Mr Andrew Skerrett**, traffic engineer presented evidence regarding the intersection of Wairau Road and SH45, in particular a new roundabout, effects on vulnerable users, traffic flows, process for NZTA approval, threshold for constructing a roundabout.

**Mr Richard Bain**, landscape architect, presented evidence on the scale and extent of the development and its effects on outstanding landscapes, natural character, visual effects from SH45, landscape plan, the boundary of the outstanding landscape, and the timing of a landscape framework plan.

**Mr Colin Comber**, planner presented evidence on the planning approach, rationale for the proposals, vision and structure, reasons that support the plan change, alternative school, business growth, a proposed stone carving, and advice on the purpose and principles of the RMA and meeting objective 23 of the Operative District Plan. Mr Comber had prepared and lodged the plan change request and application for a variation to consent notice.

68. At the reconvened hearing, the following experts for the applicant presented evidence:

**Mr Michael McKie**, the applicant, presented his evidence regarding the change of size and scale of the plan change in response to submitters in opposition.

**Mr Bain**, presented supplementary evidence on landscape regarding the reduced size and scale of the plan change, landscape framework plan, rural character, visual effects, and effects on Kaitake range.

**Mr Doy** presented supplementary evidence on access and connections, street infrastructure, subdivision layout, size of allotments, reverse sensitivity, open space areas, yield, likely conditions of consent, and staging.

**Mr Bunn** presented a high-level assessment of the proposed stormwater management system, including an assessment of the upstream catchment, hydrological effects, the capacity of the detention ponds, and capability during peak flows.

**Mr Skerrett** presented an updated statement and supplementary comments on traffic effects of the revised structure plan for 144 lot yield. Mr Skerrett detailed a scaling back of improvements such as footpaths, the roundabout, alternative access to SH45, underpass and road improvements.

**Mr Comber** presented a response to the section 42 authors recommendations including reduced scale and intensity of development, cultural impacts, social impacts and water supply, landscape, and visual impact.

69. The following experts for the Submitters presented evidence:

**Mr Cameron Twigley**, planner presented evidence on the planning context (Operative District Plan), the Paddocks subdivision consent notice, Plan Change 15, Oākura Structure Plan 2006, the community vision for Oākura, the statutory framework, the purpose of the consent notice, the ODP definition of rural character, water capacity, staging, traffic and access, landscape and visual impact, noise, ecological effects, cultural values, urban design, cumulative effects, assessment of the policy framework (Taranaki IMP, NPS Urban Development Capacity, RPS, draft NPDC Plan), section 32 RMA evaluation, and planning conclusions. Mr Twigley also attached several annexures including a large- lot proposal and landscape plan.

**Mr Nicholas Gladstone**, road safety engineer presented evidence on traffic effects at the intersection of Wairau Rd and SH45 and wider effects in the village, concerns regarding a roundabout, effects on vulnerable road users, safety guidelines and standards.

**Mr Richard Rollins**, environmental engineer, presented evidence regarding the urbanisation of the Wairau Stream corridor, adverse effects of pesticides, and potential health effects on children wading in lower reaches of the stream and beach.

**Mr Matthew Peacock**, civil and structural engineer, presented evidence on the stormwater network, water supply, proposed stream crossings,

**Mr Peter Kensington**, landscape architect and planner, presented expert evidence on the importance of the consent notice condition 4, lack of integration with the existing landscape, visual effects from those in private properties, water tanks, effects on sense of place and amenity values and people's views of the Kaitake and National Park. Mr Kensington also raised concerns for the loss of rural character, effects from construction works on waterbodies,

70. At the reconvened hearing, the following experts presented evidence for submitters:

**Mr Twigley** provided responses to the section 42A authors and evidence of the applicant regarding the consent notice protecting rural character, amenity, outstanding landscape, and the significance of the landscape to iwi. Mr Twigley also raised issues with the plan change layout, lack of social impact assessment and there being sufficient land available for development.

**Ms Standish** for NZTA presented further evidence on the capacity of the intersection, the uncertainty of vehicle safety, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and potential threshold for triggering improvements.

**Ms Caron Greenough**, a consultant engineer for NZTA provided comments on the principles for treatments to slow traffic approaching the intersection/roundabout on SH45.

**Mr Kensington**, landscape architect, responding to the change in size and scale. Mr Kensington provided comments on the different urban character of the plan change area compared to Oākura, development crossing the gullies, relationships with the Paddocks subdivision, the appropriateness of development at RL60, RL35 by SG45, lack of ecological connection, and engineering devices in the waterways and level of effects on Kaitake.

**Mr Gladstone**, responded to the evidence of the applicant, in particular the lack of information of pedestrian movements and safety issues for vulnerable road users.

71. The following experts provided evidence on behalf of Council:

**Mr Hamish Wesley**, planner was the main reporting officer and planner on behalf of Council. Mr Wesley provided 5 reports that responded to the plan change application; the subsequently amended plan change, and responses to evidence presented at the hearings

**Ms Anna Stevens**, planning consultant who assisted with the writing of the s42A reports and responses to evidence.

**Mr Emma McRae**, landscape architect, provided expert advice to Council at the original hearing by reviewing the landscape evidence of the applicant and submitters.

**Mr Boyden Evans**, landscape architect, provided expert advice at the reconvened hearing and acknowledged the revised plan change size and scale, however questioned the lack of detail for visual catchment, ecology, landform analysis, open space and planting framework, lighting effects. Mr Evans gave comments on the proximity to Kaitake range and its ability to absorb residential development.

**Mr Mark Hall**, Council Manager of Three Waters, provided the views of various departments and advice for 3 waters, parks and reserves. He confirmed the bore flow rates, user demand, a second main trunk line for water supply, water tanks, ownership of water detention areas, uncertainties for stormwater network and capacity.

**Mr Graeme Doherty**, traffic engineer, provided expert advice to Council by reviewing the traffic evidence of the applicant and submitters, including the proposed roundabout, intersection with the State Highway 45, and internal road network.

## **Submitters**

72. I heard from a considerable number of submitters who appeared at both hearing and in many cases presented extensive and detailed lay evidence. As previously noted, the list of appearances is attached as Appendix 2.

## **PRINCIPAL ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

73. Having considered all the submissions, the section 42A reports and evidence, the principal issues that require consideration are outlined as follows:
- Consent Notice - Paddocks Subdivision
  - Cultural Matters
  - Social Impact Matters
  - Traffic Matters
  - Three Waters
  - Landscape and Rural Amenity Matters
  - Noise Effects
  - Appropriateness of rezoning the Rural Environment Area

## **FINDINGS ON THE PRINCIPAL ISSUES IN CONTENTION**

### **Consent Notice - Paddocks Subdivision**

#### **Process**

74. As part of the PPC48 applications, the applicant sought an amendment to an existing consent notice that had been imposed as part of “The Paddocks” subdivision granted consent in 2011. The consent notice had been imposed to preclude further subdivision of Lot 29 which contained an existing farm. The consent notice requires amendment to allow subdivision if the subject site was rezoned for urban purposes.
75. Mr Muldowney believed any amendment to the consent notice should be addressed as a consequential amendment should the plan change be approved. He provided some background that gave rise to the imposition of the consent notice as part of the Paddocks subdivision consent.

4

76. He further noted that it was an appropriate condition of consent to impose in order to preserve both the rural character of the land, and to protect the land from further fragmentation as it had been the subject of a 30 lot subdivision.
77. Mr Muldowney noted that the condition had an important qualification in that the subdivision was precluded only while the land had a rural zoning.
78. He further outlined that the existence of the consent notice should not usurp the primacy of s32 of the RMA in the evaluation of the plan change. He stated that the existence of the consent notice was not a relevant factor in the consideration of the plan change.
79. It is accepted that the appropriate process is to undertake an evaluation of the plan change in accordance with the provisions of the RMA, including the relevant provisions of s32. It is then further acknowledged that if the plan change was recommended for approval, then consideration would need to be given as to whether it was appropriate to vary the consent notice.
80. In considering this matter it is appropriate in my view to examine the matters separately, but on the basis that they are related and that to give effect to any rezoning if approved, the consent notice restriction on subdivision would need to be varied to reflect any rezoning proposal and to allow subdivision to proceed.
81. Both Mr Muldowney and Mr Grieve referenced *Green v Auckland Council* [2013] NZHC2364 where the High Court held that when considering an application for a variation of a consent notice under s221(3) of the RMA, it is necessary to consider the purpose of the consent notice and then to enquire into whether there has been some change in circumstances that renders the consent notice of no further value.
82. Mr Muldowney was of the view that if Lot 29 no longer had a Rural Environment Area zoning with the plan change being approved, then this would be a relevant change in circumstance and therefore there were grounds for the consent notice to be varied.
83. Reference was also made by Mr Grieve<sup>5</sup> to an Environment Court case (*Foster v Rodney District Council*) where the Court concluded that the following criteria may be of relevance under a discretionary activity consent process, in considering whether to vary or cancel a condition of a consent notice:
- a) the circumstances by which the condition was imposed
  - b) the environmental values it sought to protect
  - c) pertinent general purposes of the RMA set out in ss 5-8.

---

<sup>5</sup> Grieve: Legal Submissions Paragraph17

### **Circumstances and Purpose - Imposition of Consent Notice**

84. I was provided with 'The Paddocks' consent decision. It was attached as Appendix 1 to the 31 May 2019 s42A report. I have reviewed that decision and carefully considered matters within the decision regarding the consent notice.
85. While circumstances can change, a commitment had been offered up by the applicant as part of the 'The Paddocks' subdivision application process, and the decision maker at the time relied upon it in her consideration and determination of the proposal, that being the retention of Lot 29 as open space (farm).
86. While the consent notice condition states that it applies while the land is zoned Rural Environment Area, it was to mitigate effects, and in my view, was a significant factor in the Commissioner approving 'The Paddocks' subdivision proposal.
87. I note that the Commissioner in her summary of Mr. McKie's evidence who was the applicant, outlined as follows:
- "Mr. McKie concluded by stating that they are trying to achieve a vision that will stand the test of time and said his vision was for an eco-friendly environmentally safe guarded and protected project that was future proofed and enjoyable for generations".*<sup>6</sup>
88. Condition 24<sup>7</sup> of the consent provides for a limitation on further subdivision in respect of Lot 29 while the land remains in the Rural Environment Area. The condition was subsequently imposed by way of consent notice. The purpose of the condition was to ensure that open space is retained over the balance allotment and was obviously considered by both the applicant and the Commissioner to be anchored by way of consent notice.
89. The Commissioner also noted that the- *"...applicant expressed the intention during the hearing of retaining this lot with a 'Protected Farm' status in the longer term, regardless of the zoning".*<sup>8</sup>
90. In his planning evidence Mr Twigley<sup>9</sup> was of the opinion that the Paddocks Subdivision consent notice had a critical role in offsetting the adverse landscape and visual effects of 'The Paddocks'

---

<sup>6</sup> The Paddocks' Subdivision Consent Decision, Page 22- Paragraph 4

<sup>7</sup> The Paddocks' Subdivision Consent Decision Page 109

<sup>8</sup> 'The Paddocks' Subdivision Consent Decision Page 95, Paragraph 4

<sup>9</sup> Twigley: Evidence Highlight, 24 July 2019- Paragraph 2

subdivision. He further stated that the consent notice was important in maintaining rural character and amenity and achieving the objectives and policies of the ODP.

91. I observed that Mr Twigley was the applicant's consultant planner for 'The Paddocks' subdivision hearing and therefore assumed to have been intimately involved in the preparation of the application and the subsequent hearing.
92. Mr Twigley in his evidence in chief<sup>10</sup> provided very helpful evidence on the purpose of the consent notice. It is noted that he was present at the time and had reviewed the evidence of the applicant, Mr. McKie, and the landscape evidence of Mr. Bain.
93. This has been useful in providing an understanding of the context and thinking that led to the protection of Lot 29 from further subdivision and development. The protection of Lot 29 was a key part of the subdivision proposal and is referenced in both the Mr McKie and Mr Bain evidence. It was clearly intended to be a key part of the overall Paddocks subdivision design, and integral to addressing any effects of the Paddocks subdivision by maintaining rural character including spaciousness and amenity, landscape values and visual amenity.
94. Mr Twigley<sup>11</sup> outlined that it was common Council practice to impose conditions requiring consent notices preventing further subdivision. He further explained that the wording in the consent notice "...while the land remains in the rural environment area..." was commonly used where there was a possibility of the land being rezoned. He noted that the Paddocks subdivision fell into this situation given the triangle of land in Lot 29 was identified in the Oākura Structure Plan as a future urban area residential development.
95. I note that not all of Lot 29 was similarly identified for future residential development.
96. Mr Twigley further noted that in his opinion the consent notice provided many submitters and the wider community with a high level of certainty in respect of the future of Lot 29 given it was a contentious subdivision application and observed that:

*"Given the content of the OSP at the time of granting the subdivision, I consider that the community will have had a reasonable expectation that the triangle area could eventually be subject to urban rezoning and development; but equally, that the balance of Lot 29 would continue to be protected from future subdivision and development. Given the existing supply of land Oākura available for residential development, it would, in my opinion, have also been reasonable for the community to expect that a plan change for the triangle would occur in the long term, a long time after the Paddocks subdivision and the associated development had been completed. In my opinion, it would*

---

<sup>10</sup> Twigley: Evidence in Chief, 25 June 2019, Paragraph 36-73

<sup>11</sup> Twigley: Evidence in Chief, Paragraph 53

*also have been a reasonable expectation that a Plan Change process for the triangle would be led by the Council in accordance with projected growth statistics.”*

97. It is clear that the consent notice was put in place to serve a particular purpose and was integral to the Paddocks subdivision application and the approval of it in March 2011. The consent notice as outlined in the evidence of Mr McKie and Mr Bain at that time, and confirmed by Mr Twigley, was to maintain rural character including spaciousness and existing rural landscape and maintain views out over rural farmland and from SH45 up to the ONL.
98. The retention of productive rural land and existing dairy farm are all then considered to be contributing to the maintenance of defining elements of rural character in respect of the ODP.

### **What was to be Protected by the Consent Notice**

99. The consent notice was to assist with mitigation of effects arising from granting approval to ‘The Paddocks’ subdivision, being to ensure the maintenance of rural character including spaciousness and maintenance of visual amenity and amenity values generally.
100. I note that the Commissioner outlined in her decision what environmental values were intended to be preserved or retained, as part of the consent notice condition. She noted as follows:  
*“The condition with regard to future subdivision of the Lot 29, relating to the no further subdivision of the property as long as it remains in the Rural Environment Area, has been retained as originally proposed. This condition will ensure that open space is retained over the balance allotment. It is also noted that the applicant expressed the intention during the hearing of retaining this lot with a ‘Protected Farm’ status in the longer term, regardless of the zoning.”*
101. In her decision she further noted that, *“This area is to be retained as part of the balance area of the proposed subdivision, with protected farm status and rural zoning..”*<sup>12</sup> and *“It is also noted that the applicant expressed the intention during the hearing of retaining this lot with a ‘Protected Farm’ status in the longer term, regardless of the zoning”*.<sup>13</sup>
102. The evidence presented by applicant at the Paddocks hearing was that weight was placed on the proposed protection of Lot 29 as a productive farming unit and more particularly, the maintenance of open space and views.
103. It had a specific intent proposed by the applicant and was in my opinion an integral part of the proposal and of relevance in the grant of consent by the Commissioner. The consent notice was

---

<sup>12</sup> The Paddocks Subdivision Consent Decision, 8 March 2011, page 66

<sup>13</sup> The Paddocks Subdivision Consent Decision, 8 March 2011, page 95

to assist with mitigation of effects and would have an ongoing mitigation role. It is not just in my opinion, specific to a point in time, such as the time of subdivision approval.

104. I also note the 'Protected farm' status was intended to be an instrument that would be progressed by the applicant to future proof the arrangement for generations. As I understand, no such measures have been sought or undertaken by the applicant.

### **Change in Circumstances**

105. The applicant has sought a variation in the consent notice due to a change in circumstances. Limited evidence was presented by the applicant that outlined how the environmental effects of 'The Paddocks' subdivision, are now addressed or mitigated, that does not require a continuation of the current consent notice.
106. The applicant has emphasised the 'small print' in the consent notice and that the plan change would be a quality residential development. Mr McKie responded to criticism for the variation to the consent notice.

*"The consent notice was not able to lock in the rural land use forever, despite me being at the time comfortable with that outcome. Council received advice that the consent notices would need to be qualified to say that they would apply only as long as the land was zoned rural. This recognised that it was not in perpetuity but may one day be subject to change if the zoning changed."*<sup>14</sup>

107. The proposal as originally submitted and now as amended by the applicant, does not in my opinion adequately address how the effects that were mitigated by the consent notice and are no longer of relevance. Given the significance of the consent notice condition at the time of 'The Paddocks' hearing and the subsequent decision that incorporates it, it would have seemed appropriate for far greater emphasis to have been placed in evaluating why it was no longer deemed necessary in its current form which prevents further subdivision of Lot 29.
108. Mr Bain in his evidence put forward the following opinion, in respect of why the current consent notice is no longer appropriate.

*"My assessment of the significance of the 'farm lot' (Lot 29) is not the same as when this land was discussed in the 2010 'Paddocks' application. At that time, the role of Lot 29 was considered important for maintaining rural spaciousness for the area generally, and the view from SH45 specifically. Rural spaciousness generally, is now to some extent altered by the inclusion of the Paddocks development, albeit in my assessment they are the greatest beneficiaries of Lot 29's*

---

<sup>14</sup> Response of Michael McKie, 2 December 2019, para 12.

*spaciousness, and therefore are potentially most affected by its change. In terms of the Consent Notice, I consider that with regard to rural character its role has changed from that intended”.*

109. Mr Twigley observed that there had been a “noticeable absence” of assessment of this matter by the applicant. He further observed that in his opinion there had been no change in circumstances that results in the need to vary or cancel the consent notice, and that it was as relevant today as when it was first imposed.
110. He further noted that the application to vary the consent notice would “severely undermine the integrity of the Paddocks Subdivision”.

### **Findings/ Conclusion**

111. I record that the original ‘The Paddocks’ subdivision proposal gave rise for the need for the consent notice to be imposed to preserve spaciousness in the context of the rural environment. Specifically, this included rural character values and visual amenity. To then seek its deletion because rural spaciousness is altered by the very development that gave rise to such concerns, as well as the need to preserve spaciousness, does not in my view provide a convincing reason that it is no longer required. It is in my opinion questionable whether there is any change in circumstance to warrant its’ variation.
112. Mr Twigley was also of the opinion that there was a lack of assessment regarding why the consent notice was no longer required in its current form and was not convinced that there had been a change in circumstance to provide a basis for its variation or cancellation.
113. I have reached the same conclusion and I am not satisfied that circumstances have changed to the extent that the consent notice to provide for the preservation of spaciousness and rural character and amenity is no longer required in its current form. I am further concerned that there appears to have been no attempt to ‘protect the farm status’ in any other mechanism that is available to the applicant since the time of the consent being granted.
114. Given the reliance placed on having such a condition imposed at the 2010 hearing, it seems that the reasons for it are still valid and have not changed to the degree to warrant it’s cancellation or variation apart from the applicant wishing to undertake further subdivision and development of the subject site.
115. I acknowledge the evidence of Mr Twigley where he recognised that part of Lot 29 could be subject to residential use in respect of the FUD overlay, but this only related to a portion of the land. The expectation, in his opinion, would seem to be that the consent notice would endure and fulfil the role originally envisaged at the time subdivision consent was granted in 2011.

116. From the evidence adduced by the applicant, I am not convinced that the consent notice in its current form is no longer fit for purpose. It has a defined role that parties who were participants in the 2010 hearing are entitled to place reliance on, notwithstanding at some time in the future there may be some potential rezoning of part of Lot 29 given it is identified in the Oākura Structure Plan.
117. Overall, I do not consider that there has been such a change in circumstances that the consent notice has no ongoing purpose or value. From an overall resource management perspective, the community whether residents, applicants, or submitters should be able to place reliance on planning techniques or instruments that are imposed as part of consent processes to address environmental effects.
118. I have an unease that the mechanism of a consent notice is used in one instance and then after the passage of time is no longer considered relevant, particularly when in my opinion the reasons for its variation and any effects arising from its variation, have not been appropriately addressed, nor have I been adequately satisfied that it is still not required for ongoing environmental mitigation as originally proposed in 2010.

## **Cultural Matters**

### **Applicant view**

119. The proposal was notified and presented to the first hearing as a fait accompli with regards to Māori cultural issues.
- “Consultation has been undertaken with Mana Whenua. There are no sites of significance within Wairau Estate. Mana Whenua have been invited to name the primary street within Wairau Estate. In addition, the funding of a stone carving with design arranged by Mana Whenua to be located on Upper Wairau Rd has been agreed by Oākura Farm Park Ltd”.<sup>15</sup>*
120. When considering three scenarios in the AEE including no development, some development and full development the applicant considered there would be no Māori, historic heritage or other cultural values affected in all the scenarios.<sup>16</sup>
121. The applicant relied on the advice of Ngāti Tairi hapu representatives responding to the proposal during three meetings between the applicant and hapu representatives.
122. The applicant took note of and agreed to the Ngāti Tairi’s advice which they summarised as:

---

<sup>15</sup> Request for Private Plan Change Report, March 2018 section 6.4, page 71

<sup>16</sup> Request for Private Plan Change, March 2018, pages 28 and 29, para 3.70

- That disposal of storm water within the proposed development area does not adversely impact instream values.
- Hapu be given opportunity to recommend the name for the Wairau Estate loop road; this would be reflective of the early (mana whenua) history of the locality.
- Any earthworks to be subject to archaeological supervision (pursuant to an NZHPT archaeological authority) with hapu participation.
- A memorandum of understanding will be developed to record understandings and undertakings of OFPL and the hapu in respect of matters of cultural importance relating to the Wairau Estate project with MOU being lodged as part of the Plan Change Request to NPDC.

123. Following the original hearing the applicant reconsidered the application and significantly revised the size and scale of the plan change.

*"I am happy that we have come up with a project that strikes the right balance between preserving the community's way of life but enabling others to enjoy the benefits of a lifestyle in Oākura in the future."<sup>17</sup>*

*The layout 'future proofs' the subdivision for possible growth in the long term, should that one day, long into the future, be deemed appropriate."<sup>18</sup>*

124. The CIA commissioned by the applicant which will be summarised later in this section sets out an appendix with a series of suggested plan provision drafting edits which are designed to address cultural issues. Those suggested edits are incorporated by the applicant into the proposed plan provisions through the introduction of new Amendment 3 Policy 23.10.1 through Policy 23.10.6, which provide a comprehensive set of policy provisions and implementation methods, which are then reflected in the residential rule framework.<sup>19</sup>

125. Overall, the applicant was confident that with its long-established working relationship with Ngāti Tairi any matters could be managed appropriately. The applicant was of the view that the CIA was the first step in that relationship, and the ongoing consultation which would precede any subdivision consent application will be the next step. The applicant was confident that with this level of engagement, Ngāti Tairi would be informed and involved at all stages to ensure the development reflects their aspirations for the whenua.<sup>20</sup>

### **Submitter views**

---

<sup>17</sup> Further Evidence of Mr Michael McKie, 2 December 2019, para 8.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid, para 10.

<sup>19</sup> Closing legal submissions on behalf of Oakura Farm Park Ltd. 20 December 2019. Para 65

<sup>20</sup> Closing legal submissions on behalf of Oakura Farm Park Ltd. 20 December 2019. Para 66

126. Ngāti Tairi hapu and Taranaki iwi submitted separately on the proposals. Mr Manukonga, Chairman of Oākura Pa and Ngāti Tairi did not appear at the hearings while Ms Te Wano-Bryant appeared before us on behalf of Te Kahui o Taranaki which represents Taranaki Iwi and hapu. Ms Te Wano-Bryant was accompanied and supported by members of local hapu.
127. Mr Keith Manukonga made a submission in opposition on behalf of Ngāti Tairi.<sup>21</sup> The submission raises site specific and local concerns for:
- Effects of stormwater on existing habitat and ecosystems
  - A wish to see some cultural design recognising tāngata whenua occupation, histories, and values
  - Continuing discussions with the applicant to address these concerns.
128. The Te Kahui o Taranaki Trust submission in opposition on behalf of Taranaki iwi raises broader concerns derived from its iwi management plan Taiao – Taiora:<sup>22</sup>
- There had been no consultation with Te kahui o Taranaki Trust, the mandated iwi authority in the preparation of the plan change.
  - Taiao, Taiora the Taranaki Iwi Environmental Management Plan must be taken into account when preparing and reviewing a plan change;
  - That any decision must take into account the relevant policies on ensuring subdivision and land use are well designed and reflect cultural values;
  - Development that results in the degradation of mouri of Papatuanuku, or adverse effects on Ranginui, Papatuanuku, ngā mounga o Taranaki, Tane, Tangaroa-ki-Tai and Tangaroa-ki-Uta is not supported; and concerns on loss of access to sites of significance and adverse impacts on cultural values.
129. The submission sets out four sets of activities and effects that the iwi will not support.<sup>23</sup> These are:
- Any action or activities that will result in the degradation of the mouri of Papatuanuku
  - Subdivision and associated land-uses that cannot demonstrate that they will not adversely affect Ranginui, Papatuanuku, Taranaki Mounga, Tane, Tangaroa-ki-Tai and Tangaroa-ki-Uta
  - Any subdivision or land-use that will result in the loss or restriction of access to sites of significance (including wahi tapu), on Taranaki Iwi
  - Any subdivision and development that adversely impacts the important cultural values associated with landscapes of importance to Taranaki Iwi (hapu, marae/pa).
130. The applicant consulted with representatives of Ngāti Tairi through face to face meetings; on 6 May 2016, 18 June 2017, and 20 November 2017. A pre-hearing meeting was also held with

---

<sup>21</sup> Submission #111. Keith Manukonga, Chairman Oakura Pa on behalf of Ngāti Tairi.

<sup>22</sup> Submission #134. Wharehoka Wano CEO Te Kahui o Taranaki Iwi.

<sup>23</sup> Submission #134. Wharehoka Wano CEO Te Kahui o Taranaki Iwi.

both Ngāti Tairi and Taranaki Iwi representatives on 29 January 2019. This pre-hearing was the first meeting attended by representatives of the iwi authority.

131. The outcome of the pre-hearing meeting was an exercise to respond to the key matters raised in submissions and the Taiora-Taiao IMP. A table with proposed mitigation measures was completed and it is understood that the Iwi and hapu were positive towards the methods and actions, however, were still of the view that there were outstanding matters that could not be addressed.
132. Mrs Te Puna Wano-Bryant (Te Kahui o Taranaki) and Mr Tane Manu (Ngāti Tairi of Ngā Mahanga) Chairperson of Puniho Pā and a trustee on Waikura Pā appeared at the hearing and presented a joint position statement.<sup>24</sup>
133. Mrs Wano-Bryant referred me to the iwi planning document, Taiao Taiora, which was launched in July 2018. It is noted that this document was launched after lodging of the original plan change request which occurred in March 2018 and subsequently publicly notified in June 2018.
134. Taranaki Iwi submitted that they were directly affected by the Oākura rezoning and are in opposition, due to potential adverse effects on the environment. They were particularly concerned that a cultural impact assessment had not been prepared.
135. As mentioned above the Te Kahui o Taranaki concerns were broad, however, Ms Puna Wano-Bryant identified a specific and directive policy (11.8.3 of the IMP):  
*“Taranaki Iwi will not support any residential subdivision and development within 5 km of the National Park boundaries; 5 km is not a magic figure. It speaks to our integrated and holistic approach of mountain to sea, of a complex of sites, waterways and features that all serve a collective purpose in order to protect, preserve and enhance the rich biodiversity of our environment that looks after us, its caretakers”.*
136. Ms Wano-Bryant questioned the need for further residential land and re-affirmed that the Iwi was strongly opposed to the plan change.<sup>25</sup>
137. During questioning Ms Wano-Bryant confirmed that the prohibitive sections of Taiao Taiora, regarding Taranaki Mounga in section 11 were firm statements of position.
138. The other policy she did not mention was 11.8.3(4) – Taranaki supports Project Mounga and will be prominently involved in that project at governance and operations levels.

---

<sup>24</sup> Transcript of Day 4 Hearing, 25 July 2019.

<sup>25</sup> Transcript of Day 4 Hearing, 25 July 2019

139. It should be noted that the submission also identified another directive and broad policy 11.8.3 (6) – Taranaki Iwi will not support activities that have the potential to result in the degradation of the natural ecosystem and endemic habitat of Taranaki Mounga.
140. I sought the views of the iwi regarding what had been agreed so far and what might be recognised as appropriate if the plan change were to proceed. The matters identified by Ms Wano-Bryant were street naming and a kowhatu (stone carving). She suggested, if the plan change was granted, that the iwi and hapū should be intimately involved in all aspects of the development.
141. It was also clear that the dynamic between Iwi and hapu was misaligned during the plan change process. Ngāti Tairi representatives appear to have a positive and constructive relationship with the Applicant. An MoU is in place, there has been agreement to several activities and other issues of concern are proposed to be addressed through dialogue. Taranaki Iwi and some of Ngāti Tairi are opposed to the proposed plan change and seek that it is declined in its entirety.
142. The Iwi Management Plan Taiao-Taiao contains some absolute positions regarding residential development near the mounga of Taranaki, including the Kaitake Ranges. The Cultural Impact Assessment was not definitive in its conclusions stating that there is both the potential for adverse effects and the potential to protect, acknowledge and remediate the environment, and respond to cultural values present in this location.

### **Cultural Impact Assessment**

143. It would be expected that a cultural impact assessment for a plan change application would be prepared during the preparation of the plan change, in that way informing the development of objectives, policies and methods, as well as guiding the discussion between the applicant and tāngata whenua.
144. The Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) prepared at a late stage was not presented to us as ‘expert evidence’ rather the assessment was prepared by Ngāti Tairi with support from Te Kahui o Taranaki Trust. It was completed on 29 November 2019 and there is no author identified.
145. The CIA was not available to the s42A report officers when they prepared their report.<sup>26</sup> It was provided at the reconvened hearing on 2 December 2019. The authors of the CIA did not attend the hearing and it is unclear if Mr Manukonga, Chairman of Oākura Pa was involved in its ratification.

---

<sup>26</sup> Response to Further Evidence for Reconvened Hearing – Proposed Private Plan Change 48: Wairau Road, Oakura Rezoning. Report prepared by Boffa Miskell Limited for New Plymouth District Council, 22 November 2019, para 5.2, 5.7,

146. The CIA provides a brief historical narrative, a description of the revised proposal, relevant statutory and planning documents, tāngata whenua values and assessment of potential effects, and some conclusions and recommendations.
147. There is also mention of the disappointment that the CIA was not prepared earlier in the process. Attached to the CIA are examples of district plan provisions that would go some way to addressing concerns of Ngāti Tairi and Taranaki iwi.
148. The origins of Ngāti Tairi are described briefly in the CIA.

*“Ngā Mahanga a Tāiri arrived in Taranaki in the early 10th century, where they moved inland to settle in the Ōkato District. In the 12th century, Ngā Mahanga a Tāiri formed an identify as two hapū, Ngā Mahanga and Ngāti Tāiri, with the latter moving into the Oākura area. Through inter-marriage with those already settled in the District, Ngā Mahanga ā Tāiri became the dominant iwi, so that by the 15th century, their influence extended as far north as Ōhura.*

*Sharing close connections with hapū south of the Waiweranui River, Ngā Mahanga a Tāiri identifies with and works alongside Taranaki Iwi. Once an iwi in its own right, with the advent of war, confiscation and colonisation, it is now a hapū represented by two marae. Ngā Mahanga are based at Pūniho Pā - Tarawainuku Marae, south of Ōkato township. And Ngāti Tāiri reside just north of Oākura township at Ōkorotua Marae - Oākura Pā.*

*Today, Ngā Mahanga a Tāiri exercise mana whenua over an area bounded by the Waiweranui River and Ōnukutaipari (Paritutu), which includes Ngā Tīpuna Maunga of Kaitake, Pūkeiiti, Pouākai and part of Taranaki Mouna.”<sup>27</sup>*

149. The CIA identifies and lists a set of principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. These are:
- Retention of rangatiratanga: The Māori Chiefs looked to the Crown for protection from other foreign powers, for peace and for law and order. They reposed their trust for these things in the Crown believing that they retained their own rangatiratanga and taonga.
  - Duty to Consult: The responsibility to act in good faith and reasonably puts the onus on the Crown to make an informed decision, in many cases that will require consultation.
  - Duty of active protection: The Crown has a duty to actively protect Māori interests in the use of their lands and waters.
  - Engaging the expertise of mana whenua to implement these obligations as they apply in their rohe is fundamental in ensuring these provisions are met.

---

<sup>27</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment for Wairau Estate, November 2019, Para. 2.8-2.10

150. The CIA also refers to the Court of Appeal case *NZ Māori Council v Attorney General* [1987] 1 NZLR 641.
151. In my view a CIA should have been required as a matter of priority when the original application was made. Expert cultural advice should have been commissioned at that time to inform the plan change process, the development of the proposal and associated technical reports, and recommendations made to the commissioners.
152. Providing this expert advice at the end of the hearing process, as opposed to through the development of the proposed plan change, or to inform the reporting planner in relation to the potential effects of the proposal, has made the assessment and management of potential cultural effects difficult. Ngāti Tāiri and the Trust believe that cultural values and potential cultural effects may have been more adequately addressed had this CIA process and cultural expert advice been sought at the inception of this plan change process.<sup>28</sup>
153. The CIA states that the NPS-FM 2014 and Te Mana o Te Wai gives clear direction applicable to this plan change, through ensuring tāngata whenua 'rights and interests' are reflected in freshwater management, and integrated management.
154. The CIA identifies a relevant provision in the Operative District Plan relating to the subdivision rules for Residential C Environment Area, the Proposed Plan provisions related to Site of Significance to Māori (#2261 – Pahakahaka Pa), archaeological sites and waterbodies. The CIA also summarises relevant directive policies in the Taiao, Taiora Iwi Environmental Management Plan:
- Manage development so that it does not adversely affect Ranginui, Papatuanuku, Taranaki Mouna, Tane, Tangaroa-ki-Uta and Tangaroa-ki-Tai;
  - New development should be designed in a way that reflect environmental and cultural values;
  - Landscape assessment will consider cultural values as an important and inseparable part of that landscape;
  - Subdivision and development should not adversely impact cultural values associated with landscapes of importance to Taranaki iwi (hapū/ marae/pā).
  - Promote and support access to water for the social, cultural, economic, and environmental values of Taranaki Iwi;
  - Taranaki iwi will not support residential development within 5km of the National Park boundaries; and

---

<sup>28</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment for Wairau Estate. November 2019. para 7.5

- Taranaki iwi will support the extension of the endemic habitat of the national park that assist with its proliferation to enhance natural values associated with the mounnga.

155. The CIA provides a summary of Māori values and a reiteration of the key areas of concern for both iwi and hapu:<sup>29</sup>

- The proximity of development to Kaitake, and the ability to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the relationship of mana whenua with Kaitake;
- The proximity of the development to Pahakahaka Pā, and the potential for the development to impact on previously un-recorded sites around the pā;
- The increased visibility and access to the Pā which will result from the development and may result in degradation of the site;
- The absence of the identification and recognition of an important wāhi taonga to hapū within the application and its relevant plans (including objectives, policies, rules, and identification on planning maps);
- The management of earthworks within the development area;
- The management of stormwater run-off created as a result of the development, and the impact that this will have on the waterbodies within the subdivision;
- The proposed mechanisms for ensuring planting, access and other commitments made are achieved through the current structure plan provisions;
- The proposed mechanisms for ensuring adequate ongoing consultation and engagement with tāngata whenua as the development continues, including mechanisms that ensure cultural expertise would continue to guide the development; and
- The proposed mechanisms to kōrero the importance of the site and surrounding environment to tāngata whenua, including with people who subsequently live in proximity should the plan change and subdivision proceed.

156. The CIA delivers a detailed narrative for each of these issues but does not reach a definitive conclusion.

157. The proposal has the potential to adversely affect this cultural landscape, the Pā site and its surroundings, and the Wairau Stream and tributaries through the construction and development of residential living. It also has the potential to protect, acknowledge and remediate the environment, and respond to cultural values present in this location.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment for Wairau Estate. November 2019. para 7.7

<sup>30</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment for Wairau Estate. November 2019. Section 8 [page 30]

158. The CIA goes on to conclude that:

*“If the Commission was of a mind to recommend approval of the application, it is considered that substantial amendments to the provisions of the Operative Plan (in relation to the Wairau Estate Structure Plan), and the proposed structure plan are necessary to address the cultural issues identified above. These amendments would go some way to providing for the relationship Ngāti Tāiri and Taranaki Iwi have with this area be recognised, as well as to protect the historic heritage of the area”.*

159. These amendments recommended in the CIA have been incorporated by the applicant into the proposed provisions of the plan change.

#### **Council/reporting officer views**

160. The reporting officers have provided four reports responding to submissions and evidence presented during the course of the proceedings:

- A s42A report dated 31 May 2019 (following submissions and predating hearing)
- Response to evidence presented at Hearing dated 19 August 2019
- Response to further evidence presented at reconvened hearing dated 22 November
- Response to evidence presented at reconvened hearing (record in writing) dated 2 December 2019

161. The assessment and conclusions of the reporting officers are contained in each of the documents. There is no comprehensive summary of the various cultural issues and conclusions in one document.

162. The reporting officer recorded the applicants consultation with tāngata whenua, the preparation of an assessment table comparing the relevant parts of Taiao Taiora with the proposed mitigation measures in the plan change and the iwi’s acceptance of the applicant’s mitigation measures set out in their Taiao Taiora Assessment Report.

163. The officer also recorded that Taranaki Iwi do not approve of the plan change and they resolved that they would maintain their original submission to continue in their opposition to the Oākura Rezoning. Supporting their final stance on the plan change, Taranaki Iwi noted that they are clear on their positions under Section 11.8.7 and 11.8.4 of Taiao Taiora:

*“Taranaki Mouna - Section 11.8.7*

*Taranaki Iwi will not support any residential subdivision and development within 5km of the National Park Boundaries.*

*Taranaki Mouna - Section 11.8.4*

*Taranaki Iwi supports Project Mounga and will be prominently involved in that project at governance and operations level”.*

164. Overall, following the applicant preparing a Taiao Taiora Assessment Report and Taranaki Iwi approving of the mitigation measures set out, the reporting officer considered that the proposal takes into account the relevant matters in Taiao, Taiora.<sup>31</sup>
165. The reporting officer identified that a CIA should be commissioned prior to determining the plan change, in response to concerns raised regarding the level of engagement with Tāngata Whenua, both Ngāti Tairi and Taranaki Iwi to date. They considered that a CIA would assist in understanding whether the matters in s6(e) and s7(a) of the RMA have been recognised and provided for, allowing for Taiao Taiora to inform the proposal, the plan change provisions, and structure plan, and ensure Ngāti Tairi is more actively engaged with on all aspects of the proposal and informs the Structure Plan design, outcomes, and implementation.<sup>32</sup>
166. The reporting officer considered that this CIA was required for the reasons set out in the previous paragraph, and that the plan change should not be determined in the absence of this assessment.<sup>33</sup>
167. As already mentioned, the CIA was completed on 29 November 2019 and presented to the reconvened hearing on 2 December 2019. Following receipt of the cultural impact assessment, the reporting officer having read the CIA, confirmed the following matters were still to be resolved in order to finalise the assessment<sup>34</sup>:
- Impacts on Kaitake.
  - Pahakahaka Pa.
  - Stormwater management and Te Mana o to Wai.
  - Wastewater management, including proposed planting.
  - Outstanding matters set out in paragraphs 7.33 and 7.34 in the CIA.

## **Discussion and Findings**

### **Consultation with tāngata whenua through Iwi authorities**

168. Schedule 1 of the RMA requires that consultation be undertaken with tāngata whenua through Iwi authorities. In this instance Te Kahui o Taranaki Trust is the Iwi authority established through the recent Treaty Settlement process. They were a submitter to the plan change, attended the

---

<sup>31</sup> Para 11.17

<sup>32</sup> Response to further evidence at Reconvened Hearing. 22 November 2019. page 13

<sup>33</sup> Request for Private Plan Change, prepared by Comber Consultancy, March 2018. pages 28 and 29, para 3.71

<sup>34</sup> Response to evidence presented at reconvened hearing. Hamish Wesley, Reporting Officer. 2 December 2019.

hearing and have provided a copy of the Iwi Management Plan (a relevant planning document prepared by an iwi authority). The Trust was not consulted as part of the preparation of the plan change however, the Trust did attend a pre-hearing meeting.

169. The applicant has relied on the advice of the local hapu representatives of Ngati Tairi from three meetings and dismissed any significant issues or effects from any of the options for development. The applicant acknowledges that it had not met the wider Iwi's consultation expectations, despite its early and ongoing good faith consultation with representatives from Ngati Tairi.<sup>35</sup>

170. It appears that consultation has been conducted by the applicant with a coalition of the willing and Te Kahui o Taranaki (who oppose the plan change) has been engaged at a very late stage of the plan change process and at the request of Te Kahui o Taranaki. This is important to acknowledge as schedule 1 not only requires consultation with tāngata whenua through iwi authorities but also sets out the characteristics of the consultation. These include:

- consider ways in which it may foster the development of their capacity to respond to an invitation to consult; and
- establish and maintain processes to provide opportunities for those iwi authorities to consult it; and
- consult with those iwi authorities; and
- enable those iwi authorities to identify resource management issues of concern to them; and
- indicate how those issues have been or are to be addressed.

171. An argument can be put forward that these matters have been completed, however, the quality of them and the timing is significant. I am of the view that limited consultation has been undertaken by the applicant with the iwi authority. This consultation has occurred very late in the plan change process, on a proposal fully developed, and in the absence of their input. The Te Kahui o Taranaki Trust have articulated their resource management issues of concern in submissions, attendance to the hearing and support in the CIA preparation and delivery on the last day of hearings. The applicant has indicated how those issues have been or are to be addressed in closing submissions.

172. Taranaki iwi and some of Ngāti Tairi are opposed to the plan change, however the mandated representatives of Ngāti Tairi have worked closely with the applicant, have agreed to a number of matters and have an MoU to work through outstanding issues. The key issue is whether these outstanding matters are relevant resource management matters of substance that cause significant adverse effects that may or may not be avoided, mitigated, or remedied.

173. The applicant did not employ any cultural expertise on the plan change, instead relied on the advice of representatives and experts from other fields such as archaeology, ecology, and

---

<sup>35</sup> Closing Submissions, 20 December 2019, paragraph 55

landscape. I have not cited any evidence of consultation with the iwi authority during the preparation of the plan change.

174. I note that the applicant has responded to the issues of concern raised by members of Ngāti Tairi and Te Kahui o Taranaki in a pre-hearing meeting, both in preparing a table of measures to address issues of concern, and by commissioning a cultural impact assessment, albeit late in the proceedings.
175. The CIA sets out the remaining matters of contention from an iwi and hapu perspective. These matters have been identified earlier in this section; they include impacts on Kaitake; Pahakahaka Pa; Stormwater management and Te Mana o to Wai; Wastewater management, including proposed planting; and outstanding matters set out in paragraphs 7.33 and 7.34 in the CIA.
176. As mentioned previously the consultation with Te Kahui o Taranaki Trust (the iwi authority) was only initiated at the pre-hearing stage. This is not best practice and contrary to early, regular, meaningful engagement using modes and venues preferable to Iwi. The intention of consultation is to identify resource management issues of concern and how they have been or are to be addressed. This has certainly been achieved, albeit by the end of the reconvened hearings.
177. The lack of consultation with the iwi authority is however in part mitigated by engagement with the local hapu representatives of Ngāti Tairi and the on-going relationship that has been formalised.
178. I had identified the following matters of contention and provided a consideration of each matter including effects on Kaitake, Pahakahaka Pa, stormwater management and Te Mana o Te Wai, wastewater management, principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, consultation with tāngata whenua and the 5km prohibition.

### **Kaitake**

179. The Kaitake range is of importance to the iwi.

"Ko Taranaki, ko Pouākai, ko Kaitake, koia te puna i heke mai ai te tāngata. Koia ko ō mātou nei okiokinga, ko mātou nei tō rātou okiokitanga. Taranaki, Pouākai and Kaitake are a reflection of and the source of our inseparable existence, in life and in death. We are them and they are us."<sup>36</sup> (Puna Wano-Bryant, 25 July 2019)

180. The CIA confirms that the site of the plan change is located on what iwi believe is Kaitake (albeit outside of Egmont National Park) and includes Pahakahaka Pā located within the land identified as the 'McKie QEII Covenant' area.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Hearing Transcript. Puna Wano-Bryant, 25 July 2019

<sup>37</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment. para 6.2

181. The CIA describes the bond between the tāngata whenua and Kaitake as inseparable and fundamental to the foundation of Ngāti Tāiri and Taranaki Iwi. These bonds are also expressed through cultural practices and art forms evolved from generations of occupation. Tāngata whenua draw strength from the energy of Kaitake; the flora and fauna that was abundant from the slopes to the sea which allowed Ngāti Tāiri prosper and flourish.<sup>38</sup>
182. The applicant provided its view that the proposed plan site was outside the inland Kaitake ranges and would not have any effects on them.
183. The landscape architects for the applicant and submitters provided contrary views. Landscape architects for the Council, Ms Emma McRae and Mr Boyden Evans stated, that the applicant's landscape architect, Mr Bain had no evidence to conclude that *'Associative values of natural character and legibility of the Kaitake Range/rural environment are clearly maintained with the new structure plan'*. Ms McRae and Mr Evans indicated that the assessment had not taken into consideration iwi associative values regarding Kaitake.
184. The applicant has proposed to address these matters by:
- a) The extent of the plan change area proposed for urban development takes its cues from the natural features of the site and avoids the upslope 'Inland Area' identified in the Oākura Structure Plan Area 2006.
  - b) Wairau Estate will locate on the lowest land of the site and will not compete with the dominant landform that is Kaitake.
  - c) Building controls, and limitations on height and reflectivity values in particular, are mitigations that show sensitivity toward Kaitake.
  - d) Emphasis on minimal disturbance of the Wairau Stream and tributaries, together with the enhancement of these areas with indigenous plantings to screen the urban component.
  - e) The enhanced open space areas will provide support for wildlife habitat and will help to restore a 'living link' between the coastal edge and Kaitake.
185. The Cultural Impact Assessment concludes on the matter of Kaitake by stating that *"landscape effects, and the ability to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of the proposal on the relationship mana whenua have with Kaitake is an issue that this CIA process to date has been unable to reach a conclusion, and therefore a precautionary approach must be taken with regard to these effects"*.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment, para 6.4

<sup>39</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment, para 7.11

186. The conclusions of the CIA in this regard are problematic. On the one hand the CIA establishes the relationship between tāngata whenua and Kaitake and confirms the importance of that relationship. However, on the other hand the CIA does not provide a conclusive or determinative view on the level of effects of the plan change on the relationship of Ngati Tairi/Taranaki iwi with the Kaitake range. The reporting officers, Ngati Tairi and Taranaki iwi have deferred to the CIA to determine the effects and measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate them.
187. The applicant has indicated that the plan change area avoids the 'Inland Area' identified in the Oākura Structure Plan Area 2006, the area to be developed is on the lowest land of the site and will not compete with the dominant landform of Kaitake. There will be controls on built form which will be sensitive to Kaitake, there will be minimal disturbance to the Wairau Stream and revegetation/habitat restoration is planned.
188. I am of the view that there will be adverse effects on the relationship of Ngati Tairi and Taranaki Iwi with Kaitake, and its natural character. There will be permanent change in landcover, pasture will be replaced by urban residential development and roading. These effects will be mitigated by building restrictions and the limits on density. The relationship will be enhanced through access to the area and some cultural recognition of the history through signage, street naming and open space planting. I am of the view the adverse effects on iwi and hapu relationship with the Kaitake will be moderate (more than minor).

### **Pahakahaka Pā**

189. According to Ms Puna Wano-Bryant of Taranaki Iwi:
- "The pā site is Pāhakahaka and requires more korero that only a full and comprehensive cultural impact assessment can provide. Let me share with you in closing some context regarding the land, which, like the Kaitake, isn't limited to a boundary, zone or land title but forms part of a broad range of values, stories of peace and war and resulting effects".<sup>40</sup>*
190. The Pa site is located outside the plan change site area within the adjacent Lot 29, the QEII Covenant Area. However, it is recognised by the applicant that the interface between the plan change area and the Pa requires sensitive management.<sup>41</sup>
191. The applicant has proposed a new Policy 23.10.1 to recognise and protect Pahakahaka Pa, unrecorded cultural or archaeological features uncovered at time of earthworks, and provide for adaptive management of historic heritage resources and showing the open space are within which Pahakahaka Pa is located.

---

<sup>40</sup> Transcript of Day 4 Hearing, 25 July 2019

<sup>41</sup> Closing legal submissions on behalf of Oakura Farm Park Ltd. 20 December 2019. para 61

192. The planning map A61 is proposed to be amended to show Pahakahaka Pa (Wahi taonga # 2261).
193. The land adjoining the Pa and within 50m will be set aside as open space reserve and there will be rules controlling development. There are other rules providing for the open space areas to vest as reserves, which in turn will require the preparation of reserve management plans by the Council.
194. The approach taken by the applicant to identify, recognise and provide for protection of Pahakahaka Pa is appropriate and consistent with principles of active protection of sites of significance and wahi tapu. The further recognition of unrecorded cultural and archaeological sites and features is consistent with the precautionary approach.
195. The adverse effects of the plan change proposal on Pahakahaka Pa are considered to be low (less than minor).

#### **NPS-FM 2014 (amended 2017) / Proposed NPS-FM 2019 - Te Mana o Te Wai**

196. The NPS-FM 2014 considers and recognises Te Mana o te Wai as an integral part of freshwater management. It does this through Objective AA1: To consider and recognise Te Mana o te Wai in the management of fresh water and its corresponding policy AA1:

##### *Policy AA1*

*By every regional council making or changing regional policy statements and plans to consider and recognise Te Mana o te Wai, noting that:*

- a) te Mana o te Wai recognises the connection between water and the broader environment – Te Hauora o te Taiao (the health of the environment), Te Hauora o te Wai (the health of the waterbody) and Te Hauora o te Tāngata (the health of the people); and*
- b) values identified through engagement and discussion with the community, including tāngata whenua, must inform the setting of freshwater objectives and limits.*

197. The requirements of Te Mana o Te Wai apply to regional councils when preparing their regional policy statements and plans. There is no requirement to ensure rights and interests of tāngata whenua are reflected in freshwater management, rather the NPS-FM 2014 refers to ‘values and interests.’ Both the RPS and regional plan for freshwater pre-date the NPS-FM and any proposed RPS and regional plan are yet to be notified. The New Plymouth District Council is required to give effect to any regional policy statement and plans, as is relevant to a district plan. The particular provisions of the Regional Policy Statement are as follows:

##### *Taranaki Regional Policy Statement:*

- *Section 6 Fresh Water – WAL Objective 2, WAL Policy 3*

- *Section 16 Statement of resource management issues of significance to iwi authorities – TOW Objective 1, TOW Policy 1, TOW Policy 2, KTA Objective 1, KTA Policy 1, CSV Objective 1, CSV Policy 1, CSV Policy 3.*

198. Objectives and policies in Section 16 relate to taking into account the Treaty of Waitangi, Kaitiakitanga, the relationship of Māori with land and cultural and spiritual values of tāngata whenua. Consultation has been undertaken with Tāngata Whenua but in light of the submission from Taranaki Iwi, further consideration of these matters is required. (para 11.12)
199. The reporting officer has not identified any relevant objectives, policies, and methods from the Taranaki Regional Plan – Freshwater 2001. The ODP predates the NPS-FM and is currently under review. Whilst many of the objectives and policies appear to be relevant, methods are not functions of territorial authorities and not relevant to the matters being considered in respect of this plan change.
200. I am of the view that little weight if any can be given to the proposed NPS-FM 2019. The proposed NPS received more than 17,000 submissions. The proposals are controversial and substantial change is most likely. The outcomes of decisions on this policy statement are difficult to anticipate.
201. The applicant has added a new policy to the plan change that recognises and provides for Te Mana o Te Wai. The applicant's response to recognising and providing for Te Mana o Te Wai in policy 23.10.4 is problematic in that the NPS-FM 2014 anticipates regional councils leading the implementation of Te Mana o Te Wai through regional policy statement and regional plans.
202. The Taranaki Regional Policy Statement 2010 predates the NPS-FM and although is under review an RPS to reflect Te Mana o Te Wai is not yet available and cannot be considered. The inclusion of policy 23.10.4 is ultra vires, being out of step with the planning process and may not only be inconsistent but unlikely to give effect to the future proposed RPS and future NPS-FM 2019 changes. The full consideration of Te Mana o Te Wai across the district is best left to the processes underway at a national and regional level.
203. The proposed policy 23.10.4 – Subdivision, use and development shall recognise and provide for Te Mana o te Wai within the Wairau Estate Structure Plan area should be deleted.

### **Wastewater Management**

204. Council has invested in strategic infrastructure capacity to enable this anticipated growth in Oākura. There is currently available infrastructure capacity for reticulated potable water treatment and supply, and the wastewater reticulation capacity has been the subject of a

significant investment in the last 20 years, with the establishment of the trunk main between Oākura and the wastewater treatment plant at New Plymouth.

205. The reporting officer concludes that measures were available to effectively provide for wastewater infrastructure for the original plan change proposed. These measures are included in the plan change as currently drafted, including consideration of the provision of infrastructure at the time of subdivision. No changes are proposed by the applicant relating to these measures, with the revised structure plan now proposed. The reporting officer previous assessment stands and there are no outstanding wastewater infrastructure matters.<sup>42</sup>
206. The cultural effects relating to the management of wastewater are addressed via Policy 23.10.2 in the provisions, and associated implementation methods:

Policy 23.10.2

Subdivision, use and development shall avoid any adverse effects resulting from wastewater infrastructure on all waterbodies within the Wairau Estate Structure Plan area.

**Proposed Planting (7.33 in the CIA)**

207. The Cultural Impact Assessment sought further detail and information on the stream margin reserve management areas. In particular, how these will be planted, walkways construction and who will own and manage these reserve areas. The iwi and hapu sought:
- Consideration should be given to planting proposed, its species and that it is eco sourced and native to the area; and
  - Specific provisions requiring the control of impervious surfaces and site coverage on sites.
  - Specific provisions regarding stormwater infrastructure and outcome that must be achieved in relation to the remediation of these waterbodies.
  - Specific provision regarding wastewater services and avoiding any impact on the Wairau Stream and tributaries.
208. According to the applicant, the planting/vegetative screening within the urban area will be developed in accordance with a Landscape Framework Plan as part of subdivision design, including street trees, entrance planting, and berm planting. Special areas of ecological and amenity planting will be located at key locations such as street intersections, the recreation space, stream crossing over the tributary of the Wairau Stream, and along pedestrian/cycle

---

<sup>42</sup> Response to Further Evidence for Reconvened Hearing. 22 November 2019. Para 3.53

linkages. Mr Bain's evidence for the applicant relies heavily on the existing QEII covenant area planting stating:

*"...over time, a diminishing rural outlook as the vegetation within the QEII area that is interposed between The Paddocks and Wairau Estate grows to maturity".<sup>43</sup>*

209. The applicant did not seek to recall their ecologist Mr Bevers to respond to the revised and reduced scale of the plan change. In his evidence in chief presented at the July hearing, Mr Bevers concluded that ecological protection and enhancement methods [that he] proposed will provide positive ecological effects in terms of increasing the area of habitat, increasing biodiversity and increasing native animal population sizes.<sup>44</sup> He considered the effects of the plan change would be less than minor. This was based on the very specific measures including reducing impervious surfaces, stormwater treatment design outcomes, planting requirements he recommended, not only for the species to be planted and their location, but also the avoidance of areas to allow for natural protection of existing and planted species. These recommendations were made on ecological values rather than visual or amenity values.

210. The applicant has instead relied on landscape screening and amenity planting (including the QEII covenant area outside the plan change area) to mitigate 'visual' effects. The proposed plan change policy 23.8 sets out the context and extent of planting to be implemented through a planting plan that supports an open space plan landscape framework plan and a streetscape plan.

*"b) Develop an OPEN SPACE Landscape Framework Plan setting out the overall landscape features and elements for the Wairau Estate Structure Plan Area together with a planting plan showing the species to be planted and the staging/sequencing of its implementation.*

*c) Develop a Streetscape Plan together with a planting plan detailing location, species, staging and the timing of planting".<sup>45</sup>*

211. The applicants approach relies on landscape screening and amenity planting to address any visual effects but does not address any ecological effects and does not appear to incorporate any of the measures recommended by Mr Bevers.

212. A new policy could be added to the plan change that specifically addresses ecological values, particularly those around the Wairau Stream and tributaries. The policy should have as a method of implementation the preparation and implementation of a planting plan linked to the

---

<sup>43</sup> Response to Council Officers Report and further submissions of Richard Bain, 2 December, 2019. para 11.

<sup>44</sup> Summary of Statement of Evidence. Bevers. Tabled 22 July 2019.

<sup>45</sup> Wairau Road, Oakura Rezoning Amendments required to Operative District Plan, December 2019. Policy 23.8 Methods of Implementation b) and c)

Mr Bevers ecological report or its recommendations. No such policy and implementation measures have been proposed.

213. In the absence of implementing the ecologists' recommendations, the current approach is considered to be minimalist and conservative. There are no real plans to restore biodiversity and habitats in the area of the plan change, rather enhancing aesthetic, and urban landscape values.

#### **Additional Provisions (7.34 in the CIA)**

214. As outlined in the sections above, in order to appropriately manage some of the potential adverse effects resulting from the plan change on the relationship Ngāti Tāiri and the Trust hold with this area, as well as protecting areas of historic heritage, recommended that additional provisions need to be provided in the structure plan.
215. Those matters set out in Appendix 1 of the CIA have been incorporated by the applicant into the proposed provisions of the plan change. No other provisions have been recommended by the reporting officer, iwi, and the applicant. The Memorandum of Understanding and the engagement that will be undertaken between the applicant and tāngata whenua is relied upon by the applicant and Ngāti Tairi to address matters of detail in subsequent resource consent processes.

#### **5km development prohibition**

216. Te Kahui o Taranaki has submitted that they oppose any development within 5km of the National Park. The position is derived from Taiao Tairora Section 11.8.3(7) – Taranaki Iwi will not support any residential subdivision and development within 5km of the National Park boundaries. The issue this policy appears to be related to is 11.8.1(5) - *New developments from human activity on and around the mouna can impact on the natural environment and the important cultural value our iwi associates with Taranaki Mouna*. There is no obvious objective under 11.8.2 that the policy applies to specifically.
217. When asked if the position was a matter of principle or substance, the iwi representative confirmed that it was the latter. The lack of an objective for this policy in the iwi management plan does support a view that this opposition is in principle, particularly when given only residential subdivision and development activity has been singled out and not the effects of such development.
218. This position when tested geographically appears to avoid most small villages and towns around the national park with the exception of all of Oākura and over half of nearby Okato. The policy position therefore most affects Oākura and Okato and opposes permitted infill residential

development, future urban zones and nodes for infrastructure and development provided for in planning instruments such as the district plan.

219. The 5km restriction called for by the Iwi on residential subdivision and development is not supported by evidence presented to the commission. Placing a moratorium or prohibition on residential subdivision and development over all of Oākura would be draconian and not supported by the operative planning framework.
220. The weight given to an Iwi Management Plan is guided by s74(2A), where local authorities must take into account the iwi management plan. This weight is less than 'give effect to', 'must be consistent with', 'recognise and provide for' and 'have particular regard to'. The applicant and the reporting officer are of the view that the plan change has 'taken into account' the Taiao-Taiora Iwi Management Plan. This considers that the applicant may not need to 'abide' by every single policy position in the plan, particularly prohibitive and directive policy statements, but will account for the issues of concern, and make appropriate and reasonable steps to address them in a considered manner.
221. The contextual application of the directive and absolute policy of prohibiting residential development at Oākura is problematic and contrary to the planning framework.

### **Summary of Cultural Matters**

222. I understand that Ngāti Tairi representatives of Oākura Pa appear to have a positive and constructive relationship with the Applicant, with an MoU in place. Taranaki Iwi and some of Ngāti Tairi whanui are opposed to the proposed plan change and seek that it is declined in its entirety.
223. I have considered the relevance of Te Mana o Te Wai, protection of Pahakahaka Pa, and the relevant provisions of the iwi management plan, Taiao Taiora and consider these matters either not relevant (Te Mana o Te Wai) or appropriately taken into account. There is still uncertainty with regard to the plan change approach to ecological values which I consider is minimalist and conservative, and the scale of the adverse effects on the relationship Taranaki and Ngati Tairi have with Kaitake which are likely to be moderate.
224. A key and outstanding issue is that limited consultation has been undertaken by the applicant with the iwi authority. This consultation has occurred very late in the plan change process, on a proposal fully developed, and in the absence of their input. The Te Kahui o Taranaki Trust have articulated their resource management issues of concern in submissions, attendance at the hearing and support in the CIA preparation and delivery on the last day of hearings.

## Social and Community Matters

### Applicant

225. I received expert evidence on landscape, ecology, stormwater, traffic, and planning, however, I did not receive any expert social impact evidence. The applicants' view was that I had ample evidence on which to consider social and community related matters:

*"The commission has better evidence presented on behalf of submitters in opposition can leave the commissioner in no doubt that he has a full and complete understanding of the community concerns regarding potential social effects arising from the plan change. The commission has 'better evidence' than an SIA, the commissioner has direct evidence from an extensive cross section of the Oākura community on the issue. Based on the evidence there is no evidential gap, and the commissioner as a highly experienced planner can properly evaluate that evidence".<sup>46</sup>*

226. The applicant chose to emphasise the positive social effects on the new residents and generalise the positive impacts on the existing residents. The effects on the existing 'Paddocks' residents appear in the main to have been ignored, or in the case of their opposition dismissed through small clauses in sale agreements. The potential negative social effects of the proposal were acknowledged and a 'reduced' scale and size of plan change was proposed that would make all negative social effects 'fall away'.

227. Mr Comber in his further evidence has cited other plan change requests or consent applications in the District that have not required a Social Impact Assessment (SIA) in an attempt to justify a position that an SIA should not have to be provided.

228. I am familiar with two of the examples quoted being the Bluehaven Commercial development and the Green School. Both applications were limited notification resource consent processes where all identified affected parties had provided their written approval.

229. I note that Plan Change PPC18/00049 at Johnston Street, Waitara received 18 submissions, PLC10/00025 at Cowling Road/Tukapa Street/Frankley Road received 15 submissions, PLC09/00020 Area Q Rezoning received 29 submissions and PLC09/00015 FUD overlay received 25 submissions.

230. In this case the request has received 396 submissions in opposition and many of the submitters articulated their concerns related to social impacts in detail at the hearing including the Oākura

---

<sup>46</sup> Muldowney Closing Submissions

Primary School and the Kaitake Community Board. I do not consider it helpful to compare the request to the cases above as the request has a very different set of circumstances.<sup>47</sup>

231. The applicant modified the proposal to respond to the concerns raised during the hearing.<sup>48</sup>

*"I am happy that we have come up with a project that strikes the right balance between preserving the community's way of life but enabling others to enjoy the benefits of a lifestyle in Oākura in the future".<sup>49</sup>*

*"The layout 'future proofs' the subdivision for possible growth in the long term, should that one day, long into the future, be deemed appropriate".<sup>50</sup>*

232. The applicant was also of the view that social impacts will be significantly reduced as a result of the reduced size of the proposed plan change, the 'modest' and logical expansion of the township and the sequential stages consisting of 24-33 lots.

233. The 144 dwellings (if all lots had one residence) would translate to 18-19 households having children of primary/intermediate age attending Oākura School.<sup>51</sup>

234. Mr Comber was of the view that a social impact assessment cannot be reasonably justified, and a Community Development Liaison Group is an appropriate mechanism to monitor for potential social impacts. I note that Mr Comber is not a social impact expert.

### **Submitter views**

235. I heard from a very large number of submitters who reside at Oākura who described its special characteristics being physical, social, educational, natural, and spiritual elements and attributes. I heard of the special relationships and values residents share and the behaviours expressed in everyday life. The two quotes from submissions below give a feel for the tenor of community perceptions regarding local character:

*"How do you define a 'small village feel'? Low population, tight knit communities that work together for the betterment of their village and each other. Most people know one another, if not by name, then by face and everyone pitches in to help. Strong community focused groups, a small school, play centre, library, pub, a marae, an old hall, fish and chip shop, church, for service, a little local newspaper etc...Oākura is advertised as 'picturesque, relaxed atmosphere...family*

---

<sup>47</sup> Statement of Evidence: Twigley. 25 June 2019.

<sup>48</sup> Response of Michael McKie. 2 December 2019. Para 6.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid, para 8.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid, para 10.

<sup>51</sup> Further Evidence: Skerrett, 2 Dec 2019, para 16.

*friendly...close knit community." A village indeed. At the moment it is almost entirely walkable in the urban area and it is the residents' desire to have it that way.*"<sup>52</sup>

*"...its relaxed village sense of place, the people, its productive fertile soils for horticulture, its sheltered climatic position, the beach and easy access and connectedness to village amenities".*<sup>53</sup>

236. Many submitters spoke to Oākura's proximity of beach, inland bush, commercial centre are key characteristics of a cohesive community. They described the physical aspects of the community, both their location, proximity and qualities and the social qualities that bind and connect individuals, families, and groups.
237. Some of these social qualities included:
- way of life
  - cohesion, stability, character, services, and facilities in a community
  - proximity and access to inland bush and coastal beaches
  - modest and functional community facilities and services
  - aesthetic contrasts and blending of the natural and built form
  - the marae
  - willingness of community members to participate in sports, recreation, voluntary projects, and local government
  - strong sense of identity and belonging
  - strategic plans for the future of Oākura
  - formal local representation
  - family, community, and social networks.
238. Most submitters either in their original submissions or in their submission to the hearing raised concern for social impacts as a result of the proposed plan change. Many requested that a social impact assessment be prepared by an expert.
239. The key issues were centred around the impact of a sudden and large population increase undermining the village social cohesion and overwhelming community facilities and services. These community facilities and services included the Oākura School and sports ground, early childhood centres, Corbett Park (sport ground), carparking, shops, lifesaving, and fire service.
240. Forty-nine of the submitters believed sufficient social impact had been articulated in submissions and felt that any further SIA would provide the same results.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Sarah Foreman #159

<sup>53</sup> Sam Dixon #266

<sup>54</sup> Further evidence on behalf of 49 submitters, 2 December 2019

241. Acting for some of the submitters in opposition, Cameron Twigley was of the view that the scale and significance of those effects will be dependent on the scale and nature of the rezoning.<sup>55</sup> He gave considerable weight to the views of KCB submission on the social impacts of the request. Mr Twigley holds a Bachelor of Social Science in Geography from Waikato University and a Postgraduate Diploma (with Distinction) in Urban and Regional Planning from Heriot Watt University, Edinburgh.<sup>56</sup>
242. The Kaitake Community Board (KCB) represented many of the community views. Their submission was broad and detailed. The KCB made specific comments regarding the context for social matters by saying:
- “...the FUDs identified for the Oākura community were developed with the specific intent to highlight the necessity for development and population growth in the community to be undertaken in a manner that does not compromise the natural or social environment, and conserves and maintains the rural character and the associated amenity values of Oākura”.*<sup>57</sup>
243. The KCB compared the engagement processes of the Kaitake Community Plan with the plan change.
244. The KCB facilitated the community involvement in all this work with no foregone conclusions, no ulterior motive, and no self-interest. The combined outcome of these processes provides a clear view of the social foundation of Oākura and how residents want their residential and business community to develop over time. The applicant has not liaised as effectively with the community to ensure anywhere near as wide public participation in the development of this proposal. Yet the application attempts to convince that the proposed scheme is in sync with the outcomes of all this extensive work.<sup>58</sup>
245. The KCB submission has importantly contextualised the social matters as part of, and connected to, other factors that make Oākura special.
246. The submission states that the subdivision will compromise the community’s natural and social environment and endanger the rural character and the associated amenity values of Oākura.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Statement of Further Evidence. 15 November 2019. Para 6-10

<sup>56</sup> Cameron Twigley, Planning Expert, 25 June 2019

<sup>57</sup> Kaitake Community Board Submission. 23 July 2019.

<sup>58</sup> Kaitake Community Board Submission. 23 July 2019. Page 13, para 54

<sup>59</sup> Kaitake Community Board Submission. 23 July 2019. Page 46. para 207

## Reporting officer views

247. The Reporting Officer relied on the views of submitters to inform their view of social impacts. He went further to recommend the undertaking of a social impact assessment to understand how the development would contribute to or detract from the economic and social prosperity of Oākura.<sup>60</sup> In terms of s32 (2)(c) RMA, the social impacts of this proposal could be significant, particularly considering the scale of this proposal in the context of the existing settlement.
248. I was presented with a range of strategies, plans and documents. Of particular note to social matters, were the Oākura Structure Plan and Kaitake Community Board Plan, and considered relevant strategies, prepared under the Local Government Act by the reporting officer.<sup>61</sup>
249. The Kaitake Community Board Plan: A Thirty-Year Vision 2017 sets out the visions and aspirations for Oākura, Okato and Omata, with the plan being developed with the community. The Plan provides an indication to NPDC about the matters important to the Board, where investment and action is required and a blueprint for the communities to shape future growth and development. In the Plan the Board stresses, Oākura requires managed, staged, and targeted growth. It is believed rapid and widespread expansion would negatively affect the special character of Oākura and adversely impact on matters such as education services, traffic, and environmental assets.
250. In the Plan, the Board have organised their priorities to align with the eight areas of the blueprint and thus community feedback is organised in regard to: Environment, Communities, Citizens, Growth, Industry, Talent, Central City and Destination, to guide Council in its decision making for Oākura. I consider the directions and priorities in this report in evaluating the plan change below, particularly in relation to the appropriateness of the rezoning.
251. Mr Wesley concluded that, in terms of s32 (2)(c) RMA, based on the available information, they consider there is still uncertainty with regards to the social impacts. Therefore, they consider the risk of acting (in the form of approving the plan change) with insufficient or uncertain information remains uncertain.<sup>62</sup>
252. With the reduced scale of the revised proposal, the reporting officer deemed the social impacts likely to be less. However, the magnitude of the social impacts were still uncertain, and it was unclear whether specific measures were required to manage these effects. While Mr Wesley saw merit in the suggested community development liaison group, he questioned the

---

<sup>60</sup> Reporting Officers Response to Evidence presented at Hearing, 19 August 2019, para 4.100 and 4.101

<sup>61</sup> S42A Report on Proposed Private Plan Change 48: Wairau Road, Oākura Rezoning 31 May 2019. para 71 and 72.

<sup>62</sup> Section 42A, 22 November 2019, para 3.69.

effectiveness and ability to implement such a group via District Plan provisions – this group could be a method outside the District Plan.<sup>63</sup>

253. He concluded that PPC48 is silent on what mechanisms may be available to provide community infrastructure. There are no specific or measurable upgrades or new facilities identified apart from the new sports field/facility in the West FUD.

### **Discussion and findings**

#### **No social impact assessment**

254. The absence of a social impact assessment has not assisted deliberations on whether the social effects can be articulated by an appropriate and suitably qualified expert in social impact terms and related directly to the RMA. The applicant and the Council have not contracted an expert in social effects in the preparation of the plan change or in the proceedings. The Council has not produced any expert evidence or sought advice from its community development staff.
255. I have been left to make a value judgement in respect of social matters based on the views of the parties in lay evidence (mostly in opposition) rather than any expert opinion.
256. I do not have a baseline of social conditions (other than that articulated in impact terms by lay submitters) and do not have a clear view of the scale and duration of positive and negative effects that might be relevant.
257. I have not heard any evidence of social impact on minority groups including tāngata whenua.
258. I am left to consider strong community sentiments and shared perceptions from submitters in opposition and the view of the applicant that no further assessment was required, and that there was sufficient information upon which to make a decision.

#### **Demographics**

259. Oākura had a population of approximately 1,200 residents in 2001, and on average has grown at two per cent per year. There has been demand for new dwellings in Oākura, and for lifestyle development within the rural area. The population of Oākura encompasses a diverse group of people that represent a variety of views on pertinent issues. There is a deep-seated sense of identity amongst the people in the community, who share a strong vision for the future.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Section 42A, 22 November 2019, Para 3.67

<sup>64</sup> Oākura Structure Plan 2007. New Plymouth District Council. page 7

260. In 2006 the population had about 1,356 residents. The population growth assumptions underlying Statistics New Zealand projections do not take account of potential impacts from local planning directions for population growth and socio-economic development.<sup>65</sup>
261. The population of Oākura has been stated to be between 1,200 and 1,380. We understand that Oākura has a population of more than 1,380 (Census 2013) and 516 occupied dwellings.<sup>66</sup>
262. Submissions have quoted 549 dwellings in Oākura in 2018, demand for a further 247 new dwellings by 2048, in 30 years' time. That is growth of about eight dwellings per annum.<sup>67</sup>
263. Oākura is identified as a hub for future permanent and holiday settlement and growth in the New Plymouth District Coastal Strategy. Given these strategic drivers it is likely that the actual population growth for Oākura will be considerably higher than that projected by Statistics New Zealand. The projection estimates made by Statistics New Zealand are based on existing patterns of births, deaths, and migration, and do not take account of such localised factors and drivers in Oākura and its surrounding district.<sup>68</sup>
264. There are at least a dozen different sports clubs, however there are a number of sports that are not played at Oākura, mostly due to not having facilities. Some examples are basketball (NZs most played school sport), touch rugby and swimming.<sup>69</sup>
265. The s42A report 19 Aug 2019 (p7) does not provide any information on the anticipated or projected population or housing growth being planned for, apart from a general reference in the introduction that 'Oākura had a population of approximately 1,200 residents in 2001, and on average has grown at two per cent per year.'
266. Estimates of new residents from the original proposal vary from 1,065-1,200 people, or a 60-62% increase.

### **Reduction in scale**

267. The applicant has changed the proposal considerably in size and scale to what was originally proposed. By doing so the applicant has in my view raised considerable anxiety and mistrust among community members. This turnaround appears to be both pragmatic and tactical. The structure of what is proposed now is as mentioned reduced in size and scale [and some measures have dropped out – such as the underpass, lifestyle blocks and ecological, and

---

<sup>65</sup> Oākura Recreation and Community Facility Study Report. 2011. Section 2.1, page 7.

<sup>66</sup> Taken from Statement of Stefan Kiss

<sup>67</sup> I Frame #133, para 9

<sup>68</sup> Oākura Recreation and Community Facility Study Report. 2011. Section 2.1, page 7.

<sup>69</sup> Oākura Recreation and Community Facility Study Report. 2011. Section 2.1, page 7

uncertainty of land not part of plan change [with stub roads]. These matters have some bearing on maintaining or enhancing social well-being, for example an underpass would facilitate alternative modes of transport between the plan change area and the village commercial centre, facilitating leisure and recreation activity.

268. The applicant has relied on this approach to address any and all social effects resulting from the plan change. It can only be assumed that there is no appetite to address social effects actively, rather achieve a plan change with little or no encumbrances.
269. It is assumed that the reduced lot and staged development would result in less pressure on community facilities and services, however this would be a simple and untested view in the absence of understanding what the nature, scale and duration of the impacts may have been for both the original proposal and the reduced scale proposal. The 'revised' plan change may now not include aspects of the original proposal that enhanced positive social effects and mitigated against negative ones. The nature of effects may still be present, regardless of the reduced scale of the development.
270. If population growth occurred at a slow rate community infrastructure may be able to cope, if its planned for, however, there is no mechanism in the plan change which manages this rate of development, or provides a link with the capacity of the community infrastructure.
271. The applicant is ultimately relying on the community facilities and services to respond and absorb any pressure derived from the plan change and provide access to the existing community lifestyle and facilities/services.

### **Reliance on the vehicle**

272. The applicant has developed and proposes a vehicle centric residential development, with some internal open spaces that will have walking access. This would on face value mean that future plan changes (extensions of residential development) in this area would follow and be led by existing infrastructure, service corridors and spatial planning. The lack of future proofing other modes of access will be a constraint on future development that may have to retrofit.
273. It is difficult to identify and quantify any such measures being proposed as of themselves which provide obvious and measurable benefit to the wider community in social terms.
274. It seems clear the applicant wishes to preserve their ability to seek either further plan changes and/or resource consents in the future to develop the balance of the land in Mr McKie's ownership.

275. I am of the view that the apparent reliance on private vehicle modes for transport, as a result of both the reduction in size and not proceeding with an underpass access, is an important strategic risk to future development in the area.

### **Positive social impacts**

276. There are likely to be positive effects as a result of the proposal. New residents of the proposed plan change area are likely to add to the melting pot of nationalities. New residents will bring vitality and diversity to the village, assuming that new residents actively engage and are accepted by the existing residents. Based on the views of many submitters, I am of the view that new residents will likely be attracted to Oākura because of the special character of the place.

277. It is difficult to identify and quantify what has been proposed as providing obvious and measurable benefit to the wider community in social terms. A community liaison group, without a clear and measurable monitoring method, is unlikely to achieve much, notwithstanding that the community is unlikely (based on the submissions of the Oākura School Board of Trustees and the Kaitake Community Board) to participate willingly or actively.

### **Nuisance effects**

278. We expect there will be nuisance effects from construction (noise, dust, traffic) over many years, particularly when using one entry and exit point. It is most likely there will be community disruption (traffic, noise, dust) as a result of construction over more than 10 years.

### **Community facilities**

279. We have not heard any evidence suggesting that there will be any short-medium term plan to purchase, develop and operate new sports fields.

280. In response to some submitters suggesting that slums and drug use will prevail, I find these suggestions unfounded. It is difficult to accept an argument that the resulting residential development will be of low quality, high density (multi-storey apartments) and by itself attract or encourage drug use.

281. Increased population will result in more demand for local services, potentially new services if the demographics are different to those in Oākura, for example retired or empty nesters.

282. The New Zealand average household occupancy for 2003 and 2006 is 2.7. The highest household occupancy in New Zealand, is in Mangere at 4.0. The New Plymouth household occupancy in 2013 was 2.5 and has been the same since 2001.

	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.7 (NZ average)</b>	<b>4.0</b>
144 lots	360pp	388.8pp	576pp
395 lots	987.5pp	1,066.5pp	1,580pp

283. The table above shows a rudimentary calculation of expected resident occupancy at the proposed plan change area based on New Plymouth, NZ average and highest occupancy rates. A 360-person population increase (more than 25%) is significant, however, the development is proposed to occur over five stages, with each stage comprising 24 – 33 lots, with an average and median of 29 lots. If this is done sequentially, this will reduce any sudden and significant population increases that may overwhelm community facilities and services.
284. The most recent and comprehensive study of community facilities was conducted in 2011. The study found that there was capacity within existing meeting spaces and club facilities, informal spaces, and walkways but there were either no multi-sport facilities, swimming, and limited toilets. Corbett Park was confirmed as having limited space and a significant natural hazard (flooding and inundation) that would limit and constrain any expansion.
285. None of the examined facilities available for public use reported being fully booked at peak times on a regular basis. For example, an examination of available booking records for the Oākura Hall suggests that capacity at the most desirable times from 3.30pm to 10pm weekdays and on weekends was still available. Capacity at less desirable times such as during midweek days was also available.
286. Organisations which either owned or leased facilities from Council, indicated that they also had capacity to lease space to other community groups so long as this activity did not interfere with their primary purpose or operation. Many of these organisations such as the Board Riders Club and the Rugby Club saw wider community use as desirable because it generated increased revenue and forged improved links into the community.
287. All facility managers indicated that increased community utilisation was possible and desirable. The issue was often one of how well a facility catered for the needs of potential hirers, rather than an actual lack of availability of potential quality booking times.<sup>70</sup>
288. Oākura has a range of meeting spaces (in addition to the Oākura Hall) which are available to the community on either a casual or regular booking basis. Most facility managers are happy to hire space so long as the hireage does not get in the way of their core facility use. However, hireage is

<sup>70</sup> Oākura Recreation and Community Facility Study Report. 2011. Section 6.7, page 61

not coordinated and often not advertised widely to the general community. Some optimisation of spaces was highlighted, however this was generally at a minor level.<sup>71</sup>

### **Impacts at Oākura School**

289. In New Zealand one third of households have children and of those an average of 1.9 children per household. As a very rough guide, some 90 children may be expected in the proposed plan change area. Some of these children will be of early childhood age (under 5), primary and intermediate (5-12) and secondary school age (12-17). Again, as per above, if the population of children is expected over the ten years of the development, the impact on enrolments in any particular age group at Oākura School are difficult to estimate or predict. Oākura School has a roll between 341 and 355. An increase of more than 10% of the roll (overall) is likely to cause some short-term challenges and difficulties with resourcing.
290. As an example, the applicant has chosen to not address qualitative matters of concern at the school, rather point out that the mandate and responsibility of effects sits with the Ministry of Education and the Board of Trustees. Whilst this is true to some extent, the applicant has side stepped addressing any potential and actual effects of the proposal. The applicant has stated that the school and the Ministry will provide extra classrooms and the school has technical capacity for up to 1000 students and any traffic matters can be addressed through a school led and resourced carparking plan.
291. Having considered the issues raised by the Board of Trustees, I conclude that there are benefits of undertaking a community wide social/community impact assessment and planning for growth in a manner that does rely on private plan change approaches. The Council, Community Board, and other key entities such as the Board of Trustees and community should be engaged and be key participants in a more holistic planning approach.

### **Proposed Mitigation: Proposed Community Development Liaison Group**

292. The applicant has proposed that a Community Development Liaison Group would be best to monitor social impacts, however they have not provided any baseline, methodology for monitoring, no draft terms of reference and no details regarding the responsibility for establishing and maintaining the liaison group including its resourcing.
293. I am of the view that a Community Liaison Group will not be sustainable and likely to be ineffective in the absence of community support.

---

<sup>71</sup> Oākura Recreation and Community Facility Study Report. 2011. Section 6.7, page 60

## Overall Finding

294. Social impacts are one of the key issues raised in submissions and the hearing.
295. No expert social impact evidence has been prepared and presented by the applicant. No social impact assessment has supported this plan change.
296. The applicant chose to emphasise the positive social effects on the new residents and generalise the positive impacts on the existing residents. The effects on the existing Paddocks residents appears in the main to have been ignored or in the case of their opposition dismissed through clauses in sale agreements. The potential negative social effects of the proposal were acknowledged and a 'reduced' scale and size of plan change was proposed that would make all negative social effects 'fall away'.
297. The reporting officer has been inconclusive stating that the social impacts are uncertain and PPC48 is silent on what mechanisms may be available to provide community infrastructure. There are no specific or measurable upgrades or new facilities have been identified apart from the new sports field/facility in the West FUD.
298. I am of the view that the social effects of the proposed plan change are likely to be experienced by the community over the duration of the development that occurs as a result of the plan change, estimated to be some 10 years.
299. I have been left to assess the 'reduced' plan change, however, the strong impression I am left with is that further development of residential dwellings in the original plan change area will be sought at a future date.
300. Those closest to the plan change area on Upper Wairau Road and the Paddocks subdivision will likely experience nuisance effects such as noise, dust and peak times for service vehicles and heavy vehicle trucks.
301. The apparent reliance on private vehicle modes for transport, as a result of both the reduction in size, and not proceeding with an underpass access, I think is an important strategic risk to future development in the area.
302. It is likely that community facilities and services will need to grow to meet more demand, but this demand should be expected, understood, and planned for. The management of these effects will best be linked to the size of each stage of development and the sequential roll-out of the stages over a long period e.g. ten or more years. A ten-year timeframe for development of the plan change area is likely to facilitate forward planning and implementation of new or

extended community facilities and services. I am not convinced that any of this work is going to be undertaken.

303. If population growth occurred at a slow rate community infrastructure may be able to cope, if its planned for, however, there is no mechanism in the plan change which manages this rate of development, or links with the capacity of the community infrastructure.
304. The applicant is ultimately relying on the community facilities and services to respond and absorb any pressure derived from the plan change and provide access to the existing community lifestyle and facilities/services. As a result, the development is unlikely to provide for the social well-being of the existing residents of Oākura.
305. Any effects experienced at the school as a result of the plan change (traffic, carparking roll pressure, sports grounds) are unaccounted for and no measures have been recommended by the applicant to address them.
306. The applicant has recommended a community liaison group be established and maintained, to address social impacts. I am of the opinion that a Community Liaison Group will not be helpful, unwelcome, and likely to be ineffective in the absence of a baseline, methodology and community ownership.
307. There are likely to be positive effects as a result of the proposal. New residents of the proposed plan change area are likely to add to the melting pot of nationalities. New residents will bring vitality and diversity to the village if new residents actively engage and are accepted by the existing residents. The special character of Oākura is likely to attract new residents.
308. It is clear from reading the NPDC Response to Evidence Report that the reason a SIA has been requested is due to the constant theme that came through in the submissions on the potential social impacts that the development could have on the village, its occupants and people's enjoyment of Oākura. While I acknowledge the reduced size of the scheme, I consider it is likely many of the concerns related to social impacts of the request will remain.
309. The social impact of PPC48 was an issue raised by a majority of the 396 submitters in opposition, however the plan change did not have the benefit of social impact assessment or expert opinion. This would have assisted the decision-making process and its participants in understanding and confirming the scale of effects and any appropriate measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate those effects.
310. In particular, the effects relating to community facilities and services, the relationship between social-community values and rural character and amenity values, reliance on the vehicle, nuisance effects during the construction of the development, and potential impacts on the school roll/resources and capacity of the school.

311. I am of the view that these matters should have been addressed in a comprehensive and professional manner and their absence has not brought these matters to a close.
312. On balance, this is a key issue that is required to be addressed and that there is uncertainty of acting given that the social impacts have not been adequately assessed in my opinion.

**Traffic Matters**

313. Mr Wesley<sup>72</sup> referred to Policy 23.1 of the ODP which provides direction in respect of the design and layout of future urban areas. Of particular relevance to traffic matters, are the following:

*To control the design and layout of future urban areas through structure plans to allow for the comprehensive development of the area by ensuring:*

- b) Infrastructure is provided in a co-ordinated manner by considering location, type and staging*
- d) That the constraints are identified and managed to ensure resilient and safe communities*
- g) Connectivity and accessible urban form is provided for.*

314. During the hearing, there was considerable uncertainty expressed by submitters and the reporting officer regarding how traffic effects were to be managed, whether there were to be two access points to the subject site and what the effects on the wider transport network, and any measures to address these effects.
315. The amended proposal resolved many of the concerns and uncertainties in respect of traffic matters. The reduction in scale and lot yield being limited to 144 lots, and a consequential reduction in total daily trip generation to 1,224 vehicle movements.
316. It is noted that Mr Doherty in response to the amended proposal, concluded that in the short term, interim measures could be put in place at the Wairau Rd/ SH45 intersection to effectively manage traffic effects. However, in the longer term he believed that the preferred solution was a roundabout. He further suggested that a trigger point for traffic on Upper Wairau Road is required as to when the roundabout would be required. Mr Doherty stated that:

*“To enforce this trigger, a District Plan provision could be applied to the plan change area which would be assessed at the time of subdivision and/or development. However, in terms of the wider network, there is still uncertainty about how the nature and magnitude of the*

---

<sup>72</sup> Wesley-Response to Further Evidence for Reconvened Hearing- 22.11 2019

*traffic effects, and what measures (if any), are required to ensure a resilient and safe transport network”.*

317. Mr Skerrett<sup>73</sup> proposed that various upgrades would be required such as footpath improvements, improvements to the cross-section of Upper Wairau Road and pedestrian crossing points. He concluded that the extent of the proposed upgrades can be determined at the time of subdivision consent and this could include any staging in accord with the development stages of the proposal.
318. Ms Standish<sup>74</sup> of NZTA confirmed its opposition to any new access onto SH45 on the basis that the highway is a limited access road and that no evidence had been presented that provided a compelling reason for it. It was noted that with the reduction in site yield due to the amended proposal, it could be demonstrated that the existing intersection would perform to an acceptable level even with 10 years of growth. The agency noted that traffic calming measures would be appropriate which would assist in speed reduction, and that there were options to improve vehicular and pedestrian safety in the vicinity of the SH 45/ Wairau Road intersection. In addition, Ms Standish sought some amendments to Policy 23.9 and Rule Res 100 to provide for the provision of vehicular and pedestrian safety improvements.
319. Mr Gladstone<sup>75</sup> was of the view that the applicant had taken a minimalist approach to the mitigation of undesirable traffic and mobility consequences of the amended proposal. He was of the view that the proposal had a focus on vehicular movement and that there should be greater provision for the safety and movement of vulnerable road users.
320. It is noted that Mr Wesley<sup>76</sup> in his response highlighted remaining concerns in respect of traffic effects and suggested that a range of traffic effects should be addressed by the plan change provisions. Amended plan change provisions were submitted with the closing submissions and various works are envisaged as outlined under Policy 23.9- Reasons. The provisions note that works would be required prior to any approval of the second stage of the development of Wairau Estate subdivision and the method of implementation would be via subdivision rules and matters of discretion to be addressed.
321. Overall, I am satisfied that any traffic effects have been addressed through the reduced scale of development as outlined in the amended proposal, and by the proposed amendments to Policy 23.9 and associated rules and the matters of discretion wen future applications for subdivision are considered.

---

<sup>73</sup> Skerrett Evidence: 11.10.19: Paras 22-26

<sup>74</sup> Standish Evidence :15.11.19- Paras 14 & 15, Appendix 1

<sup>75</sup> Gladstone Evidence:15.11.19

<sup>76</sup> Wesley Response to Evidence:02.12.19

### Three Waters

322. The applicant relied on the evidence of Mr Bain (landscape, layout, water supply allocation), Mr Bunn (stormwater), Mr Comber (water supply), Mr Bevers (ecology) and Mr Doy (structure plan and yield) with respect to the original proposal for 399 lots and reduced 144 lot plan change.
323. The reduced plan change was significant with regard to infrastructure capacity, availability, and likely performance.
324. The applicant ultimately referred to Council Three Waters Manager and the overall findings of the reporting officer.<sup>77</sup>
325. Many submitters raised concerns for the availability, capacity, and potential adverse effects of provision of three waters infrastructure.
326. The Iwi concerns for stormwater and wastewater were captured in the CIA prepared by Ngati Tairi and Taranaki iwi. I understand the key points in the CIA related to stormwater to be:
- Ngati Tairi supports retaining the Wairau Stream tributaries, planting, weed-pest-predator control, protection, and enhancement of waterbodies<sup>78</sup>
  - Concern for potential contaminants entering the Wairau Stream
  - Managing flow fluctuations
  - Remediating the mouri of these waterbodies<sup>79</sup>
  - Concern for waterbodies being turned into stormwater infrastructure and the impact on flow<sup>80</sup>
  - Promote water sensitive urban design<sup>81</sup>
  - Require specific provisions to avoid adverse effects on mouri<sup>82</sup>
  - Uncertainty regarding ownership, maintenance, and ongoing management<sup>83</sup>
  - Use of other stormwater treatment solutions such as swale drains, constructed wetlands, and tree bowels<sup>84</sup>
  - Support planting along road frontages<sup>85</sup>

327. And the concern for wastewater to be:

---

<sup>77</sup> Closing submissions of the applicant, 20 December 2019, paragraphs 39, 40 and 44

<sup>78</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment, 30 November 2019, paragraph 7.24

<sup>79</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment, 30 November 2019, paragraph 7.25

<sup>80</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment, 30 November 2019, paragraph 7.26

<sup>81</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment, 30 November 2019, paragraph 7.27

<sup>82</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment, 30 November 2019, paragraph 7.28

<sup>83</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment, 30 November 2019, paragraph 7.29

<sup>84</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment, 30 November 2019, paragraph 7.30

<sup>85</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment, 30 November 2019, paragraph 7.31

- The proximity of wastewater services to Wairau Stream and its tributaries<sup>86</sup>
- Specific provision and information regarding wastewater services and avoiding any impact on the Wairau Stream and tributaries.<sup>87</sup>

328. The CIA sets out in Appendix 1, a series of suggested plan provision drafting edits which are designed to address cultural issues. Those suggested edits are incorporated by the applicant into the proposed plan provisions through the introduction of new Amendment 3 Policy 23.10.1 through Policy 23.10.6, which provide a comprehensive set of policy provisions and implementation methods, which are then reflected in the residential rule framework. I have discussed the matter of stormwater and Te Mana o Te Wai in the cultural effects section of this decision and do not repeat it. Just to say I have found that those matters are not relevant considerations for the plan change.

329. The KCB submission raised concerns on a range of issues, however, following the reduced plan change scale and size, the KCB were silent on the matter of three waters. This is not unexpected as the thrust of their submissions was their view that the plan change was misaligned and out of step with the community vision and expectations for growth at Oākura.

330. Mr Twigley provided expert evidence on behalf of submitters. I understand his evidence to be:

- He supports the conclusions of the reporting officer Section 42a report as it relates to wastewater.<sup>88</sup>
- He accepts the NPDC advice that the maximum proven aquifer capacity to supply Oākura which is sufficient to meet Peak Day Demand is a total of 1279 residential lots.<sup>89</sup>
- The NPDC's groundwater take consent (ref:6114) expires in June 2020. An application for renewal has not been lodged yet and NPDC are designing/consenting and drilling a new bore before the end of this year to replace a failed bore. I understand that once the second bore has been drilled and pump tested, and a sustainable yield confirmed, that NPDC will be in a position to say with confidence how much water is available.<sup>90</sup>
- He agrees with the section 42a report that all existing zoned land should be apportioned the available capacity in the aquifer in the first instance.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment, 30 November 2019, paragraph 7.32

<sup>87</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment, 30 November 2019, paragraph 7.33

<sup>88</sup> Mr Cameron Twigley, Evidence in Chief, 25 June 2019, para 100

<sup>89</sup> Mr Cameron Twigley, Evidence in Chief, 25 June 2019, para 83

<sup>90</sup> Mr Cameron Twigley, Evidence in Chief, 25 June 2019, para 84

<sup>91</sup> Mr Cameron Twigley, Evidence in Chief, 25 June 2019, para 85

- He disagrees with a 50/50 split of water and considers a fairer way to split water supply would be 75% allocation to the West FUD (i.e. 250 lots) and 25% to South FUD/the triangle (i.e. 84 lots).<sup>92</sup>
- If Mr Doy's figures are considered to be a more accurate estimate, then West FUD at his calculated yield of 283 lots would receive 69% allocation and South FUD/the triangle at a yield of 125 lots would receive 31% Mr Doy's revised water supply allocation figure is 358 lots, so West FUD would receive 247 lots and South FUD/the triangle would receive 111 lots.<sup>93</sup>
- Appendix 22.2 of the ODP is clear that where reticulation is available, which in the case of the request it would be, then all new allotments shall provide a connection to the Council's urban reticulated water supply system via a service main, as per the Local Government Act 1974.<sup>94</sup>
- Policy 22.1 of the ODP is also clear that subdivision and development should provide for connection to reticulated water, stormwater, and sewerage systems where they are available, and it is practical to do so.<sup>95</sup>
- It would be highly unusual for a residential subdivision, where reticulation is available, to provide independent water supply at the scale proposed.<sup>96</sup>
- It is common for subdivision provisions in district plans to require residential subdivisions to connect to reticulated services where they are available. This allows Councils to plan and develop three waters infrastructure with certainty and confidence.<sup>97</sup>
- In Mr Twigley's opinion, the currently proposed provisions for water supply will not be efficient or effective in achieving objectives 22 and 23 and implementing policies 22.1 and 23.1 of the ODP.
- In regard to stormwater, I agree with Mr Peacock that for a proposal of the size and scale proposed a more detailed assessment should be undertaken as part of the request.<sup>98</sup>
- The applicant should be required to assess the risk and potential adverse effects of stormwater run-off on downstream users including children.<sup>99</sup>
- There is not enough information to determine the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed provisions in achieving objectives 22 and 23 and implementing policies 22.1 and 23.1 of the ODP.<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Mr Cameron Twigley, Evidence in Chief, 25 June 2019, para 88

<sup>93</sup> Mr Cameron Twigley, evidence in chief, 25 June 2019, para 89

<sup>94</sup> Mr Cameron Twigley, evidence in chief, 25 June 2019, para 93

<sup>95</sup> Mr Cameron Twigley, evidence in chief, 25 June 2019, para 94

<sup>96</sup> Mr Cameron Twigley, evidence in chief, 25 June 2019, para 95

<sup>97</sup> Mr Cameron Twigley, evidence in chief, 25 June 2019, para 96

<sup>98</sup> Mr Cameron Twigley, evidence in chief, 25 June 2019, para 102

<sup>99</sup> Mr Cameron Twigley, evidence in chief, 25 June 2019, para 101

<sup>100</sup> Mr Cameron Twigley, evidence in chief, 25 June 2019, para 103

331. Mr Grieve on behalf of some 50 submitters provided a two-page summary response to the revised plan change and the evidence of the applicants' experts. The response clarifies the key matters of concern, however, does not identify three waters as an outstanding issue.<sup>101</sup>
332. At the reconvened hearing Mr Duff, a resident at The Paddocks subdivision, shared his observations of stormwater management during periods of heavy rainfall.<sup>102</sup>

### **Reporting Officer/Council**

333. At the reconvened hearing Council officers provided full advice on the proposals, their likely performance, effects, and the process for implementation.

*“Overall, we consider a degree of conservatism is necessary as ultimately there is a limit to the availability of water and capacity of the wastewater system. There are a number of uncertainties that make an accurate prediction of serviceable lots difficult, but we are aware of the uncertainties and the need to gain a better understanding of supply and demand profiles. We are confident that we can service up to a total of 1,279 lots with current water and wastewater infrastructure. There is a possibility that we may be able to service a greater number in the future once additional work is done (e.g. drilling a new bore and confirming actual wastewater peaking factors and per capita generation). But this will take more work over the next few years. Until this work is done, we cannot commit to this. There is some uncertainty around the impact of stormwater and this needs to be more accurately assessed due to a current lack of reliable modelling. A staged approach may be possible making the release of land subject to confirmation of some of the uncertainties noted above”.*<sup>103</sup>

334. In regard to wastewater, the reporting officer concluded that measures were available to effectively provide for wastewater infrastructure for the original plan change proposed. These measures are included in the plan change as currently drafted, including consideration of the provision of infrastructure at the time of subdivision. No changes are proposed by the applicant relating to these measures, with the revised structure plan now proposed. The reporting officer previous assessment stands and there are no outstanding wastewater infrastructure matters.<sup>104</sup>
335. The reporting officer relied on the evidence of the Infrastructure team at NPDC. Whilst they identified some uncertainties, they were confident that three waters matters would not be a fatal constraint on the plan change. Mr Wesney advised me that the outstanding matters to be

---

<sup>101</sup> Mr Grieve on behalf of previous submitters, further submissions for Reconvened Hearing of 2nd December 2019

<sup>102</sup> Reconvened Hearing transcript, 2 December 2019, page 263

<sup>103</sup> Response to evidence of hearing, 19 August 2019, NPDC Infrastructure Group Report, page 10

<sup>104</sup> Response to Further Evidence for Reconvened Hearing. 22 November 2019. Para 3.53

resolved were identified at 7.26 – 7.31 of CIA (stormwater and Te Mana o Te Wai) and 7.33 of CIA (wastewater).<sup>105</sup>

336. Mr Hall provided advice at the reconvened hearing on stormwater as follows:

- There are three things that have been clarified with further evidence. The first of these is flooding of the Wairau Stream. Based on the applicants' evidence, and the modelling they have done, it is apparent that there are some capacity issues in the lower Wairau Stream. The Council believes that the applicants' evidence does demonstrate, though, that this development would not materially affect the current situation that is caused by existing development. This is subject to the applicant ensuring that the design is hydraulically neutral. We are satisfied with the process they have done that they have demonstrated that.
- The second point raised in the cultural impact assessment is regarding stormwater treatment. The ponds that are proposed by the applicant are themselves an effective form of treatment. It is noted, though, that there would be some refinement around the ponds' exact form, given that the proposal that they have put in their application was a pretty stock standard sediment control structure from the Waikato Regional Council, but that would be the sort of thing that would be done as part of detailed design.
- Thirdly, with regard to erosion, Council had concerns about the effect of a prolonged peak. When the detention ponds are put in, they can spread the peak of a flood over a longer period of time and cause erosion. The applicant responded to these concerns by commissioning a report from geotechnical experts Tonkin + Taylor. They have advised that while there are some increases in the duration of peaks, they do not pose a risk to the stability of the banks, so Council is satisfied with that.<sup>106</sup>

## **Discussion and Finding**

### **Wastewater**

337. Council has confirmed that the plan change area would access a reticulation network, that the plan change includes provisions for wastewater reticulation and its implementation would be considered at the time of subdivision. I have not identified any outstanding or matters of contention in this regard.

338. I am confident that there is currently available infrastructure capacity for wastewater reticulation capacity, the subject of significant investment in the last 20 years, with the

---

<sup>105</sup> Reporting Officer Response to evidence presented at hearing, 2 December 2019, page 1

<sup>106</sup> Mr Hall for Council, reconvened hearing, 2 December 2019. Transcript page 280-281

establishment of the trunk main between Oākura and the wastewater treatment plant at New Plymouth.

339. The cultural effects relating to the management of wastewater are addressed via Policy 23.10.2 in the provisions, and associated implementation methods.

### **Water supply**

340. Much of the issues related to water supply at the start of the hearing centred around the capacity of aquifers to supply the West and South FUD areas. The subsequent reduced scale and size of the plan change and the removal of potential adverse visual effects of water tanks have contributed to resolving this matter.
341. I heard from Mr Hall, NPDC Manager Three Waters confirming that water supply was not a constraint of the plan change and would be available at each stage of development. The reduced size and scale plan change did not include water tanks.
342. The installation of water tanks to collect rainwater was received with mixed views from Council and submitters. On one hand there were perceived benefits from conserving water however there were visual effects with the potential storage of potable water.

### **Stormwater**

343. At the conclusion of the hearing of evidence in July, further information was required regarding stormwater effects, including catchment modelling of run off, peak flow and potential flooding. Information was also sought on the management of water quality and integration with other matters, such as ecological effects and use and development of open spaces/reserves.
344. For the applicant, Mr Bunn's further analysis demonstrated that there is sufficient capacity in the proposed detention pond to accommodate storm events, and that the proposed pond would not increase peak flows at the discharge point. Further, he considered that the pond has a no more than minor effect on the SH45 culvert crossing and downstream confluence with the Wairau Stream. He states that in the modelled storm scenarios the development, resulting from the plan change, will have a negligible impact on the existing downstream environment.<sup>107</sup>
345. These stormwater issues are addressed in the provisions at Policy 23.8 and implementation method 23.8 d) via a Stormwater Management Plan, and cultural issues are addressed via Policy 23.10.3.<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> Closing submissions of the applicant, 20 December 2019, paragraph 43

<sup>108</sup> Closing submissions of the applicant, 20 December 2019, paragraph 45

346. The reporting officer upon the advice of Mr Hall, accepted the findings of the applicant and considered the proposal consistent with Policy 23.1 b) and d) of the District Plan in that stormwater infrastructure can be provided in a coordinated manner and ensures a resilient and safe community.

### **Landscape and Rural Amenity Matters**

347. I note that the landscape expert witnesses did not agree whether the proposed changes to the landscape were appropriate, in relation to the proximity of the plan change area to the Oākura village, rural character and effects on the Kaitake Range which is defined as an Outstanding Landscape.

348. At the reconvened hearing, Mr Bain considered in his further evidence that the amended plan change documentation addressed the above issues. He was of the opinion that the amended proposal retains an open view for much of the length of SH45 towards the Kaitake Range, with the proposed urban area restricted to a smaller area abutting the edge of Oākura and avoiding the lower slopes of the Kaitake Range. Mr Bain believed the revised structure plan ensured that the associative values of natural character and legibility of the Kaitake Range/rural environment would be maintained. He outlined that there were no ODP provisions that supported the 'notion' that the views across the subject site were particularly important.

349. Mr Bain also in his further evidence outlined that 'adverse views from the 'The Paddocks' will be reduced as 'their middle-ground views' will remain farmland. He further noted that built views would be predominantly tucked beneath the area of the QE II covenant which will increasingly screen views of the proposal from 'The Paddocks'.<sup>109</sup>

350. Disagreement between the landscape experts continued through the 'further evidence' process and the re-convened hearing. Mr Bain was of the view that that a comprehensive first principles review of the structure plan had been undertaken as opposed to an adjusting down approach.

351. Mr Kensington was of the view that the extent of the amended proposal would extend to an elevated part of the Oākura landscape which would result in an inappropriate outcome. He noted that adverse visual effects will be experienced by people viewing the landscape change from adjacent private properties including those located within 'The Paddocks' subdivision.

352. Mr Kensington highlighted his concerns which included a lack of integration into the landscape of the proposal, no opportunities or constraints analysis, the severance of important landscape features, a lack clarity of defensible rural-urban interface, and significant landscape and visual impacts that had not been addressed.

---

<sup>109</sup> Bain Further Evidence, 11 October 2019, paragraph 19

353. Mr Evans expressed similar concerns and outlined that the lack of information made it difficult to assess whether the form, scale and nature of the proposal was appropriate. He also noted that the associative values of tāngata whenua in relation to Kaitake had not been accounted for.
354. In his further evidence Mr Bain advised that he had addressed the concerns outlined and considered that the revised proposal was an appropriate form, nature, and scale of development from a landscape and visual perspective.
355. I note that further evidence from submitters contended that the amended proposal was a scaled-down version of the original proposal rather than a ‘fresh look’. Concerns about the location and scale of development, particularly when viewed from ‘The Paddocks’ area, were also re-iterated by submitters.
356. Mr Kensington was of the view that there needed to be a higher level of specification and detail contained in the structure plan regarding landscaping matters to enable assessment whether any adverse effects can be adequately mitigated.
357. Mr Wesley had concluded in his response report<sup>110</sup> that insufficient detail had been provided to be able to conclude what the impact of the revised proposal might be on the Outstanding Landscape.
358. Having considered the amended proposal, the landscape expert evidence and the concerns expressed by Mr Wesley at the re-convened hearing which are captured in his response dated 2 December 2019 and, and the concerns of submitters, I remain uneasy and unconvinced that the landscape and visual effects of the proposal have been adequately addressed.
359. I have concerns as expressed elsewhere in this decision, that the impact of removal of the consent notice on Lot 29 in respect of rural character and views has not been adequately addressed notwithstanding part of the subject site is within the South FUD.
360. In addition, I am unsure of the impact of the proposal particularly the more elevated parts of it, will have on adjacent properties including ‘The Paddocks’ subdivision and whether the rules framework provided will adequately address those effects as well as the associative values of tāngata whenua.
361. The evidence of Mr Kensington supports this concern and I agree with his conclusion in his

---

<sup>110</sup> Wesley: Response to Further Evidence for Reconvened Hearing

further evidence dated 15 November 2019, that adverse landscape and visual effects will be more than minor, and keeping the status quo will give better effect to the protection of rural character and landscape. It is the level of uncertainty of potential effects in respect of landscape and rural character effects that gives rise to my conclusion on these issues.

### **Noise Effects**

362. Given the amended proposal submitted by the applicant, the proposed attenuation bund along SH 45 is no longer proposed on the basis the amended location of lots will result in dwellings being located beyond the set-back. This situation results in there being no reverse sensitivity matters associated with noise from the state highway requiring consideration. Accordingly, any noise matters would be managed through the relevant noise provisions of the DP.
363. I note that there were no specific comments regarding noise raised in the further evidence from submitters.

### **Appropriateness of Rezoning the Rural Environment Area Land**

364. In respect of the amended plan change proposal, Mr Comber<sup>111</sup> noted that some 38.33 ha or 68% of the applicant's land will be retained in the Rural Environment area including land to be given over to open space. He was of the view that this was consistent with maintaining the site in its existing pastoral rural character.
365. Mr Comber outlined the general location was found to be appropriate as it is partially located in the FUD overlay identified in the District Plan and located close to the existing Oākura urban area. The reduced scale (reduction from 399 lots to 144 lots) of the plan change was considered to positively address submitter concerns about scale and intensity and would address community aspirations outlined in the various community planning documents that growth be managed, staged and targeted.
366. Mr Comber outlined that by reducing the overall scale of the proposal, the transport, traffic safety, social and cultural, landscape and infrastructure effects all reduce to an extent that the concerns raised by submitters and Mr Wesley, would fall away.
367. Mr Bain<sup>112</sup> outlined the rationale for the location, form and scale of the revised development proposal which primarily involved limiting built development to areas of flat land between vegetated gullies, setting development back from SH45 and utilising the unnamed tributary of the Wairau Stream as the boundary of residential development.
368. The further evidence of submitters<sup>113</sup> is noted where it was contended that the overall

---

<sup>111</sup> Comber Further Evidence:11.10.19- Paras 9-30

<sup>112</sup> Bain Further Evidence: 11.10.19: Para 10

<sup>113</sup> Kaitake Community Board:13.11.19: Para 16

concerns regarding the scale, location and need for the rezoning remained. In particular, that the revised proposal did not address the key concerns of submitters that the proposed rezoning is in the wrong location, that there is sufficient capacity for housing already provided for elsewhere in Oākura, and is contrary to the consent notice that currently does not permit subdivision of Lot 29.

369. Mr Wesley<sup>114</sup> outlined that the revised proposal better responded to the nature and characteristics of the subject site and surrounding area. The location, form and density of the revised proposal may be appropriate in terms of Policy 23.1 a), subject to matters that he outlined such as the potential for reverse sensitivity effects with the dairy farm on the adjoining property to the southwest (Greensill property). With the removal of the Rural Lifestyle area and the separation of the residential development from the adjoining farm by retaining farmland on the southern portion of the subject site, he considered that the potential for reverse sensitivity effects had been significantly reduced.
370. He also noted that the applicant was proposing to treat the southwestern boundary of the proposed residential area as an area of open space with walking/cycling connections which would provide an appropriate physical buffer. Overall, he considered that the amended plan change, better interfaced with surrounding land uses by minimising reverse sensitivity issues with adjoining rural land and open space areas which was consistent with Policy 23.1 e).
371. A further consideration in respect of rezoning rural land to residential, is the supply and demand for residential land. As discussed elsewhere in this report, the land that is currently available in the Oākura area could meet the short and medium needs for residential land identified under the NPS-UDC through either infill housing or on undeveloped land already zoned for residential activity in Oākura.
372. I note that part of the subject site has been identified for residential development though the FUD overlay, and therefore assume that at least part of the land was considered appropriate to be rezoned in the future for residential purposes. However, there is no defined timeframe by when that rezoning should occur. Also, the Kaitake Community Board queried the appropriateness of the South FUD location, and whether it should even be developed, with a strong preference for development to occur in West FUD as a higher priority. The reasoning advanced for this view, was that West FUD was further away from the Kaitake Range and more logically connected to Oākura village.
373. In conclusion, while part of the subject site has been identified for future urban development, it is not intended to occur certainly within the next 10 years. It is most likely not appropriate to rezone the land now given the availability of existing opportunities. In addition, Lot 29 is precluded from further subdivision due to the current consent notice which has a focus on

---

<sup>114</sup> Wesley Further Evidence:22.11.19

preserving rural spaciousness and character, and I am not satisfied that those matters will continue to be addressed by its removal or variation.

### **COMMUNITY PLANNING FRAMEWORK**

374. A range of documents were referred to during the hearing that provided helpful background in respect of community aspirations, and what outcomes are sought in the future in respect of the growth and development of Oākura. Putting aside any national or regional planning instruments for the moment as they are discussed elsewhere, there are some key non-RMA documents that that are of relevance to consideration of the proposal.

#### **Oākura: A Growing Community 2014/16**

375. This report was referenced in evidence and in particular by Mr Wesley in his s42A report, and by the Kaitake Community Board in its submission and evidence presented at the hearing. It outlined the findings of an Oākura community engagement project following identification of the FUD Overlay in the District Plan. Part of the community engagement project involved testing the appropriateness of growing the village to the extent shown in the Overlay.

376. The work concluded that there was a strong desire to grow Oākura in a sustainable manner, through improving linkages between the beach, urban and rural areas and to the National Park, while retaining the character and quality of its environment. Feedback included that:

- Oākura was not ready to grow to the size (of the FUDs) in the short or medium term or in the foreseeable future
- There was a demonstrated need for staged growth
- The community preferred smart and targeted growth that takes into consideration the limitations on growth including changes to the character of Oākura, the size and location of the school and current school roll and traffic and parking issues on SH 45 and the CBD.

377. In considering this work, it does provide some clear guidance regarding community aspirations relating to the town and how it should develop and growth in the future. While not a statutory RMA document, it does assist in bringing together community thinking and input, where it could occur and the pace of development.

#### **Kaitake Community Board Plan: A Thirty -Year Vision - October 2017**

378. This plan outlines the visions and aspirations for Oākura, Okato and Omata, with the plan being developed with the community. It provides an indication to the Council about matters the Board considered on behalf of the three communities as being important and the actions and investment required to shape the future growth and development of the three identified communities.

379. It is noted that in respect of Oākura, the plan states that it requires managed, staged, and targeted growth. It is believed rapid and wide- spread expansion would negatively affect the special character of Oākura and adversely impact on matters such as education services, traffic, and environmental assets.<sup>115</sup>

### **Oākura Structure Plan 2006**

380. The structure plan is a non-statutory document that provides for the overall nature and scale of the development of Oākura. The plan provides that new development needs to recognise the uniqueness and special values of Oākura including the views from the sea to the Kaitake Range. It is also recognised by the plan that there is a need to integrate the existing road network and existing utilities with any new residential development.

### **Discussion: Community Planning Direction**

381. It has been notable in consideration of this matter the engagement and input by the Oākura community in respect of setting from a community perspective what the direction and scale of development of Oākura should be. As outlined in section 3 of this report, several plans have been developed with community input and engagement such as the Oākura: A Growing Community; the Kaitake Community Board Plan- A Thirty Year Vision; and the Oākura Structure Plan. There is a high degree of clarity around what the Oākura community would like to see in terms of staged and managed growth, and while the south FUD was subsequently put in place in 2013, there remains some question as noted by the KCB in its' submission, whether the south FUD should remain in place.
382. Notwithstanding that view, the FUD overlay only indicates where potential growth could occur, and still requires rezoning of land to occur. The FUD overlay places some restrictions on land-use given such land may possibly be developed for urban purposes at some stage in the future.
383. It is also noted that none of the planning documents outlined propose that any land beyond the South FUD be developed for residential purposes.
384. What I take from the community planning and Council planning processes to date is that there is other identified land in Oākura where development should occur and in respect of the FUDs, again other areas in Oākura should be utilised first before the South FUD.
385. In respect of the OSP, it had gone through an engagement process in its development and was publicly notified for submissions. There was subsequently a public hearing of submissions and then adoption by the Council. It has a 20- year horizon and was last subject to review in 2014.

---

<sup>115</sup> Kaitake Community Board Plan- Executive Summary-Page 6

386. It identifies land to the south of SH45 for potential urban development which includes some of the subject site. In 2013, Plan Change 15 was approved by the Council which added an Urban Development Overlay that covered the same area of land defined in the OSP south of SH45 described as the South FUD.
387. I note in the KCB evidence<sup>116</sup> the Board states that the community never envisaged that there would be further development of Lot 29. It is noted that the Board further outlines that the draft District Plan which has since been notified as a Proposed District Plan for submissions, does not envisage the south FUD being required for development until the 10 to 30- year period. The Proposed District Plan is discussed elsewhere in its report.
388. I note the evidence of Mr Twigley<sup>117</sup> where he stated that both Oākura- A growing Community 2014/16 and the Kaitake Community Plan: A Thirty Year Vision 2017 should be had regard to, given they were prepared under the Local Government Act. He further noted that the community vision for Oākura supports managed, staged and targeted growth and that this as already mentioned does not include the village growing to the size indicated by the FUD overlays in the short to medium term, or the foreseeable future. He further referenced the Kaitake Community Plan which outlined that rapid and widespread expansion would negatively affect the special character of Oākura and adversely impact on matters such as education services and environmental assets.
389. The conclusion reached by me in respect of the various community and Council plans, is that while some of the subject site has been identified for the location of future growth (identified in the OSP and Plan Change 15- South FUD), it only related to part of the site and that the remainder of Lot 29 has not been envisaged for development for urban purposes.

## **OPERATIVE AND PROPOSED DISTRICT PLANS**

### **Operative District Plan**

390. The plan change request is made in respect of the ODP. The plan change request does not propose any amendment of existing ODP objectives but did seek to add two new policies and introduce new rules. In respect of the amended proposal the applicant did not submit revised plan provisions in the supplementary evidence, however amended provisions were submitted attached to Mr Muldowney's closing submissions.
391. The ODP does not provide for development of the subject site given its current Rural Environment zoning although part of the site is identified for future urban development purposes through the FUD overlay and its description as the South FUD. A significant portion of the amended proposal goes beyond the identified South FUD.

---

<sup>116</sup> KCB Evidence- Para 76

<sup>117</sup> Twigley Evidence in Chief- Paras 159 & 160

392. It is noted that the FUD overlay only identifies that land may be considered for rezoning for residential purposes and essentially has a planning framework in place to ensure development of land in a FUD does not compromise its future development for residential purposes.
393. Mr Wesley<sup>118</sup> outlined that the nature and scale of the amended proposal of the amended proposal was more in keeping with the outcomes sought by the ODP but highlighted there were still outstanding matters to be resolved relating to cultural impact, traffic, landscape and visual effects.
394. It is noted that ODP Objective 1 relates to ensuring activities (which includes subdivision and development) do not adversely affect other environmental and amenity values within the district or adversely affected existing activities.
395. The following policies are to assist in achieving the objective being:
- Policy 1.1: Activities should be located in areas where their effects are compatible with the character of the area.
  - Policy 1.2: Activities within an area should not have adverse effects that diminish the amenity of neighbouring areas, having regard to the character of the receiving environment and cumulative effects.
  - Policy 1.3: New activities that are sensitive to the elements that define the character of the area in which they intend to locate should be designed and/or located to avoid conflict.
396. To implement these policies, the methods are the zone framework and associated rules, as well as the application of the Future Development Area Overlay.
397. The ODP contains a range of objectives relevant to the proposal and I note some of the key ones of relevance to consideration of the proposal and whether it is the most efficient and effective way of achieving them.

*Objective 1: Ensure activities do not adversely affect the environmental and amenity values of areas within the district*

*Objective 4: Ensure subdivision, use and development of land maintains the elements of rural character.*

*Objective 5: Maintain and enhance the character and coherence of the urban areas of the New Plymouth District.*

*Objective 15: Protect and enhance Outstanding Landscapes and Regionally Significant Landscapes within the district.*

*Objective 22: Avoid the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development by ensuring*

---

<sup>118</sup> Response to Further Evidence: 22.11.19

*appropriate and sufficient infrastructure, community facilities and new areas of open space are provided.*

*Objective 23: That land identified for future urban use is comprehensively planned to facilitate an integrated approach to land development while addressing site specific issues to provide for accessible, connected, efficient, liveable communities and coherent urban spaces.*

398. A key theme of the objectives is to ensure activities do not adversely affect environmental and amenity values, maintenance of rural character, and a coherent and integrated approach to development.
399. There has been significant concern expressed by submitters about the loss of rural landscape and rural outlook as a result of the proposal and particularly on the rural outlook on the southern entrance to Oākura. Also, those submitters who are located in 'The Paddocks' subdivision have outlined their concerns about the impact on rural outlook and character and associated amenity by the proposal, and in particular with the proposal variation of the existing consent notice.
400. While it is accepted that there are some impacts on rural character, and landscape and visual effects anticipated by the ODP through the identification of part of the plan change area as the South FUD, I am not satisfied that such impacts have been adequately addressed and mitigated by the applicant in the amended proposal.
401. The proposal extends beyond the area identified in the South FUD which has not been identified for long term development, and that pastoral area does provide for the key elements of rural character such as spaciousness, and is maintained by its Rural Environment Area zoning and the consent notice in respect of Lot 29.
402. In terms of maintaining rural character, I am not satisfied that the proposal for rezoning is necessary given the existing and proposed opportunities for urban development that are available in the Oākura township. Hence the most efficient and effective way of providing for future urban development is not in respect of the amended proposal.
403. The applicant did not commission a social/ community impact assessment or make available an appropriate expert to adequately assess the nature and scope of any adverse effects for example on community facilities and services, connections with Oākura village and surrounds, the school capacity and how any impacts may manifest themselves due the proposal being approved and a significant increase in households albeit over a period of time, that would amount to an approximate increase of around 25% in total dwellings to what currently exists.
404. The impact of this increase would seem to be significant and appropriately considered through a social/ community impact assessment.

405. I am also not satisfied that the proposal allows for integration into the current urban fabric of Oākura, given there will be a reliance on vehicles for access to the subject site and that there is a lack of opportunities for integration into pedestrian and cycling access and provision and an example of this is the removal of the underpass under the state highway.
406. While the proposal is supported by some ODP objectives, I conclude that on balance that it does not adequately address matters related to rural character and amenity, is not appropriately integrated into the existing urban area, that there are other locations for growth and development that support a connected and liveable residential areas.

### **Proposed District Plan**

407. During the hearing, the Council publicly notified the Proposed District Plan for submissions, the proposed plan is a relevant consideration in consideration of the evaluation of the plan change and consideration of the variation application for the consent notice.
408. I note that the proposed plan is at a very early stage of the plan making process and accordingly little weight can be accorded to it.
409. Of interest is that the plan does not envisage urban development beyond the general extent of the already defined South FUD although it is noted that the Thurman property which is part of the plan change area (1.7 ha of land between Wairau Road and the tributary to the Wairau Stream), is proposed to be rezoned to Residential in the Proposed Plan.
410. It also contains objectives in the 'Strategic Directions' section which provide for stronger guidance on matters of significance to tāngata whenua, housing supply and urban development and is a distinct move away from the effects based approach of the ODP, and which had little in the way of a strategic component or direction.

### **NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY 2016**

411. It is noted that New Plymouth District is classified as a 'high growth area' under the NPS-UDC, although when the applications were lodged the classification was that of a 'medium growth area'. Mr Wesley advised that there were no additional or different matters in evaluating the plan change with this change in classification.
412. Furthermore, Mr Wesley's<sup>119</sup> advice was as follows:

*"The applicant's evaluation has assessed Objectives OA1 – OA3. I generally concur with the applicant's evaluation of these objectives. However, in regard to Objective OA2 and provision of sufficient opportunities and housing choices, this objective should be evaluated in the overall context of Oākura and the district. We understand that provision for more intensive*

---

<sup>119</sup> Wesley: s42 Report 31 May 2019- Paras 11.1-11.6

*housing within the existing urban area of Oākura is being evaluated as part of the Proposed District Plan. In addition, other greenfield areas in Oākura which are already zoned residential under the Operative Plan would contribute to housing capacity in Oākura.*

*Under the policies implementing these objectives in the NPS-UDC, Council is to ensure there is sufficient housing land to meet short, medium, and long- term needs. As documented in the attached capacity assessment for Oākura, there is currently sufficient capacity to meet the short and medium- term needs. Therefore, the rezoning of land via this plan change is not needed to meet the NPS-UDC requirements. Notwithstanding the land is not needed for these requirements, the NPS-UDC does not preclude Council from rezoning additional land.*

*I also consider Objective OD1 ‘coordinated planning evidence and decision making’ is relevant given the proposed scale of the development and the pressure it places on infrastructure. Decision-making on rezoning needs to ensure there is integration between land use, development, development infrastructure and other infrastructure. To achieve this objective, for reasons set out later in this report, we suggest changes to the scale and extent of the rezoning to achieve this integration”.*

413. It is noted that the capacity assessment for Oākura was disputed by the applicant and that there was a shortfall in actual yield of 88 lots according to Mr Doy<sup>120</sup>.
414. Notwithstanding the differences of opinion on section yield, what the draft assessment referred to by the s42A report,<sup>121</sup> is that the anticipated demand for new houses in Oākura in the next 30 years is 210 dwellings with an assessed supply depending on how the assessment is undertaken of between 542-630 lots. Even taking the lower figure of 542 lots, the supply is significantly greater than the likely demand.
415. I concur with the opinion of Mr Wesley that the rezoning of the subject land is not required to meet the requirements of the NPS-UDC. It is understood though that the NPS-UDC does not preclude Council from rezoning additional land.
416. I note that the NPS-UDC does not require the Council to ensure there is sufficient land for housing in each of the urban areas in a city or district. It takes a district -wide approach and any such need and where it is to be located, is ultimately a decision for the Council.<sup>122</sup>

## **HOUSING CAPACITY ASSESSMENT**

417. A consideration in evaluating the plan change is the capacity for additional housing in Oākura. This relates to whether current or proposed land supply can meet the anticipated future demand.
418. The Council during the hearing released its first ‘Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment 2019’ in response to the NPS-UDC. The report sets out the estimated demand for

---

<sup>120</sup> Doy: Evidence in Chief

<sup>121</sup> Wesley: s42A Report- Section 13.12

<sup>122</sup> NPS -UD 2016: PA1, PC4, PC9, PC12, PC13(a), PD1(b)

dwellings in Oākura and the supply of land available (capacity) for housing.

419. Mr Wesley<sup>123</sup> in his report provided Table 1 which contained the estimated projected household growth (demand) in Oākura. This demand includes projections in the short, medium, and long term as well as total anticipated growth. This was based on the draft capacity assessment report prior to it being finalised by the Council. Based on that assessment, the total anticipated demand for new housing in Oākura in the next 30 years were 210 dwellings and the assessed supply being 630 lots.
420. Mr Wesley in response to the evidence of Mr Doy provided further evidence in his response<sup>124</sup> dated 22 November 2019 as follows:

*“One of the further considerations with rezoning rural land to residential is the supply and demand for residential land. The Future Yield Analysis identified that the land that is currently available in the Oākura area could meet the short and medium needs for residential land identified under the NPS-UDC. That is, by way of either infill housing in Oākura as a part of the District Plan Review, or on undeveloped land already zoned for residential activity in the immediate area.*

*Mr Doy in his further evidence for the applicant has re-assessed the land supply in Oākura. He refers to the original evidence of Mr Kiss. Mr Doy concludes that in his analysis the potential lot yield/supply of dwellings in Oākura is 612, similar to Mr Kiss who concluded 590 lots/dwellings. This compares with the NPDC assessment of 756 lots/dwellings, with the main difference between Mr Kiss/Mr Doy and the NPDC assessment is the yield for infill and West FUD. The short term (2018-2021) and medium term (2021 – 2028) projected demand for dwellings in Oākura is 60 and 76 additional dwellings respectively. The long-term (2028 – 2048) projected demand for dwellings in Oākura is an additional 112 dwellings. Therefore, the total projected additional dwellings in Oākura in the next 30 years is 247. Utilising the lot yield from Mr Doy in his further evidence, the infill development and undeveloped residential land would meet the short and medium- term land supply requirements”.*

421. Mr Wesley concluded that using Mr Doy’s assessment of yield, there was sufficient zoned land to meet housing needs in Oākura for the next 30- year period. This is by way of infill in the existing residential area or use of undeveloped land already having a residential zoning.
422. Based on the land capacity assessment including potential yield, I conclude that there is sufficient land to meet housing demand in the short to medium term without the plan change as noted in

---

<sup>123</sup> Wesley S42A Report- Paras 13.6-13.12

<sup>124</sup> Wesley Response to Further Evidence for Reconvened Hearing 22.11.19

the discussion on the NPS-UDC. When the land in the FUD areas (west and south) is brought on for re-zoning and development is a matter in my view for the Council to make an assessment on in due course. This will involve weighing up all relevant matters including community aspirations on growth and development and infrastructure provision, and then determining appropriate time frames for any timely re-zoning to occur. This also relates to previous discussion in this report where I note that the Council is best placed to take a holistic approach to overall growth and development, and it is very difficult for this to occur through a single private plan change process.

423. I also note that in its closing submissions Mr Muldowney<sup>125</sup> acknowledged that the amended plan change was not required to give effect to the NPS-UDC, and that the applicant does not rely on this factor to support the plan change.

## TARANAKI REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT

424. The Taranaki Regional Policy Statement (the RPS) was made operative in 2010.
425. The main policies that the plan change must give effect to under s75(3) of the RMA in relation to the private plan change are set out in the s42a report (31 March 2019) report. Mr Twigley has also identified relevant policies. In summary the main policies are:

Section 1 Use and Development of Resources UDC Objective 1, UDC Policy 1

Section 6 Fresh Water – WAL Objective 2, WAL Policy 3

Section 9: Indigenous Biodiversity

Section 10 Natural features and landscapes, historic heritage and amenity value – AMY Objective 1, NFL Policy 2 and AMY Policy 1

Section 15 Built Environment

Section 16 Statement of resource management issues of significance to iwi authorities – TOW Objective 1, TOW Policy 1, TOW Policy 2, KTA Objective 1, KTA Policy 1, CSV Objective 1, CSV Policy 1, CSV Policy 3.

426. *Section 1 Use and development of resources*  
*To recognise the role of resource use and development in the Taranaki region and its contribution to enabling people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing.*<sup>126</sup>

*Recognition will be given in resource management processes to the role of resource use and development in the Taranaki region and its contribution to enabling people and communities to provide for their economic, social, and cultural wellbeing.*<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup> Muldowney Closing Submissions: Para 19

<sup>126</sup> TRPS, UDR Objective 1, page 23

<sup>127</sup> TRPS, UDR Policy 1, page 23

427. Overall, this objective and policy goes to the heart of the concerns for the Oākura community. I am of the view that the plan change will provide for the economic, social and cultural well-being of the future residents of the area, however the vehicle-centric layout, lack of connectivity to the coast, particularly for vulnerable users and the lack of any community service and facility contribution will have medium to long-term effects on the social well-being of the Oākura community.
428. *Section 6 Freshwater*  
*To protect the natural character of water bodies from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.*<sup>128</sup>
- The in-stream values and life supporting capacity of water bodies will be maintained, and the natural character of rivers, streams, and lakes and their margins protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.*<sup>129</sup>
429. I am satisfied that in-stream values and life supporting capacity of the Wairau Stream will be maintained as a result of the advice of the ecologist for the applicant, and the measures that have been established to control run-off and proposed planting on the stream margins.
430. *Section 9 Indigenous Biodiversity*  
*To maintain and enhance the indigenous biodiversity of the Taranaki region, with a priority on ecosystems, habitats and areas that have significant indigenous biodiversity values.*<sup>130</sup>
431. I am satisfied that the biodiversity, in terms of ecological habitat and species have been identified and measures are in place to maintain and enhance the biodiversity values of the plan change area over time.
432. Many of the submissions high-lighted the proximity of the plan change area to the Egmont National Park and the programmes to control weeds, pests, and predators. Cats and dogs have been identified as particular species that can impact on native bird species. A plan change rule or bylaw may be effective as a preventative method however the costs and difficulties with enforcement may preclude these measures from being implemented.
433. I am of the view that on balance, the plan change will be of no more concern than other development in the area, and an education response outside the plan is more likely to be effective.
434. *Section 10 Natural Features and landscape, historic heritage, and amenity value*  
*To recognise the positive contributions of appropriate use and development in terms of providing for the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values in the Taranaki region, while avoiding,*

---

<sup>128</sup> TRPS, WAL Objective 2, page 36

<sup>129</sup> TRPS, Wal Policy 3, page 36

<sup>130</sup> TRPS, BIO Objective 1, page 82

*remedying, or mitigating the adverse effects of inappropriate use and development on amenity values.<sup>131</sup>*

*The adverse effects of resource use and development on rural and urban amenity values will be avoided, remedied, or mitigated and any positive effects on amenity values promoted. Any positive effects of appropriate use and development will be fully considered and balanced against adverse effects*

*Those qualities and characteristics that contribute to amenity values in the Taranaki region include:*

- safe and pleasant living environment free of nuisance arising from excessive noise, odours and contaminants, and from traffic and other risks to public health and safety;*
- scenic, aesthetic, recreational and educational opportunities provided by parks, reserves, farmland, and other open spaces, rivers, lakes, wetlands and their margins, coastal areas and areas of vegetation;*
- a visually pleasing and stimulating environment;*
- efficient, convenient and attractive urban forms; and*
- aesthetically pleasing building design, including appropriate landscaping and signs.<sup>132</sup>*

435. The variation to consent notice seeks to remove impediments to urbanising an area that had been protecting the rural character and amenity values of 'The Paddocks' residents and views from SH45. The plan change area is designed as a vehicle-centric subdivision with little opportunities for vulnerable road users to connect to the coast including beaches.
436. It is my view that the variation to the consent notice will be inconsistent with and not give effect to AMY Objective 1 and AMY Policy 1(a), (b) and (c).

*Recognition shall be given to the appropriate management of other natural areas, features or landscapes not covered by Policy 1 (ONFL) above, but still of value to the region for one or more of the following reasons:*

- the maintenance of water quality and quantity;*
- soil conservation;*
- the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards;*
- natural character amenity and heritage values and scientific and educational significance;*
- geological and geomorphological, botanical, wildlife and fishery values;*
- biodiversity and the functioning of ecosystems;*
- ‘sinks’ or ‘pools’ for greenhouse gases; and*
- cultural features of significance to tāngata whenua.<sup>133</sup>*

437. I am satisfied that the plan change gives effect to the NFL Policy 2 as the area has natural character amenity, heritage values, cultural features of significance to tāngata whenua.

---

<sup>131</sup> TRPS, AMY Objective 1, page 95

<sup>132</sup> TRPS, AMY Policy 1, page 95

<sup>133</sup> TRPS, NFL Policy 2, page 90

438. *Section 15 The Built Environment*  
*To promote sustainable urban development in the Taranaki region.*<sup>134</sup>

*To promote sustainable development in urban areas by:*

- (a) encouraging high quality urban design, including the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values;*
- (b) promoting choices in housing, work place and recreation opportunities;*
- (c) promoting energy efficiency in urban forms, site layout and building design;*
- (d) providing for regionally significant infrastructure;*
- (e) integrating the maintenance, upgrading or provision of infrastructure with land use;*
- (f) integrating transport networks, connections and modes to enable the sustainable and efficient movement of people, goods and services, encouraging travel choice and low-impact forms of travel including opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport;*
- (g) promoting the maintenance, enhancement or protection of land, air and water resources within urban areas or affected by urban activities;*
- (h) protecting indigenous biodiversity and historic heritage; and*
- (i) avoiding or mitigating natural and other hazards.*<sup>135</sup>

*Include in district plans or resource consents, provisions or conditions that address sustainable urban development issues including among others:*

- (a) objectives, policies, methods, rules, and performance standards controlling land use, development and subdivision;*
- (b) building and development controls or criteria;*
- (c) esplanade reserves or strips or access strips; and*
- (d) designations or other provision for public works.*<sup>136</sup>

439. I have noted my view elsewhere in this report, that amenity values particularly those related to visual amenity and rural character will not be maintained. It is uncertain whether the plan change enhances or contributes to promoting energy efficiency in urban forms, site layout and building design.
440. The reduced plan change has diminished opportunities for recreation with a focus on vehicle centric access and lack of connectivity for vulnerable users with the village of Oākura. The current plan change does not include an integrated and connected network for walking, cycling and public transport.
441. The plan change contains limited information with regard to achieving SUD policies 1 (b),(c), and is likely to fail the test for SUD policy 1(f) related to *integrating transport networks, connections and modes to enable the sustainable and efficient movement of people, goods and services,*

---

<sup>134</sup> TRPS, SUD Objective 1, page 117

<sup>135</sup> TRPS, SUD Policy 1, page 117

<sup>136</sup> TRPS, SUD Method 5

*encouraging travel choice and low-impact forms of travel including opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport.*

442. *Section 16*

*Act cooperatively and in good faith, showing flexibility and responsiveness and a desire to engage with Māori for the good governance of the Taranaki region.<sup>137</sup>*

*Management of natural and physical resources in the Taranaki region will be carried out in a manner that takes into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, including the principles of kawanatanga, rangatiratanga, partnership, active participation, resource development and spiritual recognition.<sup>138</sup>*

*To have particular regard to the concept of kaitiakitanga in relation to managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in the Taranaki region, in a way that accommodates the views of individual iwi and hapu.<sup>139</sup>*

*Iwi and hapu will be consulted on an individual basis to determine how kaitiakitanga can be recognised and integrated in the management of the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in the Taranaki region.<sup>140</sup>*

*Management of natural and physical resources in the Taranaki region will be carried out in a manner that takes into account the cultural and spiritual values of Iwi o Taranaki and in a manner which respects and accommodates tikanga Māori.<sup>141</sup>*

*The special relationship that Taranaki tāngata whenua have with te taiao (the environment), as reflected in their respect for the spiritual integrity of te taiao as a living system infused with qualities of wairua (spirituality), mauri (life principle), wehi (reverence), mana (authority), tapu (sacredness) and noa (nontapu), will be given particular consideration in the promotion of the sustainable management of the region's resources.<sup>142</sup>*

*Procedures will be adopted, which seek to recognise and accommodate tikanga Māori and the rangatiratanga rights of iwi and hapu over their mahinga mātaihai and other taonga in the environment and their role as kaitiaki, within resource management processes.<sup>143</sup>*

443. I have discussed earlier that Taranaki Iwi were not engaged with in a timely manner to have early, informed and meaningful participation and input, however the local hapu were given opportunities to be involved from an early period of the plan change development, and have a formal agreement with the applicant.

---

<sup>137</sup> TRPS, TOW Policy 1, page 128

<sup>138</sup> TRPS, TOW Policy 2, page 128

<sup>139</sup> TRPS, KTA Objective 1, page 130

<sup>140</sup> TRPS, KTA Policy 1, page 131

<sup>141</sup> TRPS, CSV Objective 1, page 136

<sup>142</sup> TRPS, CSV Policy 1, page 136

<sup>143</sup> TRPS, CSV Policy 3, page 136

444. The issues of concern from the late consultation have been recorded, assessed, and incorporated into the plan change and the iwi management plan has been taken into account. Whether the poor quality of the engagement and late inputs have given effect to the richness and depth of the objectives policies above, is a moot point. I am of the view that the relatively low key engagement with local hapu and the absence of Te Kahui o Taranaki for much of the plan development process is at the low range of giving effect to the objectives and policies of the RPS, in this regard.
445. Furthermore, whether what has been prepared can be translated into implementation is difficult to say.

## STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS

### Resource Management Act 1991

446. Consideration is required to be given to Part 2 matters and whether the plan change request will promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources in an efficient and effective manner.

### Section 5: Purpose

447. The purpose of the Act is to “*promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources*”. Sustainable management is defined under the Act as:

*“Managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety while –*

*-sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and*

*-safeguarding the life supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and*

*-avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment”.*

448. The Council is required to ensure that any proposed changes to the District Plan will also result in outcomes that meet the purpose of the Act.
449. The proposal would allow for the provision of additional housing in Oākura and therefore opportunities for people to live in that community. It would also contribute to increased economic well-being by increased patronage of local businesses and activities.
450. However, there are existing locations and opportunities for residential growth and development in the town through existing zoning and District Plan provisions given the relatively modest annual growth that Oākura experiences. The subject site is therefore not currently required to achieve such opportunities. The targeted, and managed growth that the

community is seeking that is outlined in the various community planning documents is currently provided for.

451. It is noted that the part of the subject site which has a FUD overlay is not proposed for development in the next 10 or so years.
452. While the proposal will allow for the applicants' economic and social well-being, the impact of the proposal on wider social and community well-being is less certain and not well defined. Such impacts may include placing pressure on existing community and social facilities as discussed in this report and that the very qualities that people highly regard in Oākura, may be diminished.
453. It is the uncertainty of social impacts and how such impacts would be mitigated that results in my view that the status quo would in my opinion better achieve the purpose of the Act.
454. Notwithstanding the reduced scale of the amended proposal, it is considered that it would not use, develop or protect natural and physical resources in respect of the subject site or Oākura in a way or rate which enables people to provide for their economic, cultural, social or environmental well-being.
455. The proposal extends beyond the spatial extent of the South FUD and therefore is beyond what has been signaled or envisaged for urban development. There are potential impacts of removal of the consent notice in respect of Lot 29 that could result in adverse effects on rural character and amenity for adjacent property owners and in particular those residing in "The Paddocks" subdivision.
456. In addition, the proposal could result in about a 25% increase in households in Oākura over what already exist, and noting there are existing zoned development opportunities, the impact of such an increase is uncertain from a social and community perspective. Such potential cumulative impacts have not been assessed. Matters such as the 'small village feel', sense of place, social cohesion and connectedness could well be adversely affected.

#### **Section 6: Matters of National Importance**

457. This section sets out a number of such matters to be recognised and provided for.
  - “(a) the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
  - (b) the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
  - (d) the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers:*
  - (e) the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga:*
458. The subject site is situated on the foothills of the Kaitake Range (an Outstanding Natural

Landscape) and has the Wairau Stream and its tributary crossing the site.

459. I am satisfied that the proposal does not adversely affect the ONL. In addition, it would provide for access along waterways.
460. As outlined in the discussion on cultural matters, it is considered that the adverse effects on iwi and hapu relationship with the Kaitake will be more than minor.

### **Section 7: Other Matters**

461. A range of matters are set out in this section that particular regard must be had to. It is considered that the following are of relevance:

*“(b) the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources;*  
*(c) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values;*  
*(f) maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment.”*

462. The proposal will not result in an efficient use of natural and physical resources. There is already adequate provision for urban development in Oākura, and indeed the South FUD is not proposed to be utilised for urban development for at least 10 years. In addition, there are existing zoned opportunities for growth and development in Oākura.
463. I am satisfied the plan change area can be appropriately serviced for waters infrastructure and traffic effects can be addressed. Outstanding issues include the social and community impacts of the proposal, the existing and available growth opportunities in the township and inadequately defined or assessed therefore cumulative impacts.
464. I am not satisfied that amenity values are maintained or enhanced particularly with the proposed variation of the consent notice to allow subdivision of Lot 29. The effects of such have not been assessed to enable me to be satisfied that it is no longer required to mitigate effects of the earlier ‘Paddocks’ subdivision.
465. Overall, I am not satisfied that ‘Other Matters’ have been appropriately addressed to lead to a conclusion, that any effects have been mitigated to an extent that the plan change be approved.

### **Section 8: Treaty of Waitangi**

466. Section 8 of the Act requires the Council to take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. The relevant principles of the Treaty of Waitangi in this plan change are:
- The duty to consult
  - The principles of rangatiratanga
  - The principles of partnership
  - The principle of active protection, and

- The principle of resource development and spiritual recognition.

467. I am not convinced that the duties to consult with tāngata whenua through iwi authorities has been discharged in a satisfactory manner. The consultation with the iwi authority Te Kahui o Taranaki was conducted after the notification of the plan change and following the submissions period. The preparation of a CIA was prepared at haste and turned out to be inconclusive on a range of matters, in my view due to the short timeframe to consider matters and a lack of relevant information.
468. As noted below, the iwi management plan Taiao Taiora, was launched after the plan change had been lodged and publicly notified.

### **Section 74(2A) Taking Account of Iwi Management Plans**

469. A territorial authority, when preparing or changing a district plan, must take into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with the territorial authority, to the extent that its content has a bearing on the resource management issues of the district. (s74(2A)).
470. Taiao Taiora is a relevant planning document to be take account of under s74(2A) of the Act. Taiao, Taiora – Taranaki Iwi Environmental Management Plan was adopted and released in July 2018 after the plan change request had been publicly notified.
471. Taranaki Iwi spoke to the contents and relevance of this plan to this plan change. Taiao Taiora does not provide support for residential subdivision and development of the scale proposed, in the proximity proposed, to Taranaki Mounga. Relevant policies are outlined in section 11.16 of the 31 May s42A report.
472. Ms Wano-Bryant on behalf of Te Kahui o Taranaki and through other submitters raising the adequacy of the request's assessment against Taiao Taiora Taranaki Iwi's Environmental Management Plan.
473. The applicant responded by preparing an assessment of the provisions of Taiao, Taiora, and later commissioning a CIA to address the issues and concerns raised by Ngati Tairi and Te Kahui o Taranaki. Many of the recommendations of the CIA have been incorporated into the provisions of the plan change.
474. I have assessed the objectives, policies and methods included in the iwi management plan, and consider them to have been taken into account, in so far as the applicant and Council has jurisdiction.

## **Schedule 1**

475. The consultation with tāngata whenua requirements for plan changes are contained in s3B of Schedule 1 of the RMA. As I have stated in the cultural matters section of this decision the consultation undertaken with Te Kahui o Taranaki (the mandated iwi authority) occurred following notification and submissions. I have considered this consultation to be at the lower range of compliance with the Schedule 1 requirements, and I am of the view that it potentially prejudiced their early, informed, and meaningful participation and input.
476. This has been somewhat mitigated by the involvement of the local hapu, Ngati Tairi representatives in three meetings, the consideration of their views into the plan change preparation, and although late, the assessment and response to Taiao, Taiora policies.
477. Overall, I am of the view that the duties of consultation in Schedule 1 have been marginally adhered to but are inconsistent with the implicit characteristics of the duty to consult as a principle of the Treaty of Waitangi.

## **SECTIONS 32 AND 32AA RMA EVALUATION**

478. Section 32AA of the RMA requires us to include a further evaluation of any proposed changes to the plan change arising from submissions (to be undertaken in accordance with s32AA). Given that my recommendation is not to approve the private plan change and therefore there are no amendments to the proposal, no further evaluation is required.
479. In evaluating the options which are either the retention of the existing Rural Environment Area zoning, or rezoning as per the amended plan change request, I consider that maintaining the status quo is appropriate. This is on the basis that the proposal will not assist the Council in achieving its functions under s31 of the RMA nor will it assist in achieving the sustainable management purpose and principles of the RMA. The social and cultural implications have not been adequately evaluated and that by not acting and therefore maintaining the existing zoning, is an appropriate course of action.
480. The report conclusions that follow clearly identify why PPC48 is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the District Plan.

## **CONSENT NOTICE EVALUATION**

481. In considering s104 and s221(3) regarding the application to vary or cancel the consent notice, I find that there may be potential effects on the environment through variation or cancellation of the consent notice that have not be fully evaluated and assessed particularly in respect of 'The Paddocks' subdivision which gave rise to the imposition of the consent notice. The consent

notice was imposed to mitigate potential adverse effects relating to rural character, visual amenity and amenity values more generally, and I am not convinced that its removal will not give rise to such effects as outlined previously in this report.

482. The consent notice was determined to be relevant and reasonably necessary at that time to enable approval of 'The Paddocks' subdivision, and in my opinion there has been no significant change in circumstances to warrant its variation as sought by the applicant.

483. In summary, I have had regard to all relevant matters as required by s104 and s221(3) of the RMA.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

484. Overall, I find that Private Plan Change 48 as amended not to be the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives in the District Plan as:

- Recommending approval of PPC48 would be a premature action given it does not align with the clearly defined Oākura community and the District Council aspirations and direction regarding growth and development of Oākura.
- The proposal is significantly greater than the area covered by South FUD. In addition, given the current stage of Oākura and the significant increase in lots proposed by PPC48, that an Oākura wide consideration of future growth and development opportunities through the current Proposed District Plan process would be an appropriate mechanism for consideration of such matters. It would provide for a wider consideration of the future development of Oākura and also an opportunity for the community wide social impacts of growth on existing community services and facilities such as the Oākura Primary School.
- Section 5 of the RMA has a strong focus on social, cultural, environmental, and economic well-being of communities and from the evidence and submissions presented, there is uncertainty about the social and cultural impacts of the plan change if approved. It is noted that no formal social impact assessment or expertise was provided by the applicant.
- There is the uncertainty of acting given the potential social and cultural impacts which have not in my opinion been adequately informed, evaluated, and implemented in respect of the proposal. The discussion in this report outlines these concerns and the uncertainty. It would appear more appropriate for a Council led initiative to comprehensively review the future growth and development challenges and opportunities in respect of Oākura.
- The private plan change process does not seem well suited to such an approach as the focus is similar to that of a resource consent process on a particular site or area of land as opposed to a more integrated Council led approach. This seems particularly appropriate given the community interest in well managed growth and development in respect of Oākura. The

several community-led and Council/ Community Board initiatives seem to support a more holistic approach.

- Community plans, reports and projects point to a clear theme which was represented by many submitters that the Oākura community had established its aspirations and outcomes for future development and growth in Oākura. The overall extent of these aspirations could be taken as being reflected spatially in the extent of the FUD overlays, although as noted in the evidence there was some uncertainty in respect of the South FUD from the KCBs perspective.
- Notwithstanding the uncertainty, it is not envisaged that land in the south FUD would be required for development within the next 10 years. Growth is enabled through existing District Plan provisions and land through existing zoning.

485. In addition, I find it is not appropriate to recommend any variation to Consent Notice 9696907.4 as:

- There is insufficient evaluation and assessment in respect of satisfying me on the change of circumstances to warrant its amendment or cancellation.
- The consent notice was imposed for a clear purpose, that being to mitigate and off-set the adverse landscape and visual effects of 'The Paddocks' subdivision, and to ensure open space is retained in respect of Lot 29. I am not satisfied that those effects no longer require mitigation through the continued imposition of the consent notice in its current form and although the lot included some land that was identified as South FUD, a significant portion of Lot 29 was identified as Rural Environment Area and not envisaged for residential development.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

486. ***That pursuant to Schedule 1, Clause 10 of the RMA, it is recommended to New Plymouth District Council that PPC48 as requested and amended by Oākura Farm Park Ltd, to the New Plymouth District Plan, be declined.***

487. ***It is recommended that the submissions on PPC48 are accepted and rejected as set out in Attachment 1 attached to this report.***

488. **In addition to the findings made in this report, the summarized reasons for this decision are that Private Plan Change 48:**

- Will not assist the Council in achieving its functions under s31 of the RMA and the Part 2 sustainable management purpose and principles of the RMA.

- Is not fully aligned with the growth and direction for Oākura township as envisaged by the Operative District Plan; the Oākura Structure Plan or community planning aspirations of the Oākura community.
- That the social and cultural implications of PPC48 have not been adequately evaluated given the significant additional development proposed by the private plan change when compared to the existing size of Oākura.
- That there is adequate and demonstrated capacity to cater for development and growth in the foreseeable future, and certainly out 30 years.
- That declining the plan change would best achieve the purpose of the Act given there is no need for rezoning of land for residential purposes given there is demonstrated supply available in the short to medium term to provide land for housing demand and supply.
- That it has not be adequately demonstrated that the removal or variation of the consent notice will not result in effects in respect of rural character and spaciousness in respect of Lot 29.

489. ***That pursuant to sections 104 and 221(3A) of the RMA, it is recommended that the discretionary activity application of Oākura Farm Park Ltd to vary Consent Notice 9696907.4 be declined as:***

- The consent notice was imposed for a clear purpose, that being to mitigate and off-set the adverse landscape and visual effects of 'The Paddocks' subdivision and to ensure open space is retained in respect of Lot 29. It has not been adequately demonstrated that those effects have been mitigated by the plan change proposal.

490. ***That pursuant to section 37 of the RMA, the late submissions of John Newton (S427); George Newton (S429); Lee Newton (S429); Louis Newton (S430); Paul Bishop (S431); Toby Dixon (S432); Fiona Tait (S434); Karen White (S435) and Charles Cotton (S436) are accepted.***



**William Thomas Wasley**  
Commissioner

**22 May 2020**

## Appendix 1: List of Submitters to Private Plan Change 48

<b>Submission No</b>	<b>Submitter Name</b>
1	Paul Andre Lavoipierre
2	Jennifer Susan Lavoipierre
3	Jennifer Elaine Blyde
4	Anna Louise Hinton
5	Nicola Ann Lumb
6	Molly Jayne Lumb
7	Paul Joseph Veric
8	Heelan Tompkins
9	Trent Tscheuschler
10	Kevin Nielsen
11	Stuart Tinson
12	Tom Cloke - National Road Carriers Association
13	John Tanner
14	Madeline Layupan
15	Grant Stewart
16	John Grahame Christiansen
17	Leen Fiddelaers
18	Timothy John Costelloe
19	Ross Ingram
20	Jane Dove Juneau and John Riccitelli
21	Wibke Termath
22	Andrew Kenneth Marshall
23	Peter Newton
24	Alan Frederick Crawford
25	Arielle Mermin
26	Gerald Turner
27	Peter Cassie
28	Rachel Faye Schafer
29	Graeme Thomas Churchill
30	James JH Baxter
31	Manu Lee Schafer
32	Denise Mary Novak
33	Stuart J Wells
34	Sheree Jull
35	Howard Gordon Reid
36	Ben Tarrant
37	Jason Lee Peacock
38	Jacqueline Grieve
39	James Richard Matheson
40	Dennis Green
41	Heather Lofthouse
42	Matthew John Whittaker
43	Nicole Katherine Whittaker
44	Kate Whittaker
45	John Graeme Whittaker
46	Taranaki Equestrian Network (TEN)
47	Anita Christine Rebecca Luxton
48	Christian Keith Wingate

49 Steven Collier  
50 Rodney Martin  
51 Jeremy Hutchings  
52 Jennifer Maree Wells  
53 Jennifer Marjory Brown  
54 Paul Jamieson  
55 Katherine Vernon  
56 Milou Barrett - Chairperson of Oakura School Board of  
Trustees  
57 Dana Hazard  
58 Hailey Foster-Ander  
59 Richard Shearer  
60 Anthony James Ander  
61 Cameron Murray  
62 Elaine Jamieson  
63 Kim Jennings  
64 Nicholas John Gladstone  
65 Rosemary Claire Moyes  
66 Bryan Alan Moyes  
67 Lycia Moyes  
68 Vivien Angela Gladstone  
69 Joanne Ruth Brown  
70 Stephen John Wood  
71 Michael George Anderson  
72 Colin Roger Ellis  
73 Mary Levett  
74 Jonathon Heath  
75 David Paul Herbert  
76 Maura Conaglen  
77 Craig Farrant  
78 Helen Shearer  
79 Neil Farrant  
80 Glen Eugene Johns  
81 Aaron Dwayne Hine  
82 Rachel Hareb-Hine  
83 Victoriaa Jane Johns  
84 Chris Wells  
85 Dianne Kay Brien  
86 Loe and Lies Stolte  
87 Milou Barrett  
88 David Andries Willem Rood  
89 Sophie Lily Crabtree  
90 Alex Margaret Reid  
91 Susan Imhasley  
92 Ian Philip Coutanche  
93 Paul Maurice Wynter  
94 Lars Binsbergen  
95 Jackie Keenan  
96 Ronald Stratford  
97 Jaynie McSweeney  
98 Helen Margaret Fleming  
99 Alex Ingram  
100 Stuart Bennett

101 Vincenza Mancini Clark  
102 Robert Brian Clark  
103 Hayley Bennett  
104 Allie Black  
105 Simon Roche: Powerco Limited  
106 Hayley Ingram  
107 Lisa Wynter  
108 Stefan Imre Kiss  
109 Amy Cunningham  
110 John Russel Ardern  
111 Keith Manukonga  
Chairperson, Oakura Pa  
112 Jacqueline Molloy  
113 Vince Fenning  
114 Oakura Playcentre, Hayley Bennett  
115 Anne Bridges  
116 Richard Rollins  
117 Rosemary Law  
118 Rachel Anna Law  
119 Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust  
120 Kylie Braddock  
121 Climate Justice Taranaki  
122 Dirk Schmidt-Rittershang  
123 Tracey MacKenzie  
124 Kim Sheree Winstanley  
125 Sian Wingate  
126 Rebecca Scott  
127 Lyndon DeVantier  
128 Ana Hislop  
129 Robyn Ann McGregor  
130 First Gas Limited, Shell Taranaki Limited and Liquigas  
131 Nikki Ingram  
132 Angela Lawn  
133 Clare Knapton, NPOB Swimming and Surf Club  
134 Taranaki Iwi, Wharehoka Wano  
135 Amy Sutherland  
136 NZ Transport Agency  
137 Clare Knapton  
138 Anna Marie Debreceeny  
139 Scarlet-Rose Aitken  
140 Jonathan Price  
141 Mary Bishop  
142 Wild for Taranaki  
143 Claire Tompkins  
144 Paul Cunningham  
145 Sarah Cunningham  
146 Rene Stefan Lepionka  
147 Marvin Clough  
148 Simon Anthony Bond  
149 Keith Bond  
150 Jason Bond  
151 Olaf Wahlen  
152 Brigit and Matthew Krueger

153 Steven Richard Looney  
154 Stella Marie Bond  
155 Mary Deken  
156 Yvonne Peacock  
157 Anne Elizabeth Clough  
158 Matt Peacock  
159 Sarah Foreman  
160 Grant Aitken  
161 Raymond Rooker  
162 Diego Javier Romero Parra  
163 Suzette Kaye Boddington  
164 Margaret Dobbin  
165 Luke Peacock  
166 Kerry Peacock  
167 Graeme John Duff  
168 Stephen Lumb  
169 Peta Bisset Hislop  
170 Barbara Costelloe  
171 Anna Blyth Costelloe  
172 Helen Elizabeth Des Forges  
173 Matthew Robert Crabtree  
174 Layne Greensill  
175 Catherine Deeley  
176 Jessica Kate Churchman  
177 Stephen Ruddlesden  
178 Linda Kathryn Murray  
179 Geoffrey Neil Murray  
180 Craig Hunter  
181 Marion McNeil Chitty  
182 Maria Dawn Townsend  
183 Max Gillespie  
184 John William Freeman  
185 Brigitte Hegner Freeman  
186 Susan Michelle Rose  
187 Mervyn Clarence Foster  
188 Ngaio Marama Crook  
189 Craig Peter Williams  
190 Bianca Ruakere  
191 Dominique France Blatti  
192 Patricia Anne Brodie  
193 Keith McLean Brodie  
194 Candida Fox  
195 Joseph Thomas Churchman  
196 Sion Bridge  
197 Kate Evans  
198 Chris Evans  
199 Alan Kindler  
200 Clare Elizabeth Leven  
201 Toni Maree Peacock  
202 Sioban Luttrell  
203 Madaleine Bourke  
204 Finn Bourke  
205 Shirley Lynette Fisher

206 Erica Thompson  
207 Alexandra Thompson  
208 Catherine Julia Lennox  
209 Ingrid Whalen  
210 Dr Jeanette Drury-Ruddlesden  
211 Barney Walker  
212 Max Shearer  
213 Belle Evans  
214 Kris Robinson  
215 William Howard  
216 Bruce Donald Hookham  
217 Jennie Aitken-Hall  
218 Sam Mortensen  
219 Hannah Elisabeth White  
220 Sarah Markert-Emans  
221 Joseph Emans  
222 Elayne Kessler  
223 Ruth Elizabeth Morgan  
224 Narelle Frampton  
225 Karen Cave  
226 Mike Vickers  
227 Kate Ponga  
228 Chris Kindler  
229 Murray Hewitt  
230 Emma Hislop  
231 Philippa Dinnison  
232 Campbell White  
233 Susan Freeman  
234 Claire White  
235 Mikisela Nyman  
236 Steven King  
238 Stepphen John Roberts  
239 Alwyn John Dinnison  
240 Sacha Maria Bull  
241 Gareth Luttrell  
242 Andrew Paul Sherwood-Hale  
243 Ian Douglas Corrigan  
244 Rinn Frances Willetts  
245 Lizaan Sherwood-Hale  
246 Sara Elizabeth Frey  
247 Thomas Paul Ellison  
248 Gillian Elizabeth Gibbon  
249 Ian Peter Gibbon  
250 Kate Louise Hinton  
251 Hannah Brieseman  
252 Sara Jayne Matheson  
253 Gina Milestone  
254 Francois Husillos  
255 Paul and Penny Holdcroft  
256 Melissa Henwood  
257 Chris Edward Henwood  
258 Kaitake Community Board

259 Adam Christopher Thame  
260 George Poole  
261 Graeme Mitchell  
262 Mark Bridges  
263 Tobias Looker  
264 Christophe Massa  
265 Greg Shearer  
266 Sam Dixon  
267 James Harrop  
268 Rowan Deuapt  
269 Paul Donald Coxhead  
270 Patricia Rae Coxhead  
271 Elli Pillette  
272 Jenna Pillette  
273 John Tooman  
274 Jan Bisset Brash  
275 Heather McKinnon  
276 Glenys Mair Farrant  
277 Ruth Brieseman  
278 Gary Brieseman  
279 Ed Shearer  
280 Shelley Tipler  
281 Howard Evans  
282 Christopher Edward Taylor  
283 Christopher DJ Curd  
284 Irene More  
285 Dominic Barson  
286 Corrin Grace Pryce-Baxter  
287 Rowan Paul Oldfield  
288 Jane Elizabeth Shearer  
289 Michael Leonard Gibbon  
290 Bruce Gordon Duggan  
291 Suzanne Bloch-Jorgensen  
292 Andrew Kingsley  
293 Edward Roger Thompson  
294 Barry Ross (Sam) Sutherland  
295 Vicki Maree Looney  
296 Tanya Farrant  
297 Neil McLauchlan  
298 Emma Kate Taylor  
299 John Malcolm Quilter  
300 Harry Nikau Looney  
301 Mack Julian Looney  
302 Brenda Lee Frampton  
303 Warren Alexander Green  
304 Neville Courtney Frampton  
305 Karl Looney  
306 Wendy Elizabeth Marshall  
307 Hamish Shearer  
308 Margaret Rose Fleming  
309 Zaki Shamas Din  
310 Heather Mary Weston  
311 Kim Anne Fredrickson

312 Jillian Murdoch  
313 Geoff Shearer  
314 Melissa McQuaig  
315 Joanne Hill  
316 Dorrien Andrews  
317 Phoebe Ruth Andrews  
318 Ian Blair Ivess  
319 Helen Anne Ivess  
320 Marion Anne Duff  
321 Adam Karl Hinton  
322 Daisy Din  
323 Toby Din  
324 Paul John Haskell  
325 Lisa Ann Haskell  
326 Jill Angela Shearer  
327 Maree Milestone  
328 Yvonne Adele Blatti  
329 Darrell Farmer  
330 Michael Gerard Yardley  
331 Julie Helen Yardley  
332 Pamela Anne Frame  
333 Ian Stewart Frame  
334 Julia  
335 Douglas Hislop  
336 Audrey Stockman  
337 Desmond Stockman  
338 Natalie O'Donnell  
339 Katy Hutchins  
340 Gloria Zimmerman  
341 Kathleen Anne Fraser  
342 Christopher John Thame  
343 Pauline Gay Thame  
345 Joanne Mary Francis-Alles  
346 Lagen Kumeroa  
347 Gillian Slaney  
348 Nina Lobb  
349 Barbara Hawkins  
350 Christy Warke  
351 Julia McNeil  
352 Shanon Carmel Dowsing  
353 Maree Brown  
354 Hayden Corkin  
355 Margaret Anne Constance  
356 Fiona Sorensen  
357 Gabrielle Lloyd  
358 Elizabeth Barrientos  
359 Janet Sweet  
361 Yulan Imhasly  
362 Juraj Krajci  
363 Lubos Krajci  
364 Marie-Jose Griffin  
365 Michael William Pillette  
366 Hanan Michael Pillette

368 Belinda Pickford  
369 Allen Douglas Charteris  
370 Clare Sherlie Charteris  
371 Lynne Le Roux  
372 Shelley Dawn Landon-Lane  
373 Robyn Jacqueline Prentice  
374 Patrick Murray Brien  
375 Stuart G McKinnon  
376 Fay Rosalie Looney  
377 Tanya Hansen  
378 Ann Geraldine Hikaka  
379 Robert and Carlene Dobbie  
380 Francis Farmer  
381 Nicholas Field  
382 Mike Hareb  
383 Ben Chapman  
384 Leonie Smith  
385 Heather Robyn Looker  
386 Jono Watts  
387 Stephen John Butter [Butland?]  
388 Marine Derore  
389 Tony Graeme Willetts  
390 Luke Florence  
391 Amber Christiansen  
392 Claire Florence  
393 Christine Gruys  
394 Grace Pryce  
395 Eleanor Rose Moyes  
396 Shaun Thomas Churchill  
397 Catherine Ongley  
398 Rosalind McFetridge  
399 Kama Ambrose  
400 Brady Cates  
401 Joy Woodward  
402 Lee William Webb  
403 David John Smith  
404 Sharon Thomas  
405 Helen Lamb  
406 Michelle Jane Beekman  
407 Neal Pullen  
408 Janko Reinders  
409 Constance Rebecca Reinders  
410 Stephanie Marie Griffith  
411 Valerie Neil  
412 Greer Elise Thomas  
413 Nadine Greaves  
414 Emma Wilson  
415 Jarran Neil Colman  
416 Jack Kurta  
417 Alexandra Power  
418 Sarah Churchill  
419 John Briesemann  
420 Christina Wells

421 Patricia Elsie Hardy  
422 Jan Roebuck  
423 Matthew Brash

**Late Submissions**

L424 John Newton  
L425 George Newton  
L426 Lee Newton  
L427 Louis Newton  
L428 Paul Frederick Bishop  
L429 Wayne Looker  
L430 Grant Looker  
L431 Philippa Holman  
L432 Toby Dixon  
L433 Glenda May Tyrrell

## Appendix 2: List of Submitter Appearances: Hearing Private Plan Change 48

Submitter	Speaker	Sub
Kaitake Community Board (Tabled documents and USB)	Doug Hislop and Mike Pillette	258

Tuesday  
23 July 2019

Submitter	Speaker	Sub #
-----------	---------	-------

Wednesday  
24 July 2019

10.10am	Matt Peacock, Richard Shearer, Steven Looney, Wayne Looker	Scott Grieve - Legal	various
11.04am	Maria Townsend (tabled doc)	Maria Townsend	182
11.12am	Ingrid Wahlen	Maria Townsend	209
11.13am	Anita Luxton	Maria Townsend	47
11.14am	Kerry Peacock	Maria Townsend	166

11.25am	Tanya Hansen	Jennifer Blyde	377
11.35am	Jennifer Blyde	Jennifer Blyde	3
11.44am	Matt Peacock, Richard Shearer, Steven Looney, Wayne Looker	Richard Rollins - Pesticides in Water & Potential Health Effects	various
12.25pm	Matt Peacock, Richard Shearer, Steven Looney, Wayne Looker	Nic Gladstone - Traffic Safety	various

1.50pm	Matt Peacock, Richard Shearer, Steven Looney, Wayne Looker	Matt Peacock - expert evidence in relation to land development and subdivision infrastructure	various
2.14pm	Matt Peacock, Richard Shearer, Steven Looney, Wayne Looker	Peter Kensington - Landscape	various
2.58pm	Matt Peacock, Richard Shearer, Steven Looney, Wayne Looker	Cam Twigley - Planning	various
4.10pm	Milou Barrett	Milou Barrett	87
	Hayley and Stuart Bennett	Milou Barrett	103 and 100
	Richie and Sara Matheson	Milou Barrett	39 and 252
4.29pm	Loe and Lies Stolte	Milou Barrett	86
4.30pm	First Gas	Erin Whooley	130
4.46pm	Ian Frame	Ian Frame	333
5.07pm	Fay Looney MNZM	Fay Looney MNZM	379
5.30pm	Graeme Churchill	Suki Bishop	29
5.32pm	Denise Novak	Denise Novak	32
5.39pm	Bruce Hookham	Bruce and Patti	216
5.30pm	Graeme Churchill	Suki Bishop	29
5.50pm	Stefan Kiss	Stefan Kiss	108

Date  
Thursday  
25 July  
2019

	Submitter		Sub
9.10am	Rosemary Law	Rosemary law	117
9.20am	Sam Dixon	Sam Dixon	266
10am	Toby Dixon	Sam Dixon	L432
10.10am	Matt Peacock	Matt Peacock	158
10.37am	Barney Walker	Matt Peacock	211
10.39am	Luke Peacock	Matt Peacock	165
10.45am	Te Kohia O Taranaki	Puna Wano-Bryant	134
11.45am	Toni Peacock	Toni Howison	201
11.57am	Gina Milestone	Toni Howison	253
12noon	Jacqueline Kearns	Jacqueline Kearns	
12.18am	Richard Rollins	Richard Rollins (Did not finish)	116
12.21pm	Layne Greensill	Layne Greensill	174
12.40pm	Craig Williams	Craig Williams	189
12.51pm	Jacqueline Molloy	Jacqueline Molloy	112

2.07pm	Ed Shearer	Ed Shearer	279
2.08pm	Max Shearer	Richard Shearer	212
2.10pm	Richard Shearer	Richard Shearer	59
2.25pm	Yvonne Peacock	Yvonne Peacock	156
2.30pm	Jason Peacock	Jason Peacock	37
2.41pm	Dennis Green and Jennifer Brown	Dennis Green	40 & 53
	John Freeman	Dennis Green	184

	B Hegner Freeman	Dennis Green	185
	Shirley Fisher	Dennis Green	205
	Jenifer Wells	Dennis Green	52
2.58pm	Graeme Duff	Graeme Duff	167
3.23pm	Kate Evans	Kate Evans	197
3.27pm	Chris Evans	Kate Evans	198
3.33pm	Jane Dove Juneau	Jane Dove Juneau	20
3.42pm	Oakura Playcentre	Jane James	114
4.10pm	Board of Trustees, Oakura School	Paul Veric, Lynne	56
4.50pm	Catherine Lennox	Catherine Lennox	208
5pm	Rene Lepionka	Rene Lepionka	146
5.04pm	Birgit Kuriger	Catherine Lennox	152
5.10pm	Hayley Ingram	Hayley Ingram	106
5.13pm	Alex Ingram	Alex Ingram	99
5.20pm	Penny Holdcroft	Hayley Ingram	255
5.23pm	Glenys Farrant	Glenys Farrant	276
5.25pm	Olaf Wahlen	Glenys Farrant	151
5.26pm	Maura Conaglen	Glenys Farrant	76
5.28pm	Manu and Rachel Shafer	Craig Farrant	31 and 28
5.30pm	Craig Farrant	Craig Farrant	77
5.32pm	Helen Ivess	Dianne Brien	318
5.37pm	Di Brien	Di Brien	85
5.40pm	Rodney Martin	Rodney Martin	50
5.46pm	Rowan Oldfield	Rowan Oldfield	287
5.53pm	Brian and Vincenza Clark	Brian Clark	102 and 101
5.56pm	Graeme Mitchell	Graeme Mitchell	261
5.59pm	Max Gillespie	Max Gillespie	183
6.05pm	Dorrien Andrews	Dorrien Andrews	316
6.10pm	Helen Shearer	Helen Shearer	78
6.16pm	Howard Reid	Howard Reid	35
6.19pm	Mary Bishop	Mary Bishop	141
6.43pm	Jackie Keenan	Jackie Keenan	95
6.56pm	Gillian Gibbon	Gillian Gibbon	248
	Ian Gibbon	Gillian Gibbon	249
6.59pm	Michael Gibbon	Gillian Gibbon	289
7.04pm	Cam Murray	Cam Murray	61
7.10pm	Alexandra Thompson	Alexandra Thompson	207
7.20pm	Erica Thompson	Alexandra or Edward Thompson	206
	Edward Thompson	Edward Thompson	293
	Jaynie McSweeney	Jaynie McSweeney	97

Date	Tim	Submitter	Speake	Sub
------	-----	-----------	--------	-----

**Friday**  
**26 July 2019**

10.45am	Tom Cloke	Tom Cloke	12
10.55am	Marvin Clough	Marvin Clough	147
11.01am	Anne Clough	Anne Clough	157
11.11am	Elaine Jamieson	Elaine Jamieson	62
11.19am	Kim Jennings	Ross Jennings	63
11.28am	Byran Moyes	Bryan Moyes	66
11.40am	Rosie Moyes	Bryan or Rosie Moyes	65
11.45am	Catherine Ongley	Catherine Ongley	397
11.56am	Ngaio Crook	Ngaio Crook	188
12.15pm	Taranaki Equestrian Network (TEN)	Megan Gundesen	46
12.27pm	Sarah Foreman	Sarah Foreman	159
12.41pm	Rebecca Scott	Rebecca Scott	126

1.20pm	Steven Looney	Steven Loony	153
1.28pm	Steven Wood	Steven Wood	70
1.42pm	Grant Stewart	Grant Stewart	15
1.46pm	Paul and Pat Coxhead	Paul Coxhead	269 and 270
1.50pm	Allie Black and Trent Tscheuschler	Allie Black	9 and 104
1.55pm	Janko Reinders	Mary Bishop	408
2pm	Doug and Peta Hislop	Doug Hislop	235 and 169

Date	Time	Submitter	Speaker
------	------	-----------	---------

**Monday**

**2**

**December**

3.16pm	Matt Peacock, Richard Shearer, Steven Looney and Wayne Looker	Cam Twigley
3.35pm	NZTA	Kelly Standish and Caron Greenough
3.49pm	Matt Peacock, Richard Shearer, Steven Looney and Wayne Looker	Peter Kensington
4.04pm	Matt Peacock, Richard Shearer, Steven Looney and Wayne Looker	Nic Gladstone
4.44pm	Kaitake Community Board	Doug Hislop
5.12pm	Oakura School	Paul Veric and Lynn Hepworth
5.27pm	Graeme Duff	Graeme Duff
5.45pm	Oakura Submitters	Richard Shearer

**ATTACHMENT 1: ACCEPTANCE/ REJECTION OF SUBMISSIONS**

# Summary of Submissions and Decisions

## Private Plan Change PPLC48

### Introduction

The following two tables summarise the submissions and decisions requested for each submission received on the Proposed Private Plan Change 48 (PPC18/0048) Wairau Road, Oakura Rezoning. The recommended decision of the Hearing Commissioner is included in the last column of each row.

As has been described in the decision, the Plan Change changed significantly in size and scale during the hearing from 399 lots to 144 lots. Important elements of the notified Plan Change were abandoned, such as the noise bund, a roundabout, a second vehicle entry on SH45, an underpass, equestrian lifestyle blocks. In such cases the response to the submission/submission point will be n/a (not applicable) due to the absence of the proposed element that is being submitted on.

In addition to the reference numbers assigned to the submissions received (i.e. S2, refers to Submission Number 2), a unique numeric identifier (i.e. 2.01) was applied to the specific points/matters raised in each submission in order to provide greater specificity and extra clarity.

In addition, nine submissions were received after the deadline for receipt of submissions and are treated as 'late submissions'. These submissions have been recorded, were publicly notified as part of the summary of submissions calling for further submissions, and a decision was made as part of the hearing, that these late submissions be accepted and considered as part of this process.

Twenty-seven submissions were originally received on Plan Change 48 which contained no submitter contact details. A submission must contain the contact details of the person making the submission, or the name and address of an agent if someone has been employed to act on their behalf. Given no contact details were provided, these original submissions were considered incomplete and could not be accepted by the Council.

One submission was received in which the submitter requested their details be withheld. Given the submitter wished for their details to be withheld, and thus no contact details could be provided, this submission was not accepted by Council and not included in this

summary. As a consequence of the incomplete submissions and one submission where details have been withheld, submitter numbers are not in sequential order.

Table 2 contains the late submissions that were subsequently accepted as outlined in the Commissioner Report and Recommendations.

### **Table 1a: Pro Forma submissions**

Submissions on PPC18/00048 were received in many forms from a range of individuals and organisations. Many submitters completed a 'template' submission, referred to as Pro Forma submission. To minimize duplication and to be as concise as possible in this summary document, the Pro Forma submission has been summarised in Table 1a below. Where submissions contained identical information from the Pro Forma submission, a cross-reference has been provided to the Pro Forma submission (PF1) in the individual submissions summarised in Table 1b below. Pro Forma submissions that contained additional specific or handwritten comments (i.e. in addition to the Pro Forma submission) are included in the individual submitter submission point summaries in Table 1b.

NB For clarity, reference to Table 1 in the summary of submission points outlined in Table 1b, is to Table 1a.

Table 1a: Proforma submission

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>Pro Forma 1</b>					
<b>Multiple submitters (see Table 1b) below which refers to each person who made a Pro Forma submission)</b>					
PF1	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is not the most appropriate or suitable way to achieve the purpose of the RMA or the stated objectives of the Plan Change or the objectives of the existing New Plymouth District Plan.</li> <li>• The proposal is not designed to accord with and assist, nor will it assist, the territorial authority to carry out its functions in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.</li> <li>• The plan change will not properly give effect to, and is contrary to and inconsistent with, the Regional Policy Statement for Taranaki, the New Plymouth Coastal Strategy, the Oakura Structure Plan, the Land Supply Review 2007-2027 Final Framework for Growth, the Oakura Community Engagement Project Report 2014/16 and the Kaitake Community Plan: a thirty year vision and is not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the New Plymouth District Plan.</li> <li>• The plan change will have significant adverse effects on the environment (including the quality of the environment) including (but not necessarily limited to) significant adverse:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ environmental, social and cultural effects</li> <li>○ amenity values, landscape (including visual) and rural character effects</li> <li>○ lighting and light overspill effects</li> <li>○ noise, vibration and privacy effects</li> <li>○ traffic and transport effects (including compromising the effective, efficient and safe land transport system in the public</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested/Relief Sought	Recommended Decision
			<p>interest) and effects on the surrounding roading network (in terms of functioning, integrity, capacity and safety)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ infrastructure, services and community infrastructure effects</li> <li>○ storm water, sewage, water supply and waste water effects</li> <li>○ agricultural land (in terms of loss of and fragmentation of agricultural land) and soil</li> <li>○ conservation effects</li> <li>○ reverse sensitivity effects</li> <li>○ earthworks effects</li> <li>○ construction effects</li> <li>○ cumulative effects.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The adverse effects will not be, nor are capable of being, adequately or appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.</li> <li>● The proposal is not a sustainable use of the land resource the subject of the change, and overall the Plan Change will not be efficient or effective; neither does it properly consider alternatives. Further, there has been a lack of proper or any meaningful consultation.</li> <li>● The Plan Change will not achieve sustainable management and is contrary to the purpose and principles of the Act.</li> </ul>		

Table 1b: Summary of individual submissions

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested / Relief Sought	Recommended Decision
<b>S1 Paul Andre Lavoipierre</b>					
1.01	Appendices – Diagram 32.1	Support in part	Supports idea of equestrian lifestyle blocks with a bridle trail and shared arena but does not believe it is fair to force riders on to a busy rural road when there is a much safer alternative. There are statistics of horses and their riders being injured by cars on roads.	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See the esplanade strip alongside the Wairau Stream opened up to include horses as well as cyclists and walkers with appropriate signage and a neighbourhood raised on 'Share With Care' principles.</li> </ul>	n/a
<b>S2 Jennifer Susan Lavoipierre</b>					
2.01	Appendices – Diagram 32.1	Support in part	Supports idea of equestrian lifestyle blocks with a bridle trail and shared arena but does not believe it is fair to force riders on to a busy rural road when there is a much safer alternative. There are statistics of horses and their riders being injured by cars on roads.	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See the esplanade strip alongside the Wairau Stream opened up to include horses as well as cyclists and walkers with appropriate signage and a neighbourhood raised on 'Share With Care' principles.</li> </ul>	n/a
<b>S3 Jennifer Elaine Blyde</b>					
3.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The view up to the Kaitake Ranges is beautiful and should not be turned into housing. The view shaft is very special.</li> <li>Strongly oppose 300sqm sections as part of the development. Would be more supportive if the development included a retirement village, but standalone 300sqm sections in what is rural land is outrageous.</li> <li>It is understood that the Developer acquired consent for the 26 lot "Paddocks" subdivision by firstly acquiring a consent for 26 four hectare lots, then presenting a case that it would be better to subdivide 26 x 0.4 hectare lots, and to retain the balance of the land for farming use. On</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

			<p>this basis, consents from neighbouring affected parties was granted. The Developer now seeks to develop the farmland into very small lots.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter has been involved in the equestrian community for fifty years and has lived in Oakura for forty odd years. Whilst the provision of equestrian lifestyle blocks is applauded, unless the horses have direct access to the main road and beach, there will be serious problems with horses riding through the development to access riding areas (horse dung, traffic and horse issues).</li> <li>• The submitter feels that the intersection of Wairau Road and the main highway is currently dangerous due to traffic from many subdivisions up Surrey Hill Road and the recent "Paddocks" subdivision. There is not enough room to build a roundabout that milk tankers and other large trucks that often drive along the coastal road can easily drive through. The submitter believes the only way this would be possible is if the developer were to purchase all four houses on the corner of the Wairau SH45 intersection to build the roundabout.</li> <li>• Land on the sea side of the main road in Oakura is far more suitable for subdivision. Strongly oppose the Plan Change rezoning rural land when there is plenty of land available on the sea side of the main road.</li> </ul>		n/a

			The submitter also opposes the Plan Change for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S4 Anna Louise Hinton</b>					
4.01	Appendices – Diagram 32.1	Support in part	Fully supports the idea of having equestrian lifestyle blocks that have a shared bridle trail and arena, but strongly opposes the idea of forcing horse riders onto a busy rural road when there is another safer alternative.	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See the esplanade strip alongside the Wairau Stream opened up to include horses as well as cyclists and walkers with appropriate signage and a neighbourhood raised on 'Share With Care' principles.</li> </ul>	n/a
<b>S5 Nicola Anna Lumb</b>					

5.01	Appendices – Diagram 32.1	Support in part	Supports the idea of equestrian lifestyle blocks with a bridle trail and arena but does not believe it is fair to force horse riders onto a busy rural road when there is a much safe alternative.	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See the esplanade strip alongside the Wairau Stream opened up to include horses as well as cyclists and walkers with appropriate signage and a neighbourhood raised on 'Share With Care' principles.</li> </ul>	n/a
<b>S6 Molly Jayne Lumb</b>					
6.01	Appendices – Diagram 32.1	Support in part	Supports the idea of equestrian lifestyle blocks with a bridle trail and arena but does not believe it is fair to force horse riders onto a busy rural road when there is a much safer alternative.	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See the esplanade strip alongside the Wairau Stream opened up to include horses as well as cyclists and walkers with appropriate signage and a neighbourhood raised on 'Share With Care' principles.</li> </ul>	n/a
<b>S7 Paul Joseph Veric</b>					
7.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Plan Change in its entirety due to the scale of the change, not all change. Controlled or measured growth is something that the submitters does not think anyone can be opposed to. After all, all current residents reside as a result of controlled growth. The proposed Plan Change however is not in keeping with current growth. It opens up the ability for significant residential development of which the impact is detailed further in this submission. The Plan Change contradicts previous and earlier information provided when development of 'The Paddocks' occurred. Accountability to the original purpose/intent and original community acceptance surely counts for something in this day and age?</p> <p>The submitter also opposes the Plan Change for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S8 Heelan Tompkins</b>					
8.01	General - Equestrian/ Rural Lifestyle Area, Wairau Rd	Support in Part	<p>As an Equestrian "expert" making small sections of less than 5 acres could back fire. Horses need space to not only be kept but also to be ridden.</p> <p>Creating areas to ride on small sections makes for untidy muddy land and skinny horses. The riding trials that were promised in the last subdivision on Wairau Road of Mike Mckay's and also the subdivision of my other neighbour Jeff Murray's never eventuated which is fine as I never liked the idea of mixing bikes, dogs, horses, and walkers, not a great mix. The current pony club is on a small piece of land, one of the most averages pony clubs around for such an affluent area and trust me I've seen a lot of pony clubs.</p>	<p>Amend the Plan Change to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See a pony club created on a nice size block which would have an arena, yards, cross country jumps and canter track. The submitter believes this will enable small blocks as the land will be able to be used just for grazing.</li> <li>• See the developer set a number limit of stock allowed on each lot. The submitter believes if the lifestyle Equestrian is done correctly, the lifestyle feel of the area would remain. The submitter would like to see the pony club move to a more user-friendly spot and to see the land currently used as the Oakura Pony Club as a playground.</li> </ul>	n/a
<b>S9 Trent Tscheuschler</b>					
9.01	Page 9 reference and proposal for "attenuation bund"	Oppose	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed attenuation bund which is proposed to be built adjacent to SH45. Such a bund creates an environmental impairment in a rural setting. Oakura township has a rural country town appearance. Installing a 2-4m bund would remove the rural feel to the adjacent landscape. A bund of this nature is common in dense urban environments and is not keeping with the character of the landscape. Strongly object to the proposal in its existing form. To allow for such a bund to be installed land adjacent</p>	<p>Amend the Plan Change to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• remove the installation of the attenuation bund and require that the NZTA setback of 80 metres is upheld.</li> </ul>	n/a

			to the proposed subdivision would also need to be zoned urban and have an urban setting. Request a		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			change to the proposal removing the bund and setting the buildings proposed back 80m from SH45 as per NZTA requirements.		
<b>S10 Kevin Nielsen</b>					
10.01	*Inferred - Appendices – Diagram 32.1	Support in part	Equestrian lifestyle blocks with a bridle trail and shared arena is an excellent idea. However, horse riders should not be forced to ride on a busy rural road.	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See esplanade strip alongside the Wairau Stream opened up with shared access for all including horse riders.</li> </ul>	n/a
<b>S11 Stuart Tinson</b>					

11.01	General - Rules relating to the plan change area (i.e. the restrictions on building and lot size)	Oppose	<p>Opposed to the reduction in minimum lot size as applied to the plan change area. The small lot size proposed and the high density of housing will result in a dramatic change in the nature of the area in close proximity to the National Park. The fringes of the Oakura Village need to reflect existing environment. High density development close to the National Park is inappropriate. A larger plot size will mean the future owners will plant more shrubs and trees eventually moderating the development. Small plot size inevitably means no larger shrubs or trees in the gardens.</p> <p>Another issue already causing problems is the lack of services in Oakura especially the inadequate roading through the village. Extra traffic as a result of the development will stress the roading network further. Even the traffic flow through Spotswood and Whalers Gate will be affected since Oakura already seems to serve as a dormitory suburb. Traffic flow during the morning and evening commute is already heavy. Reducing the number of dwellings by maintaining existing plot size seems a sensible option, limiting these impacts.</p>	<p>Amend the Plan Change (*inferred):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter does not want the proposed new rules concerning lot size to be implemented, i.e. a minimum lot size of 700m<sup>2</sup> remains.</li> </ul>	Accept in part
<b>S12 Tom Cloke National Road Carriers Association</b>					
12.01	General – Traffic provisions	Oppose	Concerned about the extra traffic generated within the area of SH45 and Wairau Road intersection and the ability of safety aspects during and after construction.	The submitter seeks more information on the additional traffic on SH45/Wairau Road intersection. Specifically, would like more	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
				information on traffic flows and increase and addressing any adverse effects to safety, especially for large vehicles, including buses.	
<b>S13 John Tanner</b>					
13.01	General – rezoning of the land	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of this area (urban spread). Jamming 400 sections into this area, with sections as small as 300m <sup>2</sup> creates a suburb/ghetto, not a park. Increasing the amount of site that can be covered by buildings adds to this. Oppose the intent to access this area from Wairau Road (creating traffic problems).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S14 Madeline Layupan</b>					
14.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	100% oppose this development. It would destroy the character of the village and have an adverse effect on the environment. Parking in the village is already inadequate and the main road dangerous to cross now.  The submitter also opposes the Plan Change for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S15 Grant Stewart</b>					
15.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter is concerned in regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The additional stormwater runoff into the two streams will be a problem. Extra pupils at the school with no expansion area.</li> <li>• Additional traffic in the village with the two bad intersections.</li> <li>• A lack of parking at the beach front already.</li> <li>• More people equals more strain on the local environment.</li> </ul> The submitter also opposes the Plan Change for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S16 John Grahame Christiansen</b>					
16.01	General - the Plan Change	Oppose	The submitter believes:	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

	in its entirety		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area's amenity values will be seriously compromised by the plan change.</li> <li>The infrastructure will not cope.</li> </ul>		
--	-----------------	--	--	--	--

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			The submitter also opposes the Plan Change for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S17 Leen Fiddelaers</b>					
17.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter has high concerns about the closeness to the National Park and pressure on Oakura School.</li> <li>The submitter believes there will be a high increase on businesses, roads and safety of children.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes the Plan Change for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S18 Timothy John Costelloe</b>					
18.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter feels that the increase in dwellings will mean an increase in rats, mice, dogs and cats, and this conflicts with the aim to make the Kaitake Ranges predator free. The development is adjacent to the Kaitake Ranges.</p> <p>The increase in dwelling will mean increased light pollution. At the moment the night sky above this area is remarkably clear and an increase in dwellings will negatively affect this.</p> <p>The soil in this area is highly fertile, it is in a unique position sheltered from the cold south easterly winds. In the future +50-100 years from present the availability of fertile land for crops close to urban areas will be of vital importance to feed and sustain the urban population. The friable, fertile volcanic soils are a valuable, limited, resource.</p> <p>The area has significant archaeological, cultural and iwi relevance. This is where the Hau Hau movement started. The attached sketch (1864) [below] shows a view of the Kaitake from the north west. This shows a pa on the north east of the Kaitake Ranges, in the location of the proposed development.</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept



Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>Also the project could be on-sold to another developer who does not have the interests of the village in mind so without a regulated timeline of development this could have a huge effect on the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the biggest is the Oakura School. It is already at maximum capacity on the current site and another school would need to be built if this project goes ahead. Who will fund that? Where is the land going to come from?</li> <li>• There is already land allocated for development in Oakura. We don't need to rezone land if there is already an approved sub division on this land. The subdivision of around 30 lots is suitable in size and in line with Oakura's vision of steady growth to maintain a quality village lifestyle.</li> <li>• The development is too close to Mt Egmont National Park.</li> <li>• The traffic impact in the village of 800 cars would be huge.</li> <li>• We in the village want gradual growth in the area so the infrastructure can gradually grow in keeping with the village atmosphere. No large proposal is appropriate for the village.</li> <li>• A smaller development would likely be supported by people in the village i.e. 60-100 lots maximum.</li> <li>• The private plan change request has not considered the history of Oakura and how growth has been steady in keeping with the village lifestyle which has made it a successful community. Had a request for a reasonable size development as mentioned above then there might have been support. To go from a 26-lot development (as in the Paddocks) to 395 is not in the best interest of the village for the reasons outlined.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S21 Wibke Termath</b>					
21.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter strongly opposes the proposed re-zoning and subdivision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The subdivision is too close to the National Park and will destroy the look and feel of Oakura. The beautiful mountain views and rural</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>vistas will be permanently affected and the feel of a small sea side village will be lost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic is going to be a huge problem on Wairau Road and Surf Highway with increased traffic. Turning onto SH45 from Wairau is already a problem now during peak traffic hours and a 'proposed' roundabout will not make a difference.</li> <li>• The infrastructure of the village, parking at the beach and in the village is sometimes already a problem and is not designed to cope with a massive sub division and increased traffic.</li> <li>• The school is at maximum capacity now - Intermediate school must stay in Oakura and we need to keep the school a small village school for a local community and children.</li> <li>• Stick to the 20-year development plan for Oakura which was done with consultation of Oakura residents. Stick to the FUD areas as planned. Stick to the FUD areas as planned - don't waste tax payers money doing the planning involving the community and not following them.</li> <li>• During the resource consent from Paddock subdivision the developer gave undertaking not to develop Lot 29 (which is where the proposed subdivision is now).</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S22 Andrew Kenneth Marshall</b>					
22.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>Consent to the "Paddocks" development was given based on an agreement not to develop this area for domestic housing. There is no dense housing development south of the river in Upper Wairau Road.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S23 Peter Newton</b>					
23.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned about beach parking, school parking and township parking.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S24 Alan Frederick Crawford</b>					
24.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>There is already approved subdivision of up to 300 sections of seaward side of main road, plenty for Oakura to expand. Planned predator free area threatened with possibly hundreds of more cats. Visual impact on rural aspect is against NPDC existing rules and that Traffic impact enormous with difficulty getting onto Surf Highway 45 already.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S25 Arielle Mermin</b>					
25.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S26 Gerald Turner</b>					
26.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks managed development not over supply.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S27 Peter Cassie</b>					
27.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is 100% against this development. It would significantly destroy character of the village and have a huge negative effect on the environment.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S28 Rachel Faye Schafer</b>					
28.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter does not want this proposal to go ahead and is against it.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S29 Graeme Thomas Churchill</b>					
29.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extra curbing and roads will lead to extra water in Wairau Stream causing flooding.</li> <li>• Infrastructure in Oakura couldn't cope with influx of people and cars; also school roll and intersection of Wairau Road with State Highway 45.</li> <li>• The land would be better utilised as a farm or horticulture activities.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S30 James JH Baxter</b>					
30.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S31 Manu Lee Schafer</b>					
31.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is against the proposed plan as it will have a negative effect on the community.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S32 Denise Mary Novak</b>					
32.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly opposed to any urban growth close to the National Park boundary. As per the Beca Carter Report commissioned by Council late 1990s all urban growth sea side of Oakura towards Ahu Ahu Road – this is supported.</li> <li>• The Kaitake Ranges viewshaft will be destroyed by housing.</li> <li>• Oppose 300 sq metre sections.</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commercial and school infrastructure not in place for this growth.</li> <li>The intersection of Wairau Road and SH45 is not safely catered for in the proposed planning.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S33 Stuart J Wells</b>					
33.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The land the proposal relates to is one of the best farm land properties on the coast and it should remain so for future generations. The submitter lives in Oakura and is a 5<sup>th</sup> generation, 7 generations in total and is saying No this should not happen on behalf of all the Wells family.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S34 Sheree Jull</b>					
34.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter objects to the proposal of the Plan change PPC18/00048. Strongly feels that traffic on Wairau Road will become a huge problem in the future! The submitter is also very concerned that other properties could be disadvantaged if they wish to subdivide, and how is this proposal going to effect land values in Oakura?</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S35 Howard Gordon Reid</b>					
35.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is a long time resident of Oakura and submits that the proposed plan change is not in the interest of the wider Oakura community and believes it will have a detrimental impact on transport, environment and infrastructure.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S36 Ben Tarrant</b>					
36.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S37 Jason Lee Peacock</b>					
37.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes the Plan change will have significant adverse effects on the physical (including the quality of the environment) and cultural environment including (but not necessarily limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current residents of Oakura have chosen to live in this area as it provides a semi-rural lifestyle with lower density living. Allowing these changes to the District Plan would set a precedent that may result in further development of an intensive nature that would irreparably change the environment;</li> <li>• The proposed plan change is of a scale and size that is inappropriate given that the current Long-Term Plan allows for a much smaller growth rate for the area. A development of this scale would account for all the agreed annual growth of the village and prevent smaller, more appropriate scaled developments from being accommodated into the growth plan;</li> <li>• The proposed plan change makes no reference to, nor takes consideration for already consented developments in the village, such as that off Cunningham Lane, and makes no allowances for the cumulative effects that these developments would have on the residents;</li> <li>• The proposal allows for a significant increase in population without providing any firm commitment to equivalent improvements in services or amenities;</li> <li>• There is no consideration for mitigation of the effects that the additional population will have on traffic flow through the village, parking and traffic safety near the school, at the shops and at the beach;</li> <li>• The proposed plan would have a detrimental effect on the quality of life and the value of properties of those residents already</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>located on upper Wairau Road. The significant negative effects of additional noise, traffic and air quality during construction (which is to be phased and therefore be of significant duration) and thereafter will have a permanent negative effect on these existing residents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed plan makes no reference to nor allowance for the effects that this development would have on the neighbouring national park and the Taranaki Regional Council's plan for a Predator Free Taranaki. The proposal would represent a large scale urban development located immediately adjacent to a National Park and would pose a significant threat to native wildlife due to the introduction of cats, dogs and associated rodents;</li> <li>• The submitter believes the proposed plan change makes no logical reference to, nor consideration of, management of additional storm water loading on Wairau Stream and the effects that this might have on existing properties and infrastructure. Nor does it adequately address the environmental effects that this additional storm water load would have on the flora and fauna of the stream and the potential erosional effects along the stream and at Oakura Beach;</li> <li>• The submitter feels that if approved, the development would set a precedent for more intensive subdivisions and developments. The very clear feedback from the residents of Oakura during consultation for the Long-Term Plan is that this type of environment is unwanted and unacceptable.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S38 Jacqueline Grieve</b>					
38.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S39 James Richard Matheson</b>					
39.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter feels that the application to change the plan will ultimately prove detrimental to Oakura. The current and proposed infrastructure will be insufficient to cope with the additional stresses. The negative impacts on the community and environment outweigh any benefits to the population.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S40 Dennis Green</b>					
40.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on the National Park created by domestic predators</li> <li>• Lack of public parking at Oakura beach during the summer months</li> <li>• Extra demand on Oakura water supply</li> <li>• Storm water run-off created by the hard surface area and the down- stream effects.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S41 Heather Lofthouse</b>					
41.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the planned development because it will completely change the use of rural land situated close to the national park at a time when rural land is quickly disappearing. The plan shows limited access to the proposed development along a road that is inadequate for the increased traffic. The current infrastructure will not adequately cope with the increase in population which will nearly Double, and education, health and social services will struggle to meet the increased need. This is all at a time when there is an increasing need to preserve and maintain the wealth and health of our national park and the rural community.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S42 Matthew John Whittaker</b>					
42.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter feels that the infrastructure of Oakura is not to a good enough standard to support the population increase that this subdivision will bring. Upper Wairau Road and the intersection where it meets the highway will become much more busy. The small sections will be an eyesore in general and will ruin the view that the submitter's house and many other houses have.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S43 Nicole Katherine Whittaker</b>					
43.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes that the planned subdivision would adversely affect the town due to gross over population. Oakura is already busy and adding 400 sections will make the streets polluted, carparking harder to come by, and will ruin the overall feel of the town.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S44 Kate Whittaker</b>					
44.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter holds concern about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of village character of Oakura. The subdivision will alter the vibe, feeling and special character of the village. This is the main reason why the submitter and others choose to live and raise families here.</li> <li>Wairau Road cannot take the volume of traffic – it is not wide enough, and cars need to cross the centre line to pass parked cars.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S45 John Graeme Whittaker</b>					
45.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>Opposes the proposed subdivision as it will change the entire nature of the town of Oakura, including roading, amenities, aesthetic value, schools and services, detrimentally. The proposal will not allow steady controlled growth of the town in a sensible fashion.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S46 Taranaki Equestrian Network (TEN)</b>					
46.01	General - Lack of provision for safe horse and cyclist travel	Oppose	<p>Opposes the complete absence in the Proposed Plan of a safe means of travel for horses and cyclists from the proposed development down to the proposed underpass on SH 45. No page number or provision or map can be referred to because the concept is not addressed in the Proposed Plan. Requests an amendment to the Plan to provide a safe means of access to and exit from the proposed development for horses and cyclists by using the Wairau Stream esplanade strip.</p> <p>a) Horse use prohibition in Esplanade Strip Instrument 9696907.9 affecting Lot 29 DP 497629. When the original 'Paddocks' subdivision was created, so too was an esplanade strip along the Wairau Stream running from the main intersection within the subdivision down to SH43. It was a condition of the esplanade strip that animals were prohibited on it, apart from the owners' animals. This condition was imposed for the purpose of providing "riparian protection and pedestrian access". This meant that horses and cyclists could not use the 20m wide, mown, safe esplanade strip. There was no consultation with the local community, to our knowledge, about the imposition of this condition onto the use of the esplanade strip.</p> <p>b) Lack of scientific assessment of equestrian impact when prohibition originally imposed. The 2010 ecological assessment undertaken by Oecological Ltd was simply adopted by Council without making any scientific investigation into the impact of equestrian use. DOC have partially acknowledged now that there is little or no ecological impact from horses by allowing them in parks and reserves.</p> <p>c) No negative ecological impact can be shown from horse use. If horse manure is the issue, lets deal to the 'horses spread weeds' fallacy. Horse manure is 70% water; it is partly composted grass (not meat like cats and dogs ingest which makes it sticky and smelly);</p>	<p>Amend the plan change to provide for safe means of travel for horses and cyclists from the proposed development down to the proposed underpass on SH 45. Includes by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• preparing a statement covering the matters specified in s.234(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991('RMA');</li> <li>• initiate a proposal to vary the conditions governing the existing esplanade strip along the Wairau Stream.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	n/a

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>American and Australian studies have concluded that horse manure on trails cannot be shown to be responsible for weed spread; horses guts do not contain the 120 viruses and constituents of concern in human, dog and cat faeces; and it disappears in a few days with birds picking it apart, and rapid decomposition in sun and rain.</p> <p>d) Increased traffic volumes in the area.  With the proposed Private Plan Change, there will eventually be approximately 1200 new residents, including 12 to 24 horses. The equestrians will most definitely want to ride to the beach and to the pony club which are both on the sea side of SH43. If equestrians can avoid using vehicles to go for a ride, they will. Under the current proposal, they will need to ride out to Upper Wairau Road and join the throngs of road users on the bottom end of Upper Wairau Rd. The likely purchasers of the lifestyle blocks will be time poor parents who want their child to be able to ride by themselves safely down to the pony club and back. This would be possible down the esplanade strip. It will not be possible under the current proposal. Therefore the current Plan obviously exposes equestrian residents to danger.</p> <p>These vastly increased traffic volumes will occur for 3 reasons. Firstly the addition of 1200 residents from the subdivision who will use the road.  Secondly, the further lifestyle block developments anticipated to occur on Upper Wairau Rd and Surrey Hill Road. Thirdly the increased traffic resulting from the proposed Kaitake Trail ending at Koru Pa. These traffic volumes will make Upper Wairau Rd even more unsafe for horses and cyclists.</p> <p>e) Horses, walkers and cyclists will be safe on this esplanade strip  Apart from one sharpish corner (which could be cut back easily), the strip is wide enough for a 'share with care' pathway. It has good lines of sight which are important particularly for equestrians and cyclists to avoid the horse getting a fright. There may be some conflict of users initially but this is also a wonderful opportunity for local residents to learn consideration and respect for one another. Inconsiderate behaviour will no doubt be addressed informally within the community. The greater good is served by having all recreational users enjoying a safe scenic trail and leaving the road to vehicles. ACC holds no statistics whatsoever on horses injuring people in public places. Contrast that with the number of statistics held for dogs injuring people in public places.</p>		

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>Also, in spite of the large number of horses living in the Oakura area for many many years, there are no known incidents of accident or injury involving a horse and a person within Oakura or indeed within Taranaki or New Zealand.</p> <p>f) An underpass on SH43 allowing equestrian access is proposed in this Plan Change Request.</p> <p>The proposed underpass permits horse access and appears to go under SH43 within metres of where the esplanade strip connects to SH43. It is illogical therefore that horses should be expected to use Upper Wairau Rd to get to SH43 and then somehow connect with the accessway to the underpass by walking along SH43? Logic would dictate that the esplanade strip merge with the underpass without the need to use the road at all.</p>		
46.02	General - Rural Lifestyle Area	Support	<p>Supports the proposed Rural Lifestyle Area. The 1-2ha lot size is very suitable for equestrians and, together with the bridle trail and arena, will be in hot demand. The typical 10-acre lifestyle block is outdated, being too large and difficult to sell. The Rural Lifestyle Area meets a community need and will enhance the significant equestrian imprint existing in Oakura.</p>	<p>Retain the proposed Rural Lifestyle Area. *inferred</p>	n/a
<b>S47 Anita Christine Rebecca Luxton</b>					
47.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The Oakura community has voiced their opinions in the Kaitake Community Plan where an overwhelming majority of submitters did not believe that the community should grow more than 3% a year. This is on average 10 new houses a year which is well below the proposed Plan Change to enable 395 sections to be built in a community which is already struggling with infrastructure issues. We already have very busy roads with more and more traffic in the area this will be a danger to the large number of children we have walking to school and a main street which does not even have a public toilet.</p>	<p>Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.</p>	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>Oakura and the community are working towards a predator free Taranaki so the introduction of 395 more homes in the area will no doubt cause an influx of predators by the rubbish and waste generated by these households.</p> <p>Oakura is a very special place to live and is a rare mix of incredible bushland and a beautiful beach and community which will not benefit from the introduction of 395 more homes so I reject this Plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S48 Christian Keith Wingate</b>					
48.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The rezoning of this land will result in a completely unsustainable population explosion in the small village of Oakura. The infrastructure and utilities are not equipped to handle the additional pressure of a sudden doubling of the village's population. The additional rates generated from this development will not nearly cover the required increases in infrastructure capacity; major works will be required to ensure that infrastructure can be brought up to a level that can service this level of population. This development will require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading upgrades (hundreds more cars will require multiple lanes and wider roads)</li> <li>• A new sewage works (pipeline and pumping stations to the NP sewage works will not be sufficient for the hydraulic load)</li> <li>• A new school (land area will not support the numbers for the current school)</li> <li>• Major upgrade to the water supply, potentially finding a new water source.</li> </ul> <p>The development would also impinge terribly on the national park boundary, which is of the utmost concern to me personally. The Paddocks development has already resulted in a residential population too close to the national park boundary and put stress on the native forest and</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>inhabitants therein. The Oakura community is coming together to place traps in the park to eliminate rats, stoats etc to improve the native bird population, however this is completely undermined by allowing houses at the park boundary which would result in cats, dogs, rats, hedgehogs etc. being released into the park to kill kiwi and other endangered species. If we are trying to make the Kaitakes predator free, this residential development will be a major blow to this goal.</p> <p>In addition to this, there will be a hugely negative impact on the water quality in the area. Long term stormwater discharges from the necessary CSOs will result in huge COD loadings to small streams that will not cope. As the grassland is converted into concrete and other residential type surfaces, the surface detention for runoff will change, resulting in much greater peak flows to these streams. This will result in landslides and large amounts of sediment into the sea. Erosion of stream banks and destruction of aquatic habitats. In the short term, during construction, there will be large sediment loadings to these streams and the sea which will have a large negative impact. Hazardous chemicals stored in residential areas will inevitably make their way into these waterways. The fact that the streams in this area are short means that they are currently healthy and home to a diverse aquatic ecosystem. This will easily be destroyed by the proposed development, leaving another polluted waterway as is so common in NZ in this era.</p> <p>This area has very clear night skies. The proposed development will create significant light pollution.</p> <p>The Wairau Estate developer also completed the Paddocks Subdivision on upper Wairau Road several years ago. A major reason the Paddocks development was approved relied on the developer accepting to keep 58ha of farm land undeveloped. The developer is now attempting to go against this ruling and apply for a private plan change to subdivide the 58ha farm land.</p>		

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>The Oakura community growth plan and associated District Plan completed with the assistance of NPDC aims to preserve the greenbelt between the township and the Kaitake Ranges National Park. This proposed development will be placed exactly in the area that is to be preserved and makes a mockery of having a District Plan when a private development can go against it.</p> <p>Having such a large-scale development lasting many years in a small community will result in a land distribution monopoly to the developer. The developer will control the supply, demand and value of land and it will severely restrict other smaller developments from happening in the area.</p> <p>This village will increase in population over time, that is without doubt. This growth should be 'controlled' at an organic rate.</p> <p>If NPDC is styling itself as the lifestyle capital of New Zealand, then surely this development flies in the face of that sentiment.</p> <p>Please reject this proposal in the spirit of this community and in the name of all of it's residents.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S49 Steven Richard Collier</b>					
49.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>Concerned this development being close to a national park at a time when we need to protect our environment. Concerned about what the impact will be on 'predator free Taranaki' and tourism growth is also unknown.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S50 Rodney Bruce Martin</b>					
50.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S51 Jeremy Hutchings</b>					
51.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>Concerned about increase in traffic along the road (SH45) as children walk to school alongside the Highway which does not have a footpath or barriers. Surely increasing security there would be a priority.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S52 Jennifer Maree Wells</b>					
52.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>There are other properties which would be more suitable for development but not on such a large scale, such as farm land which is too small to sustain a decent income, land that is not suitable for farming such as some areas of Surrey Hill Road Wairau Road.</p> <p>The biggest issue is the traffic at the intersection of Wairau Road and State Highway will be overloaded, and water pollution from dust and excavation to our water catchment which we rely on further up Surrey Hill Road.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S53 Jennifer Marjory Brown</b>					
53.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contrary to 20 Oakura development plan ideals</li> <li>• Scale and number of sections limits other development areas</li> <li>• 'Village' lifestyle enjoyed by residents will change to 'dormitory'</li> <li>• Water, sewage, roading, traffic increase – infrastructure imbalance</li> <li>• National Park proximity – dogs, cats – effect on birds there</li> <li>• Housing density proposed.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S54 Paul Jamieson</b>					
54.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is currently ample sub-dividable land adjacent to Oakura already. When all current sub-dividable zoned land around Oakura is developed there will likely be considerable negative environmental, recreational and cultural effects. To create even more sub-dividable land without the known effects of existing potential development is irresponsible.</li> <li>• The Taranaki rural ring plain should remain free of urban development. To allow residential development on this scale in rural areas is irresponsible. Our rural landscape must remain in some form of primary industry without unnecessary intrusion of urban development. The ring plain is a significant landscape and its uniqueness must be protected.</li> <li>• A change of plan will allow further inappropriate development in rural areas. The application will set precedence across the district to allow urban development where it is totally inappropriate.</li> <li>• Maintain Taranaki's pride and independence 'Like no other'. We do not need this development so we 'Can be like every other'. Planning with foresight would maintain the uniqueness of the Taranaki landscape and the rural/urban distinction.</li> <li>• Planning should concentrate on sustainable buildings and community development in existing urban areas. Many suburbs and small townships need reviving with sustainable development. This should concentrate on low cost energy efficient housing on second class land, require green building principles that include rain water collection, grey water recycling, and solar power. Also important to encourage self-sufficient communities (halls, recreation, transport, employment, shopping) where there is less reliance on private motor vehicles.</li> <li>• The proposal is 'slave to the private motor vehicle'. The logistics of this type of development ensure dependency on motor vehicles</li> </ul>	<p>Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decline the Plan Change.</li> <li>• Start planning for sustainable, energy efficient, affordable housing in existing residential zonings.</li> <li>• To responsibly manage the existing stormwater and access issues on Oakura Beach.</li> <li>• Plan to restrict any urban development on rural areas.</li> <li>• Plan to empower community development without increased reliance on private motor vehicles etc.</li> </ul>	Accept in part

			<p>when we should be planning to be less dependent on them. Also creates traffic issues for Oakura village and does not deal with the overall increased volume of traffic. Recent local subdivision and local infill housing due to district sewage treatment has noticeably increased the volume of traffic through the village. The village main street is now separated by streams of traffic during daily migration to and from work. The increase in traffic volume on its own compromises the village atmosphere and safety of everyone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed plan change and subdivision has the potential to compromise Taranaki’s most significant natural resources – the mountain and the sea and everything in between. No development should be allowed that has such potential to negatively affect our natural heritage. Due to proximity this includes the inevitable introduction of plant and animal pests adjacent to our National Park; also provides opportunities for many ornamental plants to become plant pests. The animal pest control initiatives of Project Mounga will be compromised. The issue of cat control will cause the most damage to fauna in our National Park.</li> <li>• The proposal will contribute to night light pollution. The effect of lifestyle blocks in particular has contributed noticeably to night light pollution across the ring plain. Any more development such as this plan change will escalate the degradation of our night sky.</li> <li>• The proposal will negatively affect the existing village culture. The submitter’s definition of a village population is that you know everyone by sight - there is an overwhelming sense of community when the resident population knows each other in this way. This contrasts when the population reaches overwhelming levels and there is a McDonalds on every corner, and money lenders, car salesmen and real estate agents triumph over simple human values.</li> <li>• The proposal will negatively effect the recreational values of Oakura Beach. Oakura beach has to be the most popular beach in the district. Despite being most popular for swimming in summer, it is recreationally active all year round (surfing, kite surfing, dog walking, horse riding etc) and a place for kids to experience a safe and relatively unregulated recreational</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>environment – a place for kids and families to grow up with the quintessential kiwi lifestyle. With population growth beyond the capabilities of the beach comes more regulation and perhaps even the unthinkable of doing away with the iconic campsite to squeeze in more cars and people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current local infrastructure incapable of dealing with the potential population increase. The school is the most significant example but of more concern is the cost of upgrading the beach frontage areas for carparking and access. There is only one 'lesser abled' access on the entire beach by the surf club and this is frequently compromised by wandering of the Wairau Stream. The submitter expects the need for Messenger Tce to be stopped at Jans Tce to make for pedestrians to have priority over vehicles which will mean a new access road for residents beyond Jans Tce. The new skate park is now located in the wrong place and the new water main is on the wrong side of the road. In a growing coastal community a year-round swimming pool is essential from a water safety and educational perspective and should be a joint venture with the school.</li> <li>• The proposal will negatively affect the volume of stormwater onto the beach. One of the key factors determining sand accretion on the beach is the management of storm water. NPDC's approach to most stormwater along Messenger Tce has been to pipe it under an accessway and let flow directly onto the beach. This undermines the dune toe, pedestrian access and creates wet sand that does not build sand. The proposal will create more stormwater in priority water bodies. At the moment if the Waimoku and Wairau streams wander, upstream properties flood when a high tide meets the outgoing storm water, and the dune toe and beach frontages erode substantially. NPDC does not carry out stream straightening regularly or in a timely manner to manage these events. Any upstream subdivision would need to consider stormwater retention at source.</li> </ul> <p>The proposal will negatively affect the quality of stormwater onto the beach. Other than obvious issues of sediment in stormwater, urban properties by their nature will downgrade water quality. Currently there is little domestic rubbish coming down the streams as opposed to when recycling bins blow over and it</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			heads to the nearest storm water grate. Any upstream subdivision would need to consider on site stormwater settlement in processing. The proposal is fundamentally wrong.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S55 Katherine Vernon</b>					
55.01	Access (page 6) – Policy 23.9, Methods of Implementation 23.9, Reasons 23.9	Oppose	One road access for approximately 395 new dwellings is unacceptable. Heavy traffic during the development period (says 20 years) and subsequent traffic generated by home owners really won't be solved with a roundabout at the Wairau/SH45 intersection. A road further south on SH45 is surely a better proposal. The proposal refers to a further possible residential development immediately across SH45 on the coastal side. Foresight would surely indicate to put the roundabout further south and provide for both developments.	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a road and roundabout further south on SH45 to provide for this development and future development on coastal side.</li> </ul>	Reject
<b>S56 Board of Trustees, Oakura School</b>					
56.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are adverse social and cultural effects if this private plan change is allowed as the additional dwellings far exceed the existing and potential student capacity of Oakura School. The school has a current role of 341 students (August 2018) with 355 by end of 2018. With 399 new sections, this could account for an additional 219 students (up to 9 additional classroom spaces) based on existing home/student ratios and more if younger families are attracted.</li> <li>Current expansion allows for one new classroom (30 students) and potentially 2 further classrooms in the future. Any further classrooms exceed land capacity and would mean existing playing field space would be used for classroom development. The school fields are used for multiple sports, general play and many other activities. Apart from Corbett Park these are the only sports fields in Oakura. Losing part of these fields would have a significant effect on the entire community.</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The community values the full primary school that is offered with 85% of Oakura students remaining for years 7 and 8. Concerned if the school roll exceeds available classroom capacity then the years 7 and 8 could be removed from the school and community to provide space for additional years 1-6 classes forcing students to bus into New Plymouth intermediate schools.</li> <li>Oakura BOT commissioned a survey of the school community on the proposed plan change - 86% of respondents oppose the development, with common themes being concerns about school capacity, infrastructure capacity, increased traffic, road safety, negative effects to village feel and fear of losing year 7 and 8 senior classes (survey report attached to submission).</li> <li>There are significant traffic and transport effects with the proposed plan change. From Oakura School perspective, we want children to be able to safely travel to and from school. The additional traffic forecast must all pass Donnelly Street on which the school is located, creating a much busier traffic environment for children to navigate. We are very concerned that the additional traffic generated by the proposed plan change will reduce road safety for children travelling to school. Adding another 200 students to Donnelly Street at school drop-off and pick up times will cause additional traffic congestion.</li> <li>Based on the opinion of the Oakura School community, the BOT are opposed to this private plan change in its entirety. While organic growth and development has to be expected and coped with, the BOT feels this large-scale development on existing rural land is not an appropriate development for Oakura.</li> </ul>		
<b>S57 Dana Haszard</b>					
57.01	Appendices – Diagram 32.1	Support in part	The submitter supports the concept of equestrian lifestyle blocks, a bridle trail and a shared arena in the Wairau Estate Oakura Structure Plan. However excluding horse riders from the esplanade strip ignores the rights of horse riders to share the same safe access to the underpass as is provided for walkers and cyclists. The section of Wairau Road from SH45 to the proposed entry to the residential area will become increasingly	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include horse riders, along with cyclists and walkers as users of the esplanade strip alongside the Wairau Stream.</li> </ul>	n/a

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>busy and hence less safe for horse riders. Horse riding has been and continues to be part of the unique character of Oakura and some of NZ's most successful riders have established bases for training and coaching in the area. To compel horse riders to use a busy section of road rather than include horse riders in the esplanade strip use is short sighted, unwise and disregards the extent and rights of the equestrian population in Oakura.</p>	<p>appropriate signage and guidelines for its appropriate and safe use, this option has the potential to provide the safest access to the underpass for the three main recreational user types recognised by the rest of the plan.</p>	
<b>S58 Hailey Foster-Ander</b>					
58.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>Over the past 35 years the population of our village has quadrupled, yet we have been able to retain the uniqueness and natural character that make us a special coastal community. This subdivision will have huge ramifications for the special natural and essence of our village and a fundamental impact on the nature of the community far into the future. It will increase the population to a point where we will no longer be a 'village' but an extension of New Plymouth and we will increasingly rely on frequent trips to New Plymouth for services which the village will not be able to provide for its projected increase in population. If the extension were to go ahead, no matter how big or small, we will not be able to sustain certain services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education: with an increased population the local primary school will outgrow its current location. As a mother of 2 children I value the school and its strong relationship with the community and local environment; it was an advantage to living in a small coastal village and they would be able to attend until age 12.</li> <li>• Environmental practices: As the community gets behind projects such as 'Restore Kaitake" this subdivision seeks to work against everything it stands for and tries to achieve by increasing the number of domestic animals living next door to our National Park. The proximity of the subdivision will put our native flora and fauna which is already under threat at even greater risk.</li> </ul>	<p>Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stormwater: Already a problem for the village with runoff running straight through pipes that dispose of it onto the beach and out to sea. This increases health and environmental risks to people and animals.</li> <li>Infrastructure: The pressure to cater for new families and their vehicles will have a negative effect on the free flow and safe movement of traffic (including pedestrian and cycle traffic) at several locations. The greatest problem is Donnelly Street where problems would be increased by the number of newly-resident children attending the school, vehicle access for these children being a right- turn off SH45. Parking is already strained with most parents using adjoining Hussy Street, SH45 and The Outlook for parking. This is increasingly dangerous for all commuters, especially those with young families. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</li> </ul>		
<b>S59 Richard Shearer</b>					
59.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed plan change to rezone rural land to residential is not necessary, and further, it overrides the generations of planning and community input that make up the existing district plan (e.g. New Plymouth Coastal Strategy, The Oakura Structure Plan, The Oakura Engagement Project Report 2014/16, The Kaitake Community Plan and various NPDC Annual Plan processes). Both the existing district plan and the proposed district plan show this land zoned for rural use. All plans and studies mentioned have stated that while growth is expected within Oakura, that growth will be staged, and that maintaining the village feel is paramount. Sufficient undeveloped residential zoned land already exists in Oakura, accessed from Cunningham Lane and can be staged to provide for future growth.</li> <li>There are significant negative environmental, social and cultural effects. Oakura is a village and operates in a certain sense of balance</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>and the proposed development obliterates that balance by overloading important infrastructure. There are significant traffic congestion effects generated by the proposal, overloading of existing commercial zone, insufficient sports and local amenities, insufficient parking at Oakura beach and within the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This private plan change process has caused huge anxiety and concern to hundreds of Oakura residents. We are unsure of the “framework” arguments against this private plan change takes place in. What arguments are important, what might be discounted if we get it wrong, is this a legalised RMA argument that average people like us will have difficulty defending. We have had to organise countless meetings, find experts with experience, try to understand the process, consuming hundreds of hours cumulatively. An overwhelming majority of residents do not want what the plan change proposes – why should one person/entity be able to force such massive unwanted change over so many people?</li> <li>• There are adverse social and cultural effects if this private plan change is allowed as the additional dwellings far exceed the existing and potential student capacity of Oakura School. The community values active children and sporting opportunities; it also values the full primary school that is offered – there is concern if the school roll exceeds available classroom capacity then years 7 and 8 could be removed from the school focusing students to bus to New Plymouth intermediate schools.</li> <li>• The school fields are used for multiple sports, general play and many other activities. Apart from Corbett Park these are the only sports fields in Oakura. Losing part of these fields would have a significant effect on the entire community and Oakura’s lack of sports facilities has already been documented in a recent NPDC sports and recreation survey.</li> <li>• There are significant traffic and transport effects with the proposed private plan change. The greater than 4000 additional traffic movements per day the proposed subdivision would generate is self- explanatory. Oakura is not set up to have an entire new suburb on its southern boundary. With construction and supply vehicles the amount of road traffic could easily double and generates obvious congestion and safety issues, as well as raising safety concerns for children making their way to/from school and around the village.</li> </ul>		

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What precedent is there anywhere in Taranaki or NZ for a village to be effectively doubled in size by result of a single private plan change? If there was some community wide benefit in doing this then maybe it could be considered, but the only benefit that can be seen is a financial benefit to a single entity.</li> <li>• Oppose the proposed section sizes being reduced from the Oakura residential lot size minimum of 600m<sup>2</sup>. The Oakura focus group study acknowledged the potential of smaller section sizes in the future, but this was to be close to Oakura CBD and the proposed plan change is not in this vicinity.</li> <li>• There are significant negative amenity values with the proposed private plan change. The bunding proposed along SH45 would remove views of the Kaitake ranges from passing traffic. The loss of the rural outlook from the village towards the ranges takes away huge amenity value and replaces it with an unwanted suburban view in the middle of a village. The developer agreed to leave the piece of land in question as undeveloped rural land as part of the consent process for his Paddocks subdivision. Relaxing or over-ruling this makes a mockery of the RMA process.</li> <li>• There are numerous negative infrastructure, stormwater, water supply and waste effects. There is a lack of any definitive knowledge over the Oakura water supply.</li> <li>• NPDC, TRC, DOC, Government and other agencies are working on an ambitious but well supported effect to become predator free around Mt Taranaki. Oakura has been identified as a special significance area due to it being the closest village to border the national park.</li> <li>• The private plan change is within approx. 1200m of the national park</li> </ul>		

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>boundary and seeks to add 395 new dwellings in this space which would jeopardise this effort.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the problem this proposed plan change is solving? There are some 35 approved sections to be developed in a more appropriate location in the village, and an additional 100 or so sections already zoned as residential that are still held as rural land and could be developed without any plan change required.</li> <li>• This private plan change offers no benefit whatsoever to Oakura village. It goes against all past and current planning efforts and strategies and is not wanted by a huge majority of local residents.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S60 Anthony James Ander</b>					
60.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The proximity to the National Park / Kaitake Ranges will put increased pressure on our native flora and fauna some of which are already at risk. This goes against everything the Restore Kaitake project is trying to achieve.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S61 Cameron Murray</b>					
61.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The location, scope and timing of this application is wrong. Its impact on the village of Oakura, the adjacent farming community and the nearby Kaitake Ranges will be too great, as will its impact on traffic flows into and through the village, the school roll and the distinctive quality of life. Undertakings given during the approval of a previous subdivision application (“The Paddocks”) by the same proponent of this proposal must be upheld by NPDC.</p> <p>The immense scope of the proposal (an additional 395 dwellings) will result in a massive change in the lifestyle, one that will surely be too much for the community to absorb. In terms of the land to be developed</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>under this proposal, the Draft District Plan specifies under Policy SUB – p4 #4 “that the site must avoid subdivision in the Rural Zone which reflects the patterns of development more typical of an urban zone”. The proposal will definitely have a significant impact on the ‘sense of place’ of Oakura.</p> <p>The timing of the application is wrong in that the Draft District Plan is nearing its final stages before adoption and the approval of this application would result in a single development driving the District Plan for the Oakura area which is not sound long-term planning.</p> <p>The submitter has concerns regarding the impact of the flow of traffic from Wairau Road onto SH45, and the concomitant impacts of this on other traffic movements, as a result of this application. The proposal seeks to mitigate this by way of a roundabout at the intersection, something that NZTA and NPDC will have to consider. The proposal does not address the costs associated with this, nor does it address the phasing in of this construction.</p> <p>The development of the ‘Future Residential’ area identified within Lot 29 might be acceptable in light of the above concerns, but the rest of Lot 29 must remain in the Rural Environment Area as outlined in the conditions of the earlier subdivision report.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S62 Elaine Jamieson</b>					
62.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter has concerns around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amount of sediment and earthworks and the need for careful management - how this will be achievable? How can they guarantee that any rain events which are common on the mountain in the extreme will not result in dirty water being flushed into Oakura beach? And in the future in terms of rubbish and waste water from</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>normal home activities like car washing x 400 sections? It will go straight into the sea.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Predators are noted as a concern and the report recommends no cats on the estate. How will this be policies? Its impossible over time, people will get cats, dogs, rabbits and other household pets. Rubbish bins will attract rodents who will in turn populate our “Predator Free” Kaitake Range.</li> <li>• The report notes that the area has a pa site – how will the subdivision effect archaeological remains in the area without desecration?</li> <li>• There are 1400 people in Oakura currently – it is a busy, thriving community. If you add 400 x families there will not be enough schools, preschools, services, toilets, shops, footpaths, road space or beach space and car parks. Oakura is a “destination” beach for much of New Plymouth district over summer and should remain so. Need to retain the special village vibe that aligns the area to places like Raglan and Opunake rather than the mess of Papamoa.</li> <li>• The report suggests use of standard house and roof colours to maintain the character and visual aspects of the area – again this will be impossible to police and we will have an eyesore on the edge of our beautiful mountain.</li> <li>• The development will have a major effect on the landscape in terms of visual pollution, light and noise pollution. This is a unique narrow passage of land – green space on the edge of a pristine mountain range and bordering a “blue flag” beach.</li> <li>• Traffic flow and pressure on SH45 – the suggested roundabout at the end of Wairau Road fails to address the wider traffic impacts – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Increased flow through a narrow village road which has a very high pedestrian count and a single pedestrian crossing leading to the school;</li> <li>– Increased flow over a very narrow two-way bridge – barely enough for 2 cars – we will end up with a repeat of the Northgate traffic saga caused by development at Bell Block, traffic back up and major hold ups both ways with only one main access route for residents in and out of town. Who will foot the bill to widen the bridge?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Health and safety of the community should be paramount but how do we get an ambulance out to an accident? Support for the volunteer fire crew? This will build increase safety risks for the entire community.</li> <li>• There is no shortage of sub-dividable land in the community and there is no visible high demand for property that can't be met. This development will not add value to the community and is not justified or wanted.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S63 Kim Jennings</b>					
63.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The government is spending million to eradicate pests in the Kaitake ranges. This subdivision will introduce 100's of cats making it a costly pointless exercise.</p> <p>The private plan change does not meet the requirement of the RMA – therefore under law cannot be permissible.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S64 Nicholas John Gladstone</b>					
64.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned for road safety and the quality of village life. The submitter recommends the application be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Wairau Road Oakura rezoning proposal PPC18/00048 should be rejected in its entirety because it would have a negative effect on the free flow and safe movement of traffic (including pedestrian and cycle traffic) at a number of locations, certainly not limited to the single junction for which alterations are proposed.</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The junction alteration proposed in support of this application is not a viable design having regard to current Design Guidance relating to State Highways, give the topography of the site. The benefits that it is claimed that it would provide (which are in any case not sufficient to negate my recommendation above) are therefore not achievable.</li> <li>Particularly concerned that this proposal should not be accepted on the basis that the negative aspects are 'minor' and could be resolved at a later stage in the process.</li> <li>Query the desirability from a sustainability point of view of creating the possibility of 399 new dwellings being built at a location at least 15km from the nearest substantial employment opportunities, and retail outlets which almost every household uses on at least a weekly basis. The nearest secondary school is a similar distance away.</li> </ul>		
<b>S65 Rosemary Claire Moyes</b>					
65.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed roundabout will cause serious safety issues for our household exiting property.</li> <li>Devaluing property.</li> <li>Proposed roundabout will not provide safe movement for cyclists/ pedestrians.</li> <li>Any roundabout plans the submitter wishes to see and be able to comment on / seek professional advice.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S66 Bryan Alan Moyes</b>					
66.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal offers traffic management systems that the submitter believes are unworkable and will make the Wairau Road intersection less safe.</li> <li>The development will be an urban development that does not belong in the countryside.</li> <li>The developer made assurances after approval of "the Paddocks" development. The submitter does not think that the Council can rely on any provisions or remedies offered by the developer.</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S67 Lycia Moyes</b>					
67.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter has concerns regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety of household exiting the property. Very unsafe to have to exit onto roundabout.</li> <li>• Devaluing property – request compensation.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S68 Vivien Angela Gladstone</b>					
68.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S69 Joanne Ruth Brown</b>					
69.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>We already pay higher rates for very limited features – no public toilets in town or safe road crossing busy road.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S70 Stephen John Wood</b>					
70.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>This proposal is too big for the village and surrounding areas. So much of our infrastructure is already under pressure. The submitter's biggest concern is the stormwater runoff. The submitter backs on to the Wairau Stream – it floods now, this will make it worse. The submitter lives here because of the size and vibe of the village – the submitter believes this will change our lifestyle for the worst, not the better.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S71 Michael George Anderson</b>					
71.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	Council needs to prioritise commercial infrastructure prior to allowing any residential development – roading, shopping, school, intersections. Do not change the zoning on this farm.  The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S72 Colin Roger Ellis</b>					
72.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	Opposes because of cat numbers and for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S73 Mary Levett</b>					
73.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Houses built too close to National Reserve.</li> <li>Extra water flowing down our streams onto the beach.</li> </ul> The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S74 Jonathon Heath</b>					
74.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes because the lack of infrastructure will overload schools, roads and stormwater.  The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S75 David Paul Herbert</b>					
75.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	Keep the village small – the submitter is opposed to large scale abodes.  The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S76 Maura Conaglen</b>					
76.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter objects on the basis that it will have a significant impact on the environment which in turn will have cascading impacts on the lifestyle of the current and future residents of Oakura including but not limited to aspects such as noise, light, traffic pollution etc.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S77 Craig Farrant</b>					
77.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter objects to the subdivision because of the impact on traffic, stormwater into creek which already struggles in heavy rain.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S78 Helen Shearer</b>					
78.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is opposed to the plan change application – has been associated with Oakura for more than 50 years; residents want the “village” atmosphere to remain; height restrictions on new buildings; subdivision restrictions.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S79 Neil Farrant</b>					
79.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter objects to this subdivision on the south side of SH45 on the basis of traffic problems on corner of Wairau / SH45 and that land on north side of SH45 should be developed first. Also Oakura does not want or need to become another Bell Block.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S80 Glen Eugene Johns</b>					
80.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The extra water runoff will directly affect the already high levels of water in the Wairau Stream and cause further erosion to our property that borders this stream.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S81 Aaron Dwayne Hine</b>					
81.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes there is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much traffic on our roads</li> <li>• Not enough schooling available for extra people/families</li> <li>• Extra pressure on infrastructure – already close to limits at present</li> <li>• Village/community will be greatly affected.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S82 Rachel Hareb-Hine</b>					
82.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter is against the proposed plan</li> <li>• Infrastructure already stretched to limit</li> <li>• Lose nature of community village</li> <li>• Traffic congestion and safety of our children</li> <li>• Schools as current – school maxed already</li> <li>• Not in line with keeping Kaitake predator free.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S83 Victoria Jane Johns</b>					
83.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The amount of predators would increase drastically when we are currently trying to eradicate</li> <li>• Water runoff from dwelling roofs will flood the Wairau Stream which is already eroding into our property.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S84 Chris Wells</b>					
84.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that Oakura is already busy enough – we don't need any more traffic in our little village.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S85 Dianne Kay Brien</b>					
85.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter has concerns regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stormwater, runoff from the Wairau Stream which borders the submitter's property borders, the last 18 months-2 years has seen an increase of volume and has had an immediate impact on our boundary.</li> <li>Impact on the environment and proximity to our National Park.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S86 Loe and Lies Stolte</b>					
86.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitters are opposed as they do not think Oakura has the infrastructure for such a large development.</p> <p>The submitters also oppose for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S87 Milou Barrett</b>					
87.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is opposed as Oakura does not have the infrastructure in place to cope with such a large development. It will also have a negative effect on the special character of our 'village'.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S88 David Andries Willem Rood</b>					
88.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic and associated risks – the submitter's main gate entrance is approx. 30m down the road from the proposed entrance to the planned Wairau Estate's entrance. Although a traffic survey has been completed, does not consider it to have identified all relevant aspects to develop a proper traffic management plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two school buses stop in front of the submitter's property (c/o Tui Grove and Wairau Road at 07:45) where one bus drops high</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>school pupils that were picked up from around the coastal areas, to climb onto another bus to take them to school. The submitter has seen days where vehicles queue up behind the bus, including vehicles speeding past a stationary bus. The first-mentioned bus then makes a right turn out of Tui Grove into Wairau Rd to pick up primary school pupil from the Surrey Hill (and upper) road.</p> <p>With an entrance /exit to the estate approx. 40m up the road, this is a risk to the safety of school kids, and will add to congestion during the mornings;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The traffic survey has not considered the speeds at which vehicles travel up and down Wairau Rd. This street is 50km/hr, from South Rd up to the spilt with upper Wairau Rd and Surrey Hill Rd. Motorists do not generally obey speed limits when driving up Wairau Rd. The submitter's wife and the submitter have pointed out to the Traffic department that this is a risk to be monitored. Have also raised a concern with the Kaitake Community Board with regards to log trucks speeding up and down Wairau Rd. Adding traffic/vehicles that are turning into and out of Wairau Rd from the estate's entrance will contribute a significant safety risk that has not been considered;</li> <li>- Wairau Rd is popular for pedestrians (kids on bikes, people walking dogs etc) and horse riders (walking down to the grounds on South Road) – the traffic survey has not considered the risk to these.</li> <li>• Risks / damage caused by flooding - due to the slope/topography of the land, rain water that is collected from further up Wairau Rd runs off to our properties. The submitter and his wife have experienced rain/stormwater damage in our house in 2017. Rain water runs from adjacent properties, including the sections and properties of the proposed entrance to the estate, into our property. The current stormwater system is not capable of directing this stormwater runoff away from my property. By adding a road onto these sections/properties will add additional pressure on the stormwater runoff, which could cause severe flooding to the submitter's property with subsequent damage to the submitter's property.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S89 Sophie Lily Crabtree</b>					
89.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes the proposed plan change will cause negative effects on Oakura.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S90 Alex Margaret Reid</b>					
90.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes the proposed plan change will have a negative impact on the local community.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S91 Susan Imhasly</b>					
91.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>Oakura is a beautiful village, that's why the submitter chooses to live there, away from the city and its busy life. Allowing this plan change, the character of Oakura would completely change as many more people would live in Oakura. It will have a negative effect on traffic, environment, noise, capacity of school and parking etc. It is not right to put all this at stake with the proposed plan change.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S92 Ian Philip Coutanche</b>					
92.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned that Oakura is over populated already. The school is full. There's not enough parking. The junction at Wairau Road is dangerous. 400 more houses in this small village is too many. Too much, too quickly. Oakura has had a lot of new houses in the last couple of years. Since the drains have been put in.</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S93 Paul Maurice Wynter</b>					
93.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>Oakura is in need of available land for development, but the submitter feels that these demands can be met within the area of land already proposed for residential development, at the immediate southern edge of the village (see page 11 of the 2015 Oakura consultation document <a href="https://thetom.co.nz/uploads/oakura-consultation.pdf">https://thetom.co.nz/uploads/oakura-consultation.pdf</a> page 11).</p> <p>Traffic access and egress via Wairau Rd (as proposed) is inadequate for the scale of the development.</p> <p>The available space for the proposed Wairau Rd roundabout appears insufficient.</p> <p>Both could be remedied by relocating the roundabout southwards approximately 300m toward the general location of the Power Co building, creating a dedicated entry to developments on either the inland or seaward side of SH45.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S94 Lars Binsbergen</b>					
94.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road to New Plymouth gets too busy</li> <li>• The schools won't cope / too many buses</li> <li>• Too many cats close to the national park</li> <li>• Too much water runoff.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S95 Jackie Keenan</b>					
95.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes that such condensed housing will adversely change the “village”/rural feel of Oakura township as well as negatively impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• traffic flow</li> <li>• the school (already losing play grounds/fields for classrooms – there will be no green space left if such large development was allowed</li> <li>• the beach parking area – already limited parking for our population</li> <li>• limited street parking back from the beach during the summer months.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S96 Ronald Stratford</b>					
96.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above), especially concerns of heavier traffic through Oakura.</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S97 Jaynie McSweeney</b>					
97.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental effects</li> <li>• Inadequate sewage and roading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overflow at the school</li> <li>○ Increased traffic</li> <li>○ Increased noise</li> <li>○ Inadequate services</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Stormwater overflow – issues to the beach</li> <li>• Who pays to develop services to cope with the increased population?</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S98 Helen Margaret Fleming</b>					
98.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter objects to the plan change due to the large number of sections proposed and the negative impact this will have on the existing infrastructure, in particular the primary school, traffic numbers and stormwater, and the impact on the local community. The submitter also understands that the plan change conflicts with previous conditions agreed to by the developer during the Paddocks development.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S99 Alex Ingram</b>					
99.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The proposal goes against findings/conditions set by the Hearing Commission (Sub10/45196) in relation to The Paddocks Development and 'Lot 29' which is most of the land relating to this plan change request.</p> <p>Also note that the applicant expressed the intention during the hearing of retaining Lot 29 with a 'Protected Farm' status in the longer term, regardless of the zoning. The plan change also goes against the Oakura environment that the community has worked hard to shape and define.</p> <p>With reference to the New Plymouth District Plan, Operative District Plan (Volume 1 Management strategy) the following highlights how the plan change is inconsistent with its objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In relation to Issue 2, there will be adverse effects from light pollution from both the proposed 380+ dwellings and any street lighting. There will also be adverse effects from noise and dust due to extended periods of construction over the life of the proposed development, whose effects would be more than minor.</li> <li>• In relation to Issue 4, it will cause loss and/or reduction of rural amenity. It will degrade the site's landscape values, including the loss of open space, the loss of a rural Southern Entrance Corridor to Oakura (an open green area that generally slopes up to the Kaitake Ranges), and will cause potential loss of views to the Kaitake Ranges (Outstanding Natural Landscape) caused by the attenuation bund</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>(2m+ in height) along SH45/site interface. The site is incapable of absorbing the visual change without causing adverse visual impact to The Paddocks and residences overlooking from Wairau Road. The maximum allowable building height should be single storey for the whole development, 6m max.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In relation to Issue 15, Potential adverse effect on Outstanding Landscapes – the proposed development’s proximity to the National Park is also of concern.</li> <li>• In relation to Issue 6, there will be a reduction of residential amenity due to increased traffic, density of development and percentage of coverage changes. The Oakura Structure Plan suggests max site coverage of 35% and min 600m<sup>2</sup> lot size. The proposed lot size down to 300m<sup>2</sup> and increased site coverage of up to 55% goes entirely against the structure and makeup of the community, will lead to ecological harm from increased roading, and greatly reduced habitat for plants and animals. The min plot size for the proposed development should be 600m<sup>2</sup> and 35% site coverage.</li> <li>• Increased traffic, during construction and on completion, will have adverse effects on safety and efficiency of the road transport network. The proposed roundabout will produce funding issues.</li> <li>• The development is very automobile dependant, most people will need to commute into New Plymouth, putting strain on the road network and adding to increased pollution and use of fuels.</li> <li>• In relation to Issue 22, there will be adverse effects due to increased demand on infrastructure and community facilities, namely Oakura School and medical centre which are already near capacity. The loss of ‘surplus’ Powerco land (also incorporated into the request) could cause issues in the future with local grid capacity, especially with increased demand from growth in home charging of electric vehicles.</li> <li>• The implied poor economic values of alternative options for the site should have been considered before The Paddocks development and the promises made that open space be retained over the balance allotment (Lot 29).</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S100 Stuart Bennett</b>					
100.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>Oakura School is directly off SH45, making access for children, whether in cars, walking or biking already dangerous. The influx of traffic would escalate the dangers surrounding the Donnelly Street crossing; on-street parking for school drop offs/pick-ups would also be adversely affected.</p> <p>The added influx of people associated with the proposed subdivision will cause a surge in traffic and pedestrians and will have severe implications for the safety of our children.</p> <p>Also of major concern is the specific zoning rules requested by the developer i.e. 300m<sup>2</sup> sections, increased site coverage to 55%. This will set a precedent for all future developers throughout Taranaki. If Oakura residents wanted to live in a city, they would have! You will have a lot of explaining to do if the submitter seeks to sub-divide their property into 400-500m<sup>2</sup> sections and the submitter is told they cannot after you have given this developer special permission.</p> <p>The current school will not be able to cope with the influx of new students. The Ministry of Education has no money so will the developer be contributing to building and resourcing a new school to accommodate the extra children?</p> <p>With the “Paddocks” development, did this developer promise to provide something towards the infrastructure of the Oakura community, and if so, did he deliver on these promises?</p> <p>Growth is a natural part of any community and the submitter is not opposed to it. With a strong council that has the interests of its community at heart, growth usually occurs in a well-managed, structured way. The submitter understood that Council wanted to “advocate for a</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>coordinated approach to the growth of the village” – the proposed development is far from this.</p> <p>The proposed development would encroach on the National Park and would be detrimental to its ecosystems. The proposed plan change seems to negate the whole Restore Kaitake project.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S101 Vincenza Mancini Clark</b>					
101.1	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes the development will have adverse effects on existing infrastructure e.g. schools. The community has not been consulted in a meaningful way. This proposed development will have adverse impacts on the amenity of this beautiful coastal village.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S102 Robert Brian Clark</b>					
102.1	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes this development is not in keeping with the community plan. It would exceed capacity of existing infrastructure.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S103 Hayley Bennett</b>					
103.1	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>Oakura Primary School is directly off State Highway 45, making access for children, whether in cars, biking, or walking, already dangerous. Children need to be vigilant when crossing Donnelly Street. The increase of traffic this development brings will escalate dangers at this crossing. There is no on- street parking available during peak times (8:30 – 9:15am and 2:45pm – 3:15pm). Thus parking will also be adversely affected. If development goes ahead, the added influx of traffic (including pedestrians) will have severe implications for the safety of our children.</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>Also of major concern is the specific zoning rules that the developer is requesting be applied to this development i.e. 300m<sup>2</sup> sections, with site coverage of 55%. This will surely set a precedent for future developers in Taranaki. If the submitter wanted to live in a city, they would have! You will have a lot of explaining to do if the submitter seeks to sub-divide their property into 400-500m<sup>2</sup> sections and the submitter is told they cannot after you have given this developer special permission!</p> <p>The current school will not be able to cope with influx of new students. Ministry of Education has no money, so will developer be contributing to building and resourcing a new school to accommodate extra children?</p> <p>Regarding the developer's previous development, The Paddocks, did the developer promise to provide something towards the infrastructure of the Oakura Community? If so, did he deliver on these promises?</p> <p>Growth is a natural part of any community and the submitter is not opposed to it. With a strong council that has the interests of its community at heart, growth usually occurs in a well-managed, structured way. The submitter understood that Council wanted to "advocate for a coordinated approach to the growth of the village" – the proposed development is far from this.</p> <p>The submitter has concerns regarding the encroachment of the development on the National Park which would be detrimental to its ecosystems. Community has embraced the Restore Kaitake project, the proposed plan change seems to negate this whole initiative.</p>		
<b>S104 Allie Black</b>					
104.1	Application to vary the consent notice 9696907	Oppose	The Consent Notice 9696907 was put in place to preserve the view and rural setting to offset the effects of the subdivision. The proposed development is in complete contradiction to intention of the consent notice.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety (*inferred).	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
104.2	General - the Plan Change in its entirety		The new subdivision requires a bund of 2-4 metres high to border SH45. This bund will be hugely imposing and will completely destroy the rural outlook and feel of the area. The bund will effectively create a walled and gated community.	<p>If the residential development goes ahead:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• uphold the intention of the original Consent Notice and to retain the rural feel of the area.</li> <li>• the scale and density of the proposal needs to be reconsidered.</li> <li>• Some development is inevitable but the size of the development at 300+ lots is enormous and total overkill for a township the size of Oakura and would forever alter the character of the place.</li> </ul>	n/a
104.3			The submitter objects to the scale of the development, specifically the minimum lot sizes of 300m <sup>2</sup> in the residential area. This density is similar to that found in large urban centres, not a local village.		

-

04.4	Equestrian lifestyle lot sizes	Support	The submitter agrees with proposal to develop equestrian lifestyle lots smaller than 10 acres. This will allow development to retain rural feel and character of the land. Sections of this size are sought after and in short supply in North Taranaki due to past restrictions on subdivision.	Retain the equestrian lifestyle lots.	n/a
------	--------------------------------	---------	--	---------------------------------------	-----

**S105 Powerco Limited**

105.1	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Neutral (but seeks to ensure awareness of Powerco's existing assets in the area)	<p>The submitter seeks to ensure Council and applicants are aware of Powerco's electricity and gas assets in the plan change area that will service the proposed new lots. Powerco distributes gas and electricity to the whole of the New Plymouth District including area of Oakura covered by PPC48. Existing gas and electricity assets are attached in Appendix A, B, and C of this submission.</p> <p>The submitter is seeking to ensure recognition of the existing assets in area to ensure they are taken into account in relation to future works that may result in adverse effects on these assets. Need to manage rezoning in immediate vicinity of facilities that pose a risk to, or are at risk from, the operation of the network. Risks include:</p>	<p>No specific relief sought but does seek the following assurances:</p> <p><u>Ensuring adequate supply of electricity and gas to the PPC48 area</u>          – for new greenfield growth areas it is necessary to have forewarning and plan for the new lines, poles, gas pipes, transformers, upgrading of substations and establishment of locations for utility street furniture/ above-ground assets.</p>	Accept
-------	---	--	--	--	--------

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of electrical hazard or injury;</li> <li>• Risk to security of supply;</li> <li>• Risks associated with 'reverse sensitivity' and amenity;</li> <li>• Risks to vegetation;</li> </ul>	<p><u>Placement of mature size of trees in relation to infrastructure -</u>          if PPC48 results in alterations to existing, or</p>	Accept

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk to structural integrity;</li> <li>• Risk to Powerco’s ability to carry out inspections and maintenance activities on lines and support structures, and to undertake line upgrades.</li> </ul> <p>Trees need to be positioned away from existing above and below ground infrastructure to avoid potential conflict and to ensure compliance with The Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 (the Tree Regulations).</p> <p>Existing substation on South Road, adjacent to proposed plan change area, has capacity to supply the proposed new lots. A new 11kV cable will need to be installed (at sub-divider contribution) from the Oakura Substation to ensure security of supply if the existing 33kV line (blue in Appendix B) has an outage.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure has capacity to serve proposed lots with gas without upgrades. There is an existing gas gate east of the proposed subdivision along Wairau Road (Appendix a) which can service the PPC48 area.</p> <p>The submitter believes it is best if any new infrastructure provision can occur at same time as new development to minimise disruption to other infrastructure (e.g. dig up roads) and reduces costs to end consumers. Earlier this is addressed the more readily such facilities can be accommodated within overall design of an area.</p>	<p>new vegetation, Powerco seeks to be consulted. To avoid need for costly repairs associated with trees near underground cables/pipes, or overhead electricity lines.</p> <p><u>Major changes to ground level</u> – changes to the ground level near underground utilities should be minimised and/or there should be discussions with the relevant utility provider which may identify opportunities to re-adjust depth of the utility. Similar concerns for above ground infrastructure – earthworks in and around support structures needs to ensure there is not risk to the stability of infrastructure. Excavation depths and separation distances in and around support structures is governed by the NZ Code of Practice for Safe Distances NZECP34:2001.</p> <p>Powerco anticipates that the developer and Council will adhere to the relevant standards and initiatives when undertaking works in and around network utilities; if</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
				<p>the development goes ahead. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Dial before you Dig’ Service found online at <a href="http://www.beforeudig.co.nz">www.beforeudig.co.nz</a></li> <li>• National Code of Practice for Utility Operators Access to Transport Corridors 2011.</li> </ul> <p>Powerco seeks to be involved in early consultation in relation to the future development of the area. To ensure access is provided, to allow continued operation and maintenance of existing live gas pipes in streets of PPC48 area and gas gate in Wairau Road (Appendix A).</p> <p>Powerco seeks to ensure any works enabled by PPC48 are undertaken in a manner that avoids or mitigates effects on gas distribution assets including physical damage, disruption of supply, and access restrictions to underground infrastructure for maintenance purposes. Any new buildings must be set back</p>	

				at least 2m from existing underground gas pipes.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S106 Hayley Ingram</b>					
106.1	General - the whole plan change	Oppose	<p>The submitter has concerns around traffic increase caused by the development, starting with construction phase – usually higher number of movements than normal. Traffic effects not only restricted to Oakura, but all the way into New Plymouth. The environmental impact from vehicle emissions, during construction phase and ongoing.</p> <p>Does not uphold the Commissioner conclusions and conditions for The Paddocks development. In that process applicant stated they intended to retain Lot 29 with protected farm status in long term, regardless of the zoning of the site. Proposed development does not seem to be very community spirited. Concerned that after submissions process the proposed development will make significant changes to the plans, which submitters will not be able to re submit or Comment on in a possible hearing. The submitter believes items under discretionary columns (both restricted and fully discretionary) should be questioned i.e. Wairau Estate Structure Plan area shown in Appendix 32, Structure Plan (Rules 93-101); Discretionary column – no minimum for allotment size?</p> <p>Under landscape and visual assessment – addendum page 4. <i>“Overall notwithstanding the intention of the Consent Notice the most significant visual effects created by the rezoning proposal are limited to residents of The Paddocks”</i>. The submitter believes that the consideration for properties on the south side of Wairau Rd appear to have been dismissed.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	<p>Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.</p> <p>If rezoning is approved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The community should be given opportunity for more open discussions on the proposed development and the outcomes should be implemented.</li> <li>• Rules and/or conditions should be in place to prevent grouping of cookie cutter house designs.</li> <li>• Applicant should not be allowed to on sell the decision of the development gets approval.</li> </ul>	Accept in part

<b>S107 Lisa Wynter</b>					
107.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	Oakura is in need of available land for development, the submitter believes these demands can be met within the area of land already proposed for residential development at the immediate southern edge of	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.  If the Plan Change goes ahead:	Accept in part
			<p>the village <a href="https://thetom.co.nz/uploads/oakura-consultation.pdf">https://thetom.co.nz/uploads/oakura-consultation.pdf</a> (page 11).</p> <p>Traffic access and egress via Wairau Road (as proposed) is inadequate for the scale of the development. Available space for proposed Wairau Rd roundabout appears insufficient, making the roundabout too small for adequate traffic flow.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wairau Rd roundabout could be relocated southwards approximately 300m toward general location of the Powerco building; creating dedicated entry to developments on either the inland or seaward side of SH45, alternatively having entry up off Wairau Rd and exit onto SH45 south of Oakura.</li> </ul>	
<b>S108 Stefan Imre Kiss</b>					
108.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes the Plan change would produce a significant and disproportionate increase in housing in the Oakura township. This will generate significant adverse effects on the environment and the rate payers of the District. Rezoning of this scale, at this time, in this location, reduces options for how the land and other parts of Oakura might be developed over a 30 to 50 year+ time horizon (reduces optionality). The proposed Structure Plan has an inappropriate mix of allotment sizes not suited to the location and the Oakura Community. The submitter does not support the removal of the Consent Notice that prohibits further subdivision of this land.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S109 Amy Cunningham</b>					

109.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The developer is concerned that the effect of this development on the community will be dire. Oakura School is already bursting at the seams, with no room for new pupils. The development will bring a lot more families to area in very short timeframe, and there is no land left within the village to extend the school to build another school nearby.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
-------	---	--------	--	---	----------------

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>The submitter believes from an environmental perspective, the proposed development would be extremely detrimental to ecosystems around the area.</p> <p>The Zoning rules that the developer is requesting are completely inappropriate for the rural area. 300m<sup>2</sup> and an increase to the area of the site that can be covered by a building to 55% is a material change to current practice and will set precedent for Taranaki generally. This will surely set a precedent for all future developers throughout Taranaki.</p> <p>The development will significantly and materially increase the number of cars on the road, especially during peak times. SH45 around Wairau Road already high crash area, and this will only worsen the situation. That combined with increase children and families in area will likely lead to road fatalities. Many children in the area walk, bike ride, or scooter to school currently, and development will likely cause that to cease due to huge danger posed. Would be extremely sad to see this lovely aspect of the submitter's community change in that way.</p> <p>Parking in the village is already minimal and with such an increase in traffic and cars on the road in the area, more parking will need to be considered. Severe shortfall of parking at school already. The area around school is already dangerous at peak school hours, development will only make this worse. There is no land available for more parking in village and near school, how will this issue be resolved?</p> <p>The submitter feels that this development is extremely large for such a small village. It will completely change community and have severe, adverse effects on infrastructure supporting it. Development in Oakura is welcomed by most, included the submitter, but this is not the way to go about it. This development is not in best interests of the community by any stretch of the imagination.</p> <p>Many people in community have been very disillusioned already with this particular developer's previous development in Oakura, "The Paddocks". This went ahead on the condition that the developer would provide</p>		

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>something towards the infrastructure of the Oakura community, which has never happened.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S110 John Russell Ardern</b>					
	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes that residential subdivision should be managed or encouraged to be provided within the confines of the existing residential zones, and definitely on the seaward side of SH43. All residential zones should adhere to the long-term village plan prepared by Oakura Community Board.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S111 Keith Manukonha – Chairman Oakura Pa - on behalf of Ngati Tairi, Oakura Pa</b>					
S111.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>On behalf of Ngati Tairi, Oakura Pa, the submitter wishes to express effects on and within their tribal area. The submitter is concerned for ecological effect of storm water being disposed via series of small dams along existing waterways. Existing habitat and ecosystems will be effected and possibly completely altered. These small waterways are breeding and development habitat for invertebrates smaller species.</p> <p>Although the submitter is continuing to talk to the applicant, they would like to see a degree of cultural design for this development. Oakura is a soldier settlement and since 1860s no cultural or alternative historical perspective has been contemplated. Oakura Pa has survived in isolation.</p>	<p>Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety (*inferred) initially.</p> <p>If the plan change does go ahead:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see a better solution to cater for additional stormwater runoff.</li> <li>• Sees this as an opportunity to highlight tangata whenua, their continued occupation, histories, and values within this design rezoning.</li> <li>• The submitter lodges the objection but will continue discussions with applicant to hopefully give effect to the issues the submitter is concerned about.</li> </ul>	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S112 Jacqueline Molloy</b>					
S112.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter does not need PPC18/00048. The submitter believes Oakura has already identified land for future urban development though community consultation, and this has been accepted by the village. Area subject to plan change is too much and will change nature of Oakura village completely. Area proposed for residential land is inappropriate and would affect Oakura's character and values e.g. quiet village character. Need to only grow in areas already identified for future development. Adding more residential area on top of that already existing should not happen. One or the other should only be allowed to happen and existing areas already identified should be it.</p> <p>The land identified in the plan change is productive farm land and is too valuable to be left vulnerable to market forces that could see it subdivided into unproductive lots. Additional traffic generation would have significant adverse effects on the village. The submitter details that key issues are width of Wairau Road, if one car is on side of road then road becomes one lane; and the intersection of Wairau and South Road which would be too busy and a round about would be a total disaster. Intersection would become very dangerous and slow.</p> <p>School would not cope with large influx of students. Needs to grow slowly. The submitter wants it to stay as a full Y1 – Y8 primary school, and not suddenly have no room for the older kids. The subdivision would be the closest to the national park, we need to protect our natural environment and not allow this abominable plan proposal.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S113 Vince Fenning</b>					
S113.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter does not need PPC18/00048. Oakura has already identified land for future urban development though community consultation, and this has been accepted by the village. Area subject to proposal is too	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>much and will change nature of Oakura village completely. Area proposed for residential land is inappropriate and would affect Oakura's character and values e.g. quiet village character. Need to only grow in areas already identified for future development. Adding more residential area on top of that already existing should not happen. One or the other should only be allowed to happen and existing areas already identified should be it. The land subject to the plan change is productive farm land. It is too valuable to be left vulnerable to market forces which could see it subdivided into unproductive lots.</p> <p>Additional traffic generation would have significant adverse effects on the village. Key issues are width of Wairau Road, if one car is on side of road then road becomes one lane; and the intersection of Wairau and South Road which would be too busy and a round about would be a total disaster. Intersection would become very dangerous and slow. School would not cope with large influx of students. Needs to grow slowly. The submitter notes that they want it to stay as a full Y1 – Y8 primary school, and not suddenly have no room for the older kids. The subdivision would be the closest to the national park, the submitter enforces that there is a need to protect our natural environment and not allow this abominable plan proposal.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S114 Oakura Playcentre</b>					
S114.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	Oakura Playcentre is accessed directly via SH45. Property borders Oakura Primary School and Oakura Library, therefore the submitter shares access via Donnelly Street. The submitter is concerned as there is already high traffic volume on Donnelly Street which creates significant hazard for the playcentre's whanau when arriving or leaving the site. The submitter's tamariki and parents/caregivers who hikoi or bike need to be extremely careful when crossing the street. Increase to traffic volumes would escalate dangers surrounding this crossing.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>Parking on Donnelly St and surrounds (Hussy St, ST45 and The Outlook) are currently at capacity during peak times (8.30am – 9am and 2.30am – 3:30pm). Tamariki (age range from 0 – 6 years) mostly arrive at centre with parents/caregivers in strollers/prams, and/or in infant capsules/carriers. If subdivision goes ahead added influx of people will cause surge in traffic and pedestrians, will have severe implications on safety of the submitter’s tamariki.</p> <p>Ministry of Education owns land which Oakura School and Playcentre are situated on. If school rapidly expands with new development, it will need extra space to cope. Playcentre site is therefore in jeopardy of being lost as ministry would use Playcentre site for school expansion. Members of community would have to travel significant distances to get the same opportunities/services/education. Playcentre strategic plan has strong environmental stance. The submitter values surrounding national park. We are concerned that proposed development encroaches the national park and would negate the work which the Restore Kaitake project has achieved.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S115 Anne Bridges</b>					
S115.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	This submitter is concerned with the scale of the area to be rezoned and the consequent impact on the infrastructure of Oakura. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S116 Richard Rollins</b>					
S116.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes the proposed plan change from rural to residential not advised because of potential health impacts on infants, children, and pregnant mothers due to concentrations of pesticides in residential runoff and impacts on Wairau Stream Catchment to Oakura Beach. Changing the plan before completion of credible assessment of health risks to the public would not be advisable. The Council would be	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>negligent to assume that the stream concentrations would be below <i>de minimis</i> (inconsequential) risk without appropriate measures to quantify or mitigate the hazard.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S117 Rosemary Law</b>					
117.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter having lived in Rural Oakura for the last 20 years, and in rural Taranaki for most of their life, the submitter feels strongly that this proposal sets a poor direction for Taranaki as well as this small area. Taranaki one of few places not growing in population, compared to many other areas of NZ, and most places are predicted to slow in growth so the submitter believes the area definitely will too. The submitter notes that there is a need to look to Tourism as an asset to encourage, with Oakura uniquely placed for outdoor activities e.g. mountain biking and hiking, close links to coast and National Park. There should be green space corridors beside Park, not suburbs. Oakura loses its intrinsic value as small, easily accessible beach village without traffic hassles etc. In other places, areas that attract locals and visitors are protected.</p> <p>Need to protect land between settlement and the National Park to avoid issues such as pest control, pets close to the National Park, and other urban disturbances to wildlife associated with intensive housing close to the National Park. Community is trying to restore Park assets through organisations such as Predator Free Taranaki – see response from Oakura residents to Sunday’s session. Land subject to plan change is alluvial, north facing land, which has multiple use options that would be more appropriate next to the National Park e.g. bike tracks, organic or alternative agriculture. The submitter owns shares in rural section on other side of Mountain and it is very feasibly an economic unit.</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S118 Rachel Anna Law</b>					
118.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes areas adjacent to and between Kaitake and the coast should be maintained in as low density housing as possible to encourage growth of native plants, to ensure enhancement and maintenance of hugely important habitat.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S119 QEII National Trust</b>					
119.1	Appendix diagram 32.1 Wairau Estate Oakura Structure Plan	Oppose in part	The submitter notes that the medium density residential development is proposed adjacent to QEII Open Space Covenant identified as 'open space' in eastern part of Diagram 32.1. The submitter believes that residential development in this area, immediately adjacent to the native bush, will likely result in: rubbish and garden waste being dumped in the covenant; increased weed and pest threats e.g. garden weeds and domestic animals; Impediments to access – particularly the covenant boundary fence that can only be accessed from within the area covered by Structure Plan.	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Structure Plan be amended to show the bridle trail running between Proposed Residential 'C' and the boundary of the Open Space Covenant – area indicated in plan attached to submission.</li> </ul>	Reject
119.2	Policy 23.8		The submitter discussed matter with applicant and agreed relocation of bridle trail. The submitter holds no concerns regarding border between Open Space Covenant and the Proposed Rural Lifestyle Area; as area is much lower density and have not had issues with developments of this nature next to covenant land in past. The submitter holds no objections to this element of plan change. The submitter appreciates that concerns regarding specific developments will be best dealt with through submissions once subdivision applications are made.	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend policy to include clarification that the bridle trail will run between Residential C area and Open Space Covenant. In addition, ensure that the reciprocal rights of way also permit access to the QEII National Trust.</li> </ul>	Reject
<b>S120 Kylie Braddock</b>					

120.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>Concerned at lack of schooling facilities to cope with amount of homes being built.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned about: a Traffic increase; Alteration to rural aspect, strain on environment and community; One person's gain a whole community to lose.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
-------	---	--------	--	---	----------------

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S121 Climate Justice Taranaki</b>					
121.1	Amendment 1 Policy 23.8 and Amendment 2 Policy 23.9	Oppose	The submitter believes the application does not provide comprehensive assessment of the carrying capacity of the resources required to support development e.g. added demand and pressure on water supply, traffic, threats to local amenity values. No clear evidence as to how impacts of development will be avoided, minimised, mitigated, or managed. No alternative site or development strategy to justify viability, effectiveness, or efficiency or what's proposed. Considering 20-40-year time-scale for development, the submitter asks how the plan change fits with Long- term Plan and Infrastructure Plan that Council adopted in June 2018, and with current District Plan Review.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.  Unless changes are made to significantly reduce scope and incorporate real sustainability visions, designs, and rules.	Accept in part
121.2  121.3	Amendment 3 Residential Environment Area and Amendment 4 Rules  Amendment 5 Rural Environment Area and Amendment 6 Rules	Oppose  Oppose	Inadequate justification for the various rules proposed, in particular site coverage of 55% and lot size of 300m <sup>2</sup> . What would be the loss of productive land, open space, and opportunities for community initiatives e.g. food gardens, communal sheds or outdoor education?  Not convinced that the Rural Lifestyle Area will be effective in promoting sustainable management of rural resources. Risks of weed infestations, soil erosion and water quality issues if area isn't managed properly; in close proximity to national park. Other land uses such as small scale market gardening would be more sustainable.	If the Plan Change goes ahead:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If new rules are introduced, we urge rules that ensure and promote sustainability and resilience, e.g. water supply, wastewater treatment, storm water management, energy efficient homes, solar water heating, renewable energy generation, smart-grids, public and low carbon transport systems.</li> <li>Example: Kapiti Coast District Council's Plan Change 75 requiring new residential units to have rainwater tanks and/or greywater irrigation.</li> </ul>	Accept in part  Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S122 Dirk Schmidt-Rittershans</b>					
122.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises that current infrastructure isn't sufficient to support the additional dwellings.</p> <p>The submitter expects massive traffic issues at Wairau/South Road intersection in the mornings. Oakura School cannot accommodate the possible high influx of new pupils in a short period of time. School roll could double if most sections sold in short period of time. The submitter questions if all the additional storm water could change shape of the breach and could affect water quality of rivers.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S123 Tracey Mackenzie</b>					
123.1	Diagram 32.1	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports idea of equestrian lifestyle blocks. However human and horse safety should be at forefront of development's planning and safety alternative all users being forced to use Wairau Road and intersection should be taken into consideration and actioned as a result of community wide planning.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that the safety on Wairau Road for riders is already an issue for children riding to Ponyclub and Beach.</p>	<p>Amend the Plan Change to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See the esplanade strip along Wairau Stream be made available for all to use, including horses, cyclists, and walkers.</li> </ul>	n/a
<b>S124 Kim Sheree Winstanley</b>					
124.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes this proposal will greatly impact the special village feel that the submitter believes they have.</p> <p>The submitter notes that they are not against progress but scale of this development is too great and will be a negative impact. The submitter believes another "Paddocks" style development would be ok.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S125 Sian Wingate</b>					
125.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned that the proposal will increase Oakura’s housing stock by almost 75%. Expansion result of a single individual/entity developer for personal gain. Personal gain is not appropriate trigger for Council to use local government powers. Land has already been marked for future development which caters to phased population growth. The submitter considers planning approval of Council for personal gain to be acting ultra vires of its designated authority. The submitter believes the proposed subdivision is unwarranted and unnecessary.</p> <p>Development should be staged and designed to meet actual demand as opposed to perceived demand. Developer entity has conflict of interest and therefore is not appropriate or legal vehicle to drive growth.</p> <p>The submitter notes that there will be health and safety effects resulting from proposed population increase, such as increase to traffic volumes, school roll nearing max capacity, and impacts of increased traffic volume affecting safety of school children in immediate area surrounding school. Small scale business cannot cope with additional population growth.</p> <p>Scale of development – the 300m<sup>2</sup> lots proposed are not in line with long term plan of council. Lack of consideration of this would be acting ultra vires in the submitter’s view. Wairau Estate developer also completed The Paddocks development. Key reason this was approved was that 58ha of farm land was to remain undeveloped. Undermining prior consent conditions without a genuine public interest is akin to acting ultra vires of its delegated powers of a local authority</p> <p>Development not a community or council imitative, majority of money earned will go to one entity. The submitter believes approval of this development would undermine the democratic value of the consulted District Plan that was developed with assistance from Council. A key aim</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>being to preserve green belt between township and national park which the developed would be located in.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S126 Rebecca Scott</b>					
126.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter notes that New Plymouth Coastal Strategy, Oakura Structure Plan, Oakura Community Engagement Project Report 2014/16, Kaitake Community Plan, and various Council Annual Plan processes, were all worked by staff with community. Countless hours, staff expertise, and ratepayers money, spent on these reports show the land subject to this plan change is zoned for rural use. How can one developer, whose sole purpose is making money, overturn years of planning by Council and community?</p> <p>Council needs to listen to rate payers of Oakura. The submitter believes the Community do not want this proposal. The submitter notes the community's children, future contributors to district, will be adversely affected as Oakura School cannot cope with large intake of children from new subdivision. Children thrive at the school and do not want this to change. Traffic congestion and traffic safety are huge concerns for children going to and from school, and around the village.</p> <p>The submitter opposes section sizes being smaller than 600m<sup>2</sup> in the development. Oakura focus group stated there is potential for smaller sections in future, but only close to Oakura CBD. Development proposed is not in this location. Sufficient undeveloped, residential zoned land already exists in Oakura in Cunningham Lane; with 35 sections already approved to be development. Growth is expected in area, but that growth needs to be staged and maintain village feel. Please listen to community. This goes against all past and current planning efforts.</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S127 Lyndon DeVantier</b>					
127.1	General - the plan change in its entirety Specifically: Amendment 1 Policy 23.8 and Amendment 2 Policy 23.9	Oppose	<p>The submitter details that the Plan Change lacks comprehensive assessment of carrying capacity of resources e.g. water supply, stormwater management, traffic, impact on local amenity, water quality, indigenous biodiversity – considering proximity to National Park. The submitter notes that there is a lack of evidence on how wide range of impacts from development would be avoided, minimised, mitigated, or managed.</p> <p>The submitter believes the Plan Change is not clear on costs to NZTA, Council, and rate payers for infrastructure. The submitter believes the population increase is concerning, with 1,065 people in current 59ha site, and another 1,200 people in 48ha Future Urban Development area on seaward side of SH45. All issues above relate to how plan change fits with Long-term Plan, Infrastructure Strategy, and District Plan Review.</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
127.2	Amendment 3 Residential Environment Area and Amendment 4 Rules		New rules, if needed, should promote sustainability and resilience for aspects such as: water supply, wastewater treatment, stormwater management, energy efficient homes, solar water heating, renewable energy generation, low carbon and public transport. Kapiti Coast District Council Plan Change 75(2011) is a good example.		Reject
127.3	Amendment 5 Rural Environment Area and Amendment 6 Rules		The submitter believes it is not clear how Rural Lifestyle Area can promote sustainable management of rural resources. Horses can introduce weed infestations, soil erosion, and water quality issues. Domestic pets can also be significant problem in proximity to national park.		Reject

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S128 Ana Hislop</b>					
128.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes that the plan change generates significant adverse effects on environment (including quality), including but not limited to: environmental, social and cultural effects, amenity values, landscape (visual) and rural character, lighting and light overspill effects, noise, vibration, privacy, traffic and transport effects (compromise effective, efficient, an safe land transport system in the public interest), including surrounding road network (its functioning, integrity, capacity and safety), infrastructure, services and community infrastructure effects (e.g. storm water, sewage, water supply), loss and fragmentation of agricultural land, soil conservation effects, reverse sensitivity effects, earthworks and construction effects, cumulative effects. The submitter is concerned that these adverse effects will not and cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S129 Robyn Ann McGregor</b>					
129.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter urges that land subject to plan change is prime productive land on coastal strip, which has potential for market gardening or the like. The submitter believes that infrastructure in the village would not be able to cope with more families (school, kindy, roading etc) without substantial increase to ratepayer contributions which I am opposed to.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S130 First Gas Ltd, Shell Taranaki Ltd, and Liquigas</b>					
130.1		Neutral	<p>First Gas Ltd is owner/operator of gas transmission network across North Island. The submitter is the requiring authority as Vector Gas Ltd's successor.</p> <p>Shell Taranaki Ltd operates Māui and Pohokura (produce natural gas and associated liquids, feeding domestic gas market; Māui asset includes pipeline from Māui Production Station in Oaonui to Paritutu Tank Farm in New Plymouth), and New Plymouth Tank Farm assets.</p>	<p>Amend the Plan Change to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan change must give effect to the Regional Policy Statement.</li> </ul> <p>Submitters willing to discuss contents of submission with Oakura Farm Park Ltd if desired.</p>	n/a

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>Liquigas is NZ leader in bulk LPG gas handling. Operates 4 terminals in NZ. Coordinates buying, import and distribution of LPG from overseas to NZ. Collectively seek protection of regional assets, including safe access to operate, maintain, and upgrade where needed.</p> <p>The submitter notes that companies have high pressure gas and LPG lines within plan change area across three rural lifestyle lots, one of these is equestrian arena.</p> <p>Adjoining eastern most rural lifestyle lot is Oakura Delivery Point; at which high pressure gas is de-pressurised and sent into local gas distribution network. See Figure 1 in Submission for asset map.</p> <p>Plan change must give effect to the Regional Policy Statement (identifies gas network as regionally and nationally significant infrastructure) and provide for protection and enhancement of gas network.</p>		
130.1	Illustration of Gas Transmission Infrastructure on Concept Plan/Structure Plan	Neutral	The submitter notes that prominently illustrating the gas infrastructure on the three lifestyle lots affected will better show position of the asset, for the benefit of plan users, future purchasers of sites, and decision makers. Will enable good resource management practice.	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better illustrate gas pipelines on the Concept Plan/Structure Plan</li> </ul>	n/a
130.2	Land Use Zoning	Neutral	Provide more appropriate land use zoning over the assets. Signals that development (further subdivision and land use activity) will not be appropriate over/near gas pipelines.	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change to land use zoning of all land traversed by gas and LPG pipelines (and overlaid with easement) to open space with rules to restrict subdivision and land use activity. Bridle track could</li> </ul>	n/a

				also be zoned open space.	
130.3	Rural Lifestyle Rules: Structures – Buildings	Neutral	Ensure the gas network is both protected and enabled. Allow for First Gas, Shell Taranaki Ltd, and Liquigas to consider implications of the building or structure; as well as the activities that the building accommodates. E.g. equestrian arena generates many horse	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a new <u>Restricted Discretionary Activity Rule:</u></li> </ul>	n/a

			float movements that may stress pipelines, further pipeline protection may be required.	Any structure or building within 20m of the centreline of a gas pipeline or the Oakura Delivery Point Station (Legal Description: Lot 1 DP 11721 BLK II Wairau SD) <u>Matters to be considered</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The extent to which the building or structure, including activities facilitated by the building or structure and access arrangements, avoids or</li> </ol>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>mitigates conflict with existing pipelines.</p> <p>2. The ability for maintenance and inspection of gas and liquid petroleum pipelines including ensuring access to the pipelines.</p> <p>3. The outcome of any consultation with the affected network utility operator(s).</p>	
130.4	Rural Lifestyle Rule 110: Subdivision	Neutral	<p>Ensure the gas and liquid petroleum pipelines are both protected and enabled.</p> <p>Allow for First Gas, Shell Taranaki Ltd, and Liquigas to consider implications of the subdivision, inclusive of access.</p>	<p>Amend the Plan Change to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure new matters to be considered are captured: <u>New matters to be considered:</u></li> </ul> <p>1. The extent to which the subdivision design avoids or</p>	n/a

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
				<p>mitigates conflict with existing gas and liquid petroleum pipelines, including access.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The identification of building platforms.</li> <li>3. The ability for maintenance of gas and liquid petroleum pipelines, including ensuring access to the pipelines.</li> <li>4. Consent notices on titles to ensure on-going compliance with AS2885 Pipelines – Gas and Liquid Petroleum – Parts 1 to 3.</li> <li>5. The outcome of any consultation with the affected network utility operator(s).</li> </ol>	
130.5	Access to eastern-most rural lifestyle lot	Neutral	Unclear if direct access off Wairau Road is proposed to eastern-most rural lifestyle lot containing the equestrian arena. There would be significant concerns if access was proposed as potential accessway has gas and liquid petroleum pipelines (and others) beneath the land. Horse float and other large vehicle movements over this land would likely stress the pipelines. Further, there is elevated risk at this intersection because of the Oakura Delivery Point Station. An internal Right of Way is considered more appropriate.	<p>Amend the Plan Change to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarity that no direct access is proposed to the rural lifestyle lot containing the equestrian arena (as shown on staged concept plan) is proposed off Wairau Road.</li> </ul>	n/a
130.6	Easement		Easement established in 1960s to protect gas pipelines not wholly fit for purpose now. E.g. not uncommon across North Island for subdivisions to go ahead and for First Gas not to be notified. Results in time needing to be spent managing expectations of purchasers, or remediating activities that have occurred. Most effective way to resolve this is at	Deal with these issues at subdivision stage	n/a

			subdivision stage, as well as clear signals in District Plan as to what is acceptable and what isn't in relation to the gas infrastructure.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S131 Nikki Ingram</b>					
131.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter notes that they have seen a lot of growth and change over time, as the submitter has lived in Oakura on and off for over 25yrs, which the submitter doesn't view negatively. The submitter believes the current proposal would have significant, immediate, and irreparable impact on community in many ways. The submitter's concerns primarily relate to the pressure which growth would have on the school, which has already grown significantly in recent years. Proposal is close to National Park, more houses will introduce more domestic and wild animals. The submitter is concerned about how further growth can be accommodated whilst retaining green space. Roads are already busy through the village; how do we ensure safety of road users with huge increase in traffic volumes?</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S132 Angela Lawn</b>					
132.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned large subdivision will result in Oakura losing small town charm, will become another suburb of New Plymouth. Traffic generated will result in congestion through main street and roads to town. As a home owner, the submitter's home will likely lower in value due to many more homes being available.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	<p>Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.</p> <p>A smaller scale of subdivision, implemented over longer period of time, would allow infrastructure to catch up and change to occur more organically.</p>	Accept in part
<b>S133 President and Executive Committee of New Plymouth Old Boys Swimming and Surf Club (NPOB)</b>					
133.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter has concerns for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic – Messenger Tce/Tasman Parade/Lower Wairau Road intersection will become busier as traffic flow through village to avoid busier South Road. Is at close proximity to boat ramp and</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>crossing between gear shed. Lack of parking at beach which will be key destination. Traffic safety issues due to increased pedestrian and vehicle movements at beach. Many pedestrians are children due to proximity of playground/skate park to beach and need to cross road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased stormwater runoff – Potential to exacerbate current issues with the streams and the tracks they take in front of the club and board ramp. Concerns regarding environmental impact through Oakura Streams, reserve land and the beach.</li> <li>Lack of local infrastructure to support significant increase in population.</li> </ul>		
<b>S134 Te Kāhui o Taranaki (Taranaki Iwi)</b>					
134.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>Te Kāhui o Taranaki is the mandated authority for Taranaki Iwi. Taranaki Iwi, its hapū marae and pā exercise mana whenua and mana moana from Paritūtū in the north around the western coast of Taranaki Maunga to Rāwa o Turi stream in the south and out to the outer extent of the exclusive economic zone (map attached in submission). The iwi environmental management plan, Taiao, Taiora must be taken into account when reviewing a plan change under the RMA 1991.</p> <p>Taiao, Taiora outlines issues that are causing adverse impacts on Papatūānuku, in summary these relate to unsustainable/inefficient uses of land, increased demand on resources (e.g. water and waste services), destruction of wāhi tapu and other important sites, loss of access to areas, increased demand on water resources, and pollution.</p> <p>Taranaki Iwi has a number of policies regarding subdivision and land use, and submit that any decision should take these into account. In brief these policies relate to ensuring that new urban development is well designed in a manner that reflects the environmental and cultural values of the site; and that any landscape assessment considers underlying cultural values as an important and inseparable element of that landscape.</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			Taranaki Iwi will not support any action that results in degradation of the mauri of Papatūanuku; subdivision and land use that cannot demonstrate there will be no adverse effects on Ranginui, Papatūanuku, Taranaki Mounga, Tāne, Tangaroa-ki-Tai and Tangaroa-ki-Uta; loss of access to sites of significance; and adverse impacts on cultural values.		
<b>S135 Amy Sutherland</b>					
135.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Support in part	The submitter supports idea of some growth in the area. Area is great place to live and fair to share it with more people. The submitter supports proposal to include native bush, QE2 land, and the equestrian park. The submitter does not support size and density of the lots (400 lots with sections at 300m <sup>2</sup> in a small space); and the access point to the subdivision (create huge traffic volumes on Wairau Road which cannot cope). Oakura village has very clear look and feel; rest of village is not equipped to cope with that many more people.	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider moving access way for subdivision to SH45 instead of Upper Wairau Road.</li> <li>Reduce amount of lots from 400 to 100 max.</li> <li>Impose max section size of 900m<sup>2</sup>.</li> </ul>	Reject
<b>S136 New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)</b>					
136.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Support in part	Supports PC48 in part, in that it includes policies regarding provision of a safe and efficient road transportation network; supports planned to integrated growth in the Taranaki Region; detailed structure plan is proposed that includes provision of a noise bund to mitigate noise effects generated by State Highway.	Approve the Plan Change subject to amendments sought.	Reject

136.2	Policy and Methods of Implementation 23.8	Support in part	Broadly support Policy 23.8 and implementation methods. Note that Residential D, Rural E, and Business C zoning proposed adjacent to SH45, which will provide for sensitive activities. Need to avoid effects of reverse sensitivity on these activities. NZTA support 3m high noise barrier parallel with SH45 and the requirement for activities within 80m of SH45 to have acoustic treatment to achieve internal acoustic amenity (recommended by Marshall Day Acoustics).	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Amend Diagram 3.2: Wairau Estate Oakura Structure Plan</i> to show noise barrier and end return sections (located wholly within structure plan land); and area within 80m of SH45 where acoustic treatment for sensitive activities is required.</li> <li>• <i>Policy 23.8</i> to be amended to recognise existing infrastructure</li> </ul>	Reject
-------	---	-----------------	--	--	--------

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Methods of Implementation 23.8</i> Insert a new method of implementation to encourage acoustic treatment of noise sensitive activities within 80m of SH45, and corresponding changings to the reasons for the methods.</li> </ul>	Reject
136.3	Rules – Erection of buildings and structures other than buildings	Support in part	While NZTA supports proposed structured development it is anticipated that with changing the zoning to both Residential D and Rural E (and to lesser extent Business C) noise sensitive activities will be established within 80m of SH45. Marshall Day Acoustic Assessment outlines activities can occur in these areas provided acoustic insulation treatments are installed.	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert a new rule under this heading to outline requirements for acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities. New rule wording is outlined in submission.</li> </ul>	Reject
136.4	Policy and Methods of implementation	Support in part	NZTA supports inclusion of methods into proposal that recognise growth and how this will affect traffic volumes, increase in pedestrian traffic and active transport modes across SH45. The inclusion of a roundabout is	Amend the Plan Change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change wording of Policy 23.9 to include provision for future development to consider impact on resilience of</li> </ul>	Reject

	23.9	<p>supported and the pedestrian underpass on SH45. However, there is absence of information re when construction of new roundabout/pedestrian underpass will be required. Applicant needs to provide information with specific details re threshold to be reached that triggers installation of roundabout/underpass. If information is not provided, then a matter of discretion must include impact/s on safety and efficiency of SH45.</p> <p>Important to highlight that information provided to NZTA will allow Agency to plan for allocation of funding for the roundabout. No funding is currently available for this upgrade, nor is funding planned for it. NZTA expectation is that applicant will fully fund pedestrian underpass. NZTA of view that this is not needed currently, and future need for it will be driven by growth in residents of new development wanting to cross SH45.</p>	<p>infrastructure (specific changes listed in submission).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enter into agreement with NZTA, developer/applicant, and New Plymouth District Council. Agreement to cover roles and responsibilities of parties regarding funding, design and construction of Wairau Road/SH45 roundabout.</li> <li>• Further information needs to be provided regrading timing and/or stage of development when the roundabout will be required to be constructed.</li> <li>• To ensure that the SH45 underpass is fully funded by the applicant.</li> </ul>	
--	------	--	--	--

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S137 Clare Knapton</b>					
137.1	General - the plan change in its entirety		<p>The submitter has concerns around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic through village beyond intersection with Wairau Road and South Road;</li> <li>• Increase in storm water runoff through streams and reserves;</li> <li>• Locality of proposal and national park.</li> <li>• The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S138 Anna Marie Debreceeny</b>					
138.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter has concerns regarding effects of proposal on amenity values, landscape (including visual) and rural character. Developer does not seem to have any explicit design requirements for the new buildings. The submitter believes it is imperative to do this to avoid a Dannemora style of infill housing. If this type of development does go ahead it will be in complete contrast to existing village. Council has obligation to plan and develop in conjunction with community.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S139 Scarlet-Rose Aitken</b>					
139.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter stresses that they do not want Oakura to change. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S140 Jonathan Price</b>					
140.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes the Plan Change would destroy the character of Oakura. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S141 Mary Maselli Bishop</b>					
141.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter details that the Plan change will have significant negative environmental impact as is currently proposed, due to: traffic flow increase of nearly 120% on Wairau Road, and the impacts of this on safety and living in Oakura; Increase of resulting vehicle traffic to Oakura Beach with no available parking; over urbanised design in rural community with lot size of 300m<sup>2</sup>; impact of increased water flow and flooding in Wairau River; lack of green space with small lot size and high site coverage; potential impact on local schools.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S142 Wild for Taranki</b>					
142.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter notes that the Plan change needs to give effect to Regional Policy Statement and New Plymouth District Blueprint provisions regarding indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>The submitter believes the Plan change may create significant adverse effects on environment. Plan change poses risk to Wairau Key Native Ecosystem/McKie QEII covenant site, and project to rid region of predators. Due to intensified residential development, the likelihood of the introduction and spread of pest plants also increases.</p>	<p>Amend the Plan Change to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that plan change gives effect to Regional Policy Statement and New Plymouth Blueprint</li> </ul>	Accept in part

142.2	Ecological Assessment (Appendix 7)	Support	<p>Note that report recommends prohibiting domestic cats in subdivision. Submit that prohibition of cats and mustelids is necessary due to proximity of development to freshwater and riparian ecosystems, the Wairau Kay Native Ecosystem/Mckie covenant site, and Egmont National Park. Ban is consistent with conditions on adjoining development "The Paddocks". Report recommends the revegetation planting of the area with various native plants. Note that a full survey for native lizards and invertebrates was not undertaken for the ecological assessment. Support</p>	<p>Amend the Plan Change to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That cats and mustelids are banned from the proposed subdivision.</li> <li>• The planting of the area with native plants in accordance with</li> </ul>	Reject
			<p>agreement to undertake ongoing monitoring of wetland birds, such as the Spotless Crane, and other fauna within Wairau Estate.</p>	<p>the Egmont Ecological District Planting Guide is undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That native vegetation associated with freshwater ecosystems and open spaces is protected through use of QEII covenant or other protection status.</li> <li>• That any development requires a full ecological assessment, investigation and relocation if necessary.</li> </ul>	
<b>S143 Claire Tompkins</b>					

143.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose in part	The submitter has concerns regarding the proportion of green space to housing being too low; equestrian facilities will not provide for meaningful practical usage – more communal facilities are required to support that usage; traffic volumes – question whether this is manageable as currently projected; more clarity around number of sites to ensure impact of growth on infrastructure; concerns re site coverage.	Amend the Plan Change to (*inferred): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure planting and fencing is covenanted with minimum plantings per dwelling; and maximum or no fences on borders.</li> <li>• Ensure proposal aligns with previous community consultation and collaborative documents, including Regional Policy Statement for Taranaki.</li> </ul>	Accept in part
<b>S144 Paul Cunningham</b>					
144.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter notes that Oakura School is directly off SH45, making access for children, whether in cars, walking or biking already dangerous. The influx of traffic would escalate the dangers surrounding the Donnelly Street crossing; on-street parking for school drop offs/pick-ups would also be adversely affected. Increased traffic will have severe implications for the safety of our children. Also of major concern to the submitter is	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>the specific zoning rules requested by the developer i.e. 300m<sup>2</sup> sections, increased site coverage to 55%. The submitter believes this will set a precedent for all future developers throughout Taranaki. If the submitter wanted to live in a city, the submitter would have! You will have a lot of explaining to do if the submitter seeks to sub-divide their property into 400-500m<sup>2</sup> sections and is told they cannot after you have given this developer special permission.</p> <p>The submitter believes the current school will not be able to cope with growth. The Ministry of Education has no money so will the developer be contributing to building and resourcing a new school to accommodate the extra children? With the “Paddocks” development, did this developer promise to provide something towards the infrastructure of the Oakura community, and if so, did he deliver on these promises?</p> <p>The submitter understands that growth is a natural part of any community and is not opposed to it. With a strong council that has the interests of its community at heart, growth usually occurs in a well- managed, structured way. The submitter understood that Council wanted to “advocate for a coordinated approach to the growth of the village” – the proposed development is far from this. The submitter believes the proposed development would encroach on the National Park and would be detrimental to its ecosystems. The proposed plan change seems to negate the whole Restore Kaitake project.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S145 Sarah Cunningham</b>					
	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter identifies that Oakura School is directly off SH45, making access for children, whether in cars, walking or biking already dangerous. The influx of traffic would escalate the dangers surrounding the Donnelly Street crossing; on-street parking for school drop offs/pick-ups would also be adversely affected. Added influx of people will cause a surge increased traffic and will have severe implications for the safety of our children.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>Also of major concern to the submitter is the specific zoning rules requested by the developer i.e. 300m2 sections, increased site coverage to 55%. The submitter believes this will set precedent for all future developers throughout Taranaki. If the submitter wanted to live in a city, the submitter would have! You will have a lot of explaining to do if the submitter seeks to sub-divide my property into 400-500m<sup>2</sup> sections and is told they cannot after you have given this developer special permission.</p> <p>The submitter believes the current school will not be able to cope with growth. The Ministry of Education has no money so will the developer be contributing to building and resourcing a new school to accommodate the extra children? With the “Paddocks” development, did this developer promise to provide something towards the infrastructure of the Oakura community, and if so, did he deliver on these promises?</p> <p>The submitter understands that growth is a natural part of community and is not opposed to it. With a strong council that has the interests of its community at heart, growth usually occurs in a well-managed, structured way. The submitter understood that Council wanted to “advocate for a coordinated approach to the growth of the village” – the proposed development is far from this. The proposed development would encroach on the National Park and would be detrimental to its ecosystems. The proposed plan change seems to negate the whole Restore Kaitake project.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S146 Renē Stefan Lepionka</b>					
146.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter has concerns around excess traffic/congestion and noise on Wairau Road. The submitter also has concerns re traffic safety on the road and in village. Little park in village and beach now, and no room for	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>more parking. The submitter believes increased traffic generation detrimental to quality of life. Proximity of high density housing to National Park. Green space needs to be protected. Subdivision will have detrimental impact on National Plan due to proximity to it. Development close to Park will have detrimental effect on biggest assets in Taranaki, the countryside and outdoor pursuits. Water runoff from subdivision to beach will create environmental and safety hazards. High density housing (300m<sup>2</sup>) not in keeping with rest of Oakura, does this set precedent for others to have smaller sections?</p> <p>The submitter stresses that there is no capacity at school for further growth. Local of facilities in Oakura to accommodate population growth. Developer suggesting arming not viable is not justification for plan change; there are many other ways to diversify for food production.</p> <p>There is already a lot of development in Oakura to enable growth at appropriate pace.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S147 Marvin Clough</b>					
147.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter stresses that the plan change will have detrimental effect on traffic in and around Oakura. Significant increase in traffic on Wairau Road and Wairau/South Road intersection will cause congestion in village and in beach area. Proposal is a flagrant disregard for existing Oakura Structure Plan. The submitter believes the plan is disproportionate to existing size and scale of Oakura – will result in changes to character and amenity of village. Land has already been zoned for development behind Shearer Reserve. Intensive development should be in areas that can accommodate large growth from an infrastructure and services point of view. The New Plymouth District Plan identifies areas for higher density housing in established areas to accommodate growth. The submitter details that Oakura is not suitable place for this type of development.</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S148 Simon Anthony Bond</b>					
148.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter stresses that restrictions should be placed on extent of residential development in Oakura. More houses will strain existing resources e.g. school, parks, general infrastructure. It will mean increased traffic, noise, lighting, and loss of agricultural land. The submitter wants to retain village feel of Oakura. The submitter is concerned that this development will change Oakura from a village to a town. The submitter is opposed to any plans that would allow high density housing or large- scale property developments being built or developed in Oakura.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S149 Keith Evan Bond</b>					
149.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes restrictions should be placed on extent of residential development in Oakura. More houses will strain existing resources e.g. school, parks, general infrastructure. It will mean increased traffic, noise, lighting, and loss of agricultural land. The submitter wants to retain village feel of Oakura. The submitter believes this development will change Oakura from a village to a town. The submitter is opposed to any plans that would allow high density housing or large-scale property developments being built or developed in Oakura.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S150 Jason Samuel Bond</b>					
150.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter enforces that restrictions should be placed on extent of residential development in Oakura. More houses will strain existing resources e.g. school, parks, general infrastructure. It will mean increased traffic, noise, lighting, and loss of agricultural land. The submitter wants to retain village feel of Oakura. The submitter believes this development</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>will change Oakura from a village to a town. The submitter is opposed to any plans that would allow high density housing or large-scale property developments being built or developed in Oakura.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S151 Olaf Wahlen</b>					
151.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes there will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An increase in pests - rats, cats, dogs;</li> <li>• Traffic increase;</li> <li>• School is already full.</li> <li>• Other land already developed (Teeford Terrace);</li> <li>• The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S152 Birgit and Matthew Kuriger</b>					
152.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitters detail that the rural outlook and privacy from their property in Wairau Road will be lost, amplified by medium density housing area alongside Wairau Stream. Minimum lot sizes of 300m<sup>2</sup> not in keeping with rural environment, or existing sections nearby. Oakura village is unique in its semi-rural landscape, plan change would erode what makes Oakura special. The submitters consider that the 400-house proposal, with this level of density housing, would be an eye sore. The submitter is concerned about construction, noise, vibration and dust for a proposed 20yr development. The submitters believe the plan change will have significant cumulative effect on our property and surrounding properties over this time. Minimal riparian planting is proposed along Wairau Stream walkway/bridle path (proposed Open Space C). Increased area of Open Space C with riparian planting should be mandatory, given proximity to existing housing on Wairau Stream. Concerned about the lack of green space and communal areas given the size of the development. There is only one public playground in Oakura, and this proposal will affect availability and usage of this and other local amenities (Matakai Park and beach).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>The submitters have traffic safety concerns – lack of safe crossing at intersection of Wairau Road/South Road, nearest pedestrian crossing is Donnelly Street. Do not believe pedestrian underpass is viable option as only suits those walking down walkway/bridle path, not those walking on Wairau Road. Underpass also safety concern at night. Wairau/South Road is already dangerous, roundabout may make it safer but not likely to happen for years. No reason why entrance to development could not be from SH45, like Golf Course and areas surrounding this. There is already as lack of parking in Oakura Centre, proposal will make this worse with no solution.</p> <p>Other issue is school, preschool, and kindergarten are at max capacity. Consultation with Ministry of Education essential to ensure growth is accommodated. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S153 Steven Richard Looney</b>					
153.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is disappointed that consultation between the Wairau Estate Subdivision (WES) officials and Nga Mahanga Taire Hapu representatives of the Oakura Marae occurred at pub and not at local marae. The submitter believes that it would be concerning for many that this did not occur, and scenario could be perceived as unprofessional and not commensurate with the scale of development proposed. Note that not all hapu representatives were present at two of the meetings.</p> <p>Particularly considering the potential effects of development on Kaitake Ranges (Outstanding Natural Landscape) and surrounding environment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Was consultation process with hapu reps only appropriate for scale of development proposed?</li> <li>2. Did hapu reps undertake their duties in transparent manner?</li> <li>3. Did views of hapu reps reflect those of wider hapu they represent and were all hapu members consulted regarding the WES proposal?</li> </ol>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>4. Were hapu reps conscious of the local Iwi's perspectives upon the proposed development at time of consultation with Oakura Farm Park Ltd?</p> <p>5. Why were discussions held at pub and not Marae?</p> <p>When "The Paddocks" subdivision (previous development by Oakura Farm Park Ltd) was decided particular reference was made to Lot 29 remaining as rural land by Helen Tobin (Commissioner for hearing). Mr Mckie himself stated that a "protective farm" status would be established over Lot 29 regardless of eventual zoning of this land. Oakura Farm Park Ltd is now attempting to remove the very covenant they put in place to protect Lot 29 from further subdivision. QE2 covenant established by Mckie family also in breach of number of rules regarding managing of a QE2 and key native ecosystem area; relating to inadequate fencing, lack of weed control. The submitter stresses that WES caused residents large anxiety, size of WES will create large problems for village rather than solve 'perceived' housing storage. Housing supply already in long-term plans for area. WES is quick get rick scheme offering community nothing.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S154 Stella Marie Bond</b>					
154	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter details that restrictions should be placed on extent of residential development in Oakura. More houses will strain existing resources e.g. school, parks, general infrastructure. It will mean increased traffic, noise, lighting, and loss of agricultural land. We want to retain village feel of Oakura. This development will change Oakura from a village to a town. The submitter is opposed to any plans that would allow high density housing or large-scale property developments being built or developed in Oakura.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S155 Mary Deken</b>					
155.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter lives in Surrey Hill Road and cannot subdivide their section. The submitter respects that council is safeguarding our lifestyle choice and not allowing what this proposal will do and destroy it. The submitter stresses that they live in rural area for many good reasons. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S156 Yvonne Peacock</b>					
156.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises that a huge subdivision close to mountain is huge concern, cats, dogs, rubbish etc. The submitter believes it will be detrimental to this pristine environment and blight on the landscape. Protect and preserve this area. The sea side of Wairau Rd is urban, and mountain side of Wairau Rd kept natural – all the way around mountain. Change, not growth, is inevitable. We do not deserve subdivision at foot of our beautiful mountain in 20-30yrs time. Traffic increase is concerning. Already safety concerns in village, particularly for children, elderly, and cyclists, due to “requested 50km/h” speed limit through village and location of the Main Road running directly through our “pedestrian” orientated village. Bridge into village also causes many problems and minor changes have already been made.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S157 Anne Elizabeth Clough</b>					
157.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes the plan change will have detrimental effect on traffic in and around Oakura. Significant increase in traffic on Wairau Rd and Wairau/South Rd intersection will cause congestion in village and beach area. Proposal is a flagrant disregard for existing Oakura Structure Plan. The submitter raises that the plan is disproportionate to existing size and scale of Oakura – will result in changes to character and amenity of village. Land has already been zoned for development behind Shearer Reserve. Intensive development should be in areas that can accommodate large growth from an infrastructure and services point of	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>view. The District Plan identifies areas for higher density housing in established areas to accommodate growth. Oakura is not suitable place for this type of development.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S158 Matt Peacock</b>					
158.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter notes that Oakura Farm Park Ltd (OFP) previously completed The Paddocks development. In decision for this development OFP and Mr Mike Mckie stated that 58ha block (subject of this plan change) was a “productive farm unit”. Now they say it is “becoming increasingly marginal farm unit”. Previously also said that The Paddocks subdivision would “protect the open landscape and views of the Kaitake Ranges”, which would now be impeded by this proposal. The submitter believes these statements and others show that OFP is misleading community, land purchasers and council, and that they are inexperienced developers who feel they can change statements to suit best outcome for themselves. Proposal will result in land monopoly for village, as developer will control supply, demand, and value of land. It will severely restrict other small developments from happening. OFP state in proposal that there is a lack of greenfield land. However there are currently 36 lots available, with others around village available to purchase. This small scale of development is consistent with Oakura Structure Plan. With a growth rate of 2% (stated in Oakura Structure Plan) the proposal has a lack of foresight and actual evidence to show that there is land demand to sustain this large-scale development.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that the consultation process has not been fair for the community. Developer has had</p>	<p>Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.</p> <p>Council needs to assist and engage much earlier and better with the community, with these types of major proposed developments and provide at least as much planning support to community as that which developer receives. It’s all far too late during 4-6 week public submission process.</p>	Accept

			<p>many months or years to discuss project with council and change submission according to council request. Community only had 4-6 weeks to review all information, understand language used in developers reports, and make a submission.</p> <p>The submitter stresses that the community typically has little or no funding to fight against land development, unless some members are familiar with process.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S159 Sarah Mainwaring Foreman</b>					
159.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter details that there has been a lack of meaningful public consultation and insufficient time to consider the proposal. If Council allows this, it will set a precedent and change activity status by exceeding allocated entitlement. Visual impact of proposed subdivision is set within a highly sensitive and values environment. The submitter believes that the proposal is not of scale that is consistent with landscape values, rural amenity and character of surrounding environment.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S160 Grant Andrew Aitken</b>					
160.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter notes that the Future Urban Development (FUD) area identified in District Plan is sufficient land for growth in Oakura. Oakura Beach and CBD do not have enough carparking, amenities, or land to develop to cater for the increased population of the proposed rezoning and the FUD area. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S161 Raymond Lewis Looker</b>					
161.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes Oakura does not have the infrastructure to cope with the influx of people development will bring. The school is already at capacity. Wairau Rd SH45 is already nightmare at times. The intensity of proposal is inappropriate for environment and will impact on National Park. The proximity of proposal to Park will detract from magnificent views of Park from SH45 and surrounding area. The proposal will have impact on Oakura residents, who live here for unique social characteristics of the village. There are storm water risks to downstream properties from adverse weather events, as intensity of rainfall increases</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>due to climate change. The submitter notes that the Paddocks was marketed as having rural vistas and the lifestyle for residents in this existing development will be significantly comprised by proposal. The existing reserve area is poorly maintained and exhibits likely indicator as to how future reserve and common areas will be looked after in perpetuity.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S162 Diego Javier Romero Parra</b>					
162.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter stresses that the plan goes against the basic development rules, is not complete, and the village is not ready for that. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S163 Suzette Kaye Boddington</b>					
163.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter agrees with proposed roundabout. This is a necessity currently. People often use hand signals as there is no clear right of way when both are turning right. Some people also do not use the left hand turn right of way, and for exiting off Wairwau Rd is not always easy to stay behind line when look left as bush gets in the way for safe viewing of rd. The submitter also agrees with lifestyle. The submitter stresses that it is important to keep rural landscape, especially next to the national park.</p> <p>The submitter opposes the property numbers and small 300m<sup>2</sup> lots. This will put too much pressure on existing Oakura facilities and infrastructure. Traffic will increase in area. The submitter opposes the equestrian and dog walkers being taken away from use of track which was put in The Paddock, for people to use. Increased traffic and locals wanting horses off the roads.</p>	<p>Amend the Plan Change to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For this to be successful community need to feel satisfied that they will all benefit, all questions asked need to have tangible and realised answers.</li> <li>• Less small residential lots, increase larger 'lifestyle lots' to bring number to 200.</li> <li>• Clear visual right of way</li> </ul>	Accept in part

				<p>signals with well-planned roundabout at Main Rd/Wairau Rd intersection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allow for safe pedestrian/animal/horse crossing if underpass not safe to use and not available to be on</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
				<p>correct side of Rd to go up Wairau Rd.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian crossing for walkers/horse riders to cross onto Main Rd to Upper Wairau Rd.</li> <li>• If all lots approved, entrance/exit needed onto Main Rd – existing entrance with '50' moved further south. Safe easement/track from Wairau Rd for horse riders to walk to Oakura Beach or Pony Club grounds.</li> <li>• Proposed bridle track increased to gain access for other road/horse riders to have opportunity for riding track to minimise road ride usage.</li> <li>• Increased facilities in village (public toilets, parking, etc.). Safe access ways for children to get to/from school.</li> </ul>	
<b>S164 Margaret Dobbin</b>					
164.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes infrastructure needs to improve for existing residents before any expansion takes place, or else extra people will create an unsafe environment, and some will be detrimental to the village. The submitter stresses that improvements need to be made to: carparking in Main Street and outside Four Square; congestion on Main St during school bus times; a plan for expansion of the school; intersection of Dixon St/Main St; public toilets in CBD, there are none currently; is there room for CBD to expand to accommodate growing population?; lack of safe walking footpaths in some streets/parts of streets.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety if no changes are made.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S165 Luke Peacock</b>					
165.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter notes that Oakura already has land for development. It is small village and current infrastructure/facilities are unsuitable for a large development. Oakura is a small community where everyone knows each other, this subdivision will turn village into another Auckland subdivision. If it goes ahead it can't be taken back. This is just pure greed in action.</p> <p>Keep Oakura the village it was always meant to be, a small quant surfing community.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S166 Kerry Peacock</b>					
166.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes that, as a mother with young children, the existing school and grounds is unable to take on more students. The submitter chose to live in Oakura for small village feel where you feel it is safe to raise family. If the submitter wanted to listen to traffic noise all day the submitter would have stayed in Australia. The infrastructure cannot withstand the amount of people the proposal would cater for. The submitter would be greatly saddened if Oakura lost its small village appeal which residents have chosen to make home.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S167 Graeme John Duff</b>					
167.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes the intensity of development is entirely inappropriate for the rural area. Many of the sections are proposed to have 55% site coverage, which is extreme in any big city and inappropriate for a quality semi-rural and beach location. The submitter believes the proposal will result in 411 new houses, some within 400m of National Park. The Park is a great beauty, particularly at boundary</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>adjoining proposal. Effects of proposal on National Park is quite frankly beyond believe and comprehension. Ample land for expansion has already been identified in the FUD. Any expansion should be on north side of SH45 to protect Kaitake Ranges. The submitter believes the visual impact to surrounding properties is unacceptable. Applicant's own landscape architect report confirms high and medium adverse effect.</p> <p>Negative visual effect due to intensity of sections is reason enough to decline application, without numerous other adverse impacts. The application would add further 1,065 to existing population of 1,380. Opportunity for population to expand by 80% immediately will only provide social disaster. Cannot rely on developer statement that growth will take a minimum of 10yrs. Impact of this growth on services/infrastructure is unacceptable.</p> <p>Stormwater catchment has an abnormally high risk. Though work has been completed on this, the introduction of 400 more homes will pose significant flooding risks to owner/occupant. If consented will be unacceptable and huge liability risk to Local Authority.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S168 Stephen Peter Lumb</b>					
168.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes no requirement exists for additional development in Oakura, other than those already defined in Plans. Projected urban growth is already accounted for. That 300m<sup>2</sup> lots with 55% site coverage is in keeping with existing village is quite simply fanciful. Scale conjures up visions of slums and inner city living. The submitter is concerned that the proposal will significantly increase traffic flows on SH45. Developer's initial project "The Paddocks" already increased traffic movements on Upper Wairau Rd. There are roading and drainage issues at Wairau and Surrey Hill Rd already. Further 395 properties in area will make Wairau Rd dangerous, and is not insignificant.</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>The submitter raises that visual and environmental effects of development at foot of Kaitake Ranges cannot be dismissed. Urban fabric is predominantly on seaward side of SH45 and that is where it should remain. There is no need for the proposal.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S169 Peta Bisset Hislop</b>					
169.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter does not support this proposal in any way. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S170 Barbara Costelloe</b>					
170.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter does not support this change. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S171 Anna Blyth Costelloe</b>					
170.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter does not support this change. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S172 Helen Elizabeth Des Forges</b>					
172.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter is against this plan change due to the negative impact it will have on the road safety, noise, light pollution, and community resources. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S173 Matthew Robert Crabtree</b>					
173.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter seeks the proposal be declined due to: privacy issues; transportation effects on current roading layout; noise pollution and light spill. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S174 Layne Greensill</b>					
174.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter owns the farm on western boundary of land subject to plan change. It is viable working dairy farm supplying Fonterra. The submitters current Resource Consent allows the submitter to apply effluent from dairy shed onto pastures, conditions of this consent and nearby houses result in us using land adjacent to plan change site. If this proposal permits residential development the submitter’s farming business would be restrained from operation because of inability to spread effluent within the required separation distances from any new residential buildings. The submitter stresses that careful consideration needs to be given to what result of the plan change will be, and its effects on neighbouring and nearby dairy farms. This change, with residential properties on the submitter’s boundary, would affect ability to farm and make business unviable – also impacting on the value of property.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	<p>Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.</p> <p>The submitter’s farming business not be comprised in any way by the proposed development.</p>	Accept in part
<b>S175 Ms Catherine Deeley</b>					
175.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter details that this proposal goes against conditions set by Hearing Commissioner (SUB10/45196) in relation to The Paddocks Development and “Lot 29” which is site of this plan change. Applicant expressed, in that hearing, that Lot 29 would retain “Protected Farm” status in long term. The submitter also believes goes against Oakura environment that community worked hard to shape. The implied poor economic values of alternative options for site should have been considered before “The Paddocks” was carried out. The submitter does not think one person who does not live in Oakura should have right to change way of life for entire community. Whole community should have been notified.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
175.2	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter stresses that the proposal is inconsistent with New Plymouth District Plan objectives as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue 2 – Adverse light pollution from development, and noise/dust effects over construction period will be more than minor.</li> <li>• Issue 4/Issue 15– Loss of rural amenity, proposal will degrade landscape values, loss of open space and views to Kaitake Ranges (Outstanding Natural Landscape) due to noise bund beside SH45. Site not capable of absorbing change without adverse visual impact. Proximity of proposal to National Park also concerning.</li> <li>• Issue 6 – Reduction in residential amenity due to traffic increase, density of sections and site coverage. Ecological harm due to increased roading and reduced habitat. Traffic increase will have adverse effect on safety and efficiency of transport network. Proposal is automobile dependent as most people will need to commute.</li> <li>• Issue 22 – Adverse effect on infrastructure and facilities due to increased demand. School and medical centre already at or near capacity. Loss of ‘surplus’ Powerco land could cause issues in future with local grid capacity – future increase in demand with home-charge electric vehicles.</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S176 Jessica Kate Churchman</b>					
176.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter notes that Wairau Rd cannot cope without additional infrastructure. Road only has footpath down one side, despite school access on unpaved side. 1,200 more vehicles will make road more hazardous for children. Intersection between Upper Wairau Rd and SH54 is dangerous for cars and pedestrians. Proposal is closest in NZ to a National Park. The submitter believes Oakura infrastructure cannot support growth, the school is zoned and often over-subscribed. Will developer contribute green space, school and retail area to community within massive cul-de-sac? Only access appears to be in/out onto Wairau Rd, the biggest cul-de-sac in NZ. It will add congestion on Wairau Rd and through village. The submitter believes allowing proposal to go ahead will affect village aesthetic, unique nature, and ‘vibe’ of Oakura. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S177 Stephen Ruddlesden</b>					
177.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes the proposed development could mean over 1,000 cars using road only 200m from SH45. In addition to existing logging, housing, builders and concrete trucks travelling through intersection. Entire proposal is one huge cul-de-sac, therefore traffic at Wairau Rd intersection will be huge, which could limit service and emergency vehicle access and school buses. Children have to cross road to get to school from paved side of Wairau Rd, either at Donnelly Rd (no marked crossing) or at junction of Wairau Rd and SH45 which is unsafe. There have been numerous accidents and one fatality there. In addition, 50km speed limit sign is only 20m from intersection and cars come past sign before they slow down. Developments on Wairau Rd and SH45 already increase traffic dangers.</p> <p>The submitter stresses that the effect of proposal on Oakura infrastructure has to be considered, increase of 500-600 children has be catered for before future development (also applies to day-care and nursery) A new school perhaps? Medical centre and retail would also be overwhelmed. Plus seasonal holiday makers and walkers who enter Kaitake Ranges at top of Wairau and Surry Hill Rds. Manna Healing Centre only 30m from entry to proposed developed. Residents, some are frail, have to walk past proposed entry/exit where currently there is no footpath. If this is like past developments by this applicant, the submitter believes the community may expect some promises to be reneged on e.g. No pedestrian underpass provided.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S178 Linda Kathryn Murray</b>					
178.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes vehicle movements will increase on Wairau Rd – turning into Wairau Rd from subdivision and right onto SH45 towards New Plymouth in particular. The submitter is concerned that this will become bottle-neck and an unsafe intersection. Currently is manageable but approx. 800 vehicles commuting to/from subdivision via Wairau Rd will become dangerous and unmanageable. Oakura has village environment. The submitter notes that the community all feel safe; their children have friendly environment in which to play and learn. With addition of new subdivision, the submitter believes Oakura will lose that environment.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S179 Geoffrey Neil Murray</b>					
179.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter details that Oakura is a coastal village, which should grow on seaward side of SH45. Creating a “nappy village” on postage stamp sized sections will seriously affect the amenity value and character of the village. With single storey, 200m<sup>2</sup> dwellings on the sections they will have average boundary setback and will be anything but idyllic in terms of noise, privacy, and light. With new sections, 800+ cars will use Upper Wairau Road and will result in significant delays, particularly for vehicles turning right into SH45. The submitter believes development on seaward side of SH45 would be more manageable. Growth will place huge demand on Oakura School and kindergarten; could result in loss of sports fields if additional classrooms are added. Would ruin small town, full primary school.</p> <p>Proposal will result in construction/earthworks effects for years, whereas current growth rate has minimal impact on residents. Given scale of proposal, it may rob long-term residents of their opportunity to subdivide land as proposal detracts from Oakura lifestyle and makes many sections available for ready market. Residents of The Paddocks were told future</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>subdivision would be line with The Paddocks. If this proceeds it will affect their outlook and property value. Proposal has potential to become like this  <a href="https://www.stuff.co.nz/environment/105679742/coastal-pollution-flows-into-orewa-waterways">https://www.stuff.co.nz/environment/105679742/coastal-pollution-flows-into-orewa-waterways</a> – not something we want for our thus-far well managed area.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S180 Craig Hunter</b>					
180.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the “plan change”. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S181 Marion McNeil Chitty</b>					
181.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter agrees with all possible adverse effects in PF1. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S182 Maria Dawn Townsend</b>					
182.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter details that the proposal is not most appropriate way to achieve purpose of the RMA1991, or the stated objectives of plan change and existing District Plan. Proposal is not designed to accord with or assist the territorial authority to carry out its functions in order achieve the purpose of the RMA. Plan change will not give effect to, and is contrary to Regional Policy Statement for Taranaki, New Plymouth Coastal Strategy, Oakura Structure Plan, Land Supply Review 2007-2027 Final Framework for Growth, the Oakura Community Engagement Report 2014/2016, and the Kaitake Community Plan: a 30yr vision; and it is not the most appropriate method for achieving objectives of New Plymouth District Plan.</p> <p>The submitter believes the plan change will have significant adverse effects on the environment including significant adverse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>environmental, social and cultural effects – Predator Free 2050 will become much more difficult</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• visual landscape and rural character effects</li> <li>• light overspill effects</li> <li>• noise and privacy effects</li> <li>• traffic effects compromising the effective, efficient, and safe land transport system and capacity and safety on the surrounding roading network</li> <li>• community infrastructure and services effects</li> <li>• storm water, sewage, water supply and waste water effects</li> <li>• loss of and fragmentation of agricultural land and soil</li> <li>• earthworks and construction effects</li> </ul> <p>The adverse effects will not be adequately or appropriately avoided, remedied, or mitigated. The proposal is not a sustainable use of the land resource the subject of the change, and overall the Plan Change will not be efficient or effective; neither does it properly consider alternatives. Further, there has been a lack of proper or any meaningful consultation. The Plan Change will not achieve sustainable management and is contrary to the purpose and principles of the Act.</p>		
<b>S183 Max Gillespie</b>					
183.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises that the rezoning of Upper Wairau Rd and development will greatly affect the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roading infrastructure;</li> <li>• Schooling;</li> <li>• Surrounding landscaping, National Park, and views of Kaitake Ranges;</li> <li>• The infrastructure required to sustain development of this size;</li> <li>• Strain on local business;</li> <li>• Increase village size by approximately 70%;</li> <li>• Proposal is in addition to land already zoned for future development;</li> <li>• Have a major effect on the village lifestyle that residents enjoy;</li> <li>• Development is high density housing that I believe does not belong in greater Oakura area.</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S184 John William Freeman</b>					
184.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the subdivision is too close to the National Park which is a predator free zone in which kiwi and other birds are going to be released. The view shaft from SH45 towards National Park will be ruined. Further development should be on seaward side off SH45 within the future 10yr development plan. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S185 Brigitte Hezer Freeman</b>					
185.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter endorses concerns in the Pro Forma Submission, and further objects particularly to the speed in population increase, and visual pollution of environment close to National Park. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S186 Susan Michelle Rose</b>					
186.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter stresses the need to maintain character of small coastal towns. As further development plans and amenities are designated for Bell Block, the population could be better served to increase residential development in proximity of Bell Block. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S187 Mervyn Clarence Foster</b>					
187.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes the infrastructure cannot cope with this proposed subdivision. Beach access is strained now. There aren't enough shops or parking on main street. The school is not big enough. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S188 Ngaio Marama Crook</b>					
188.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes this plan change has not been well thought out. It is in interests of a few and not majority of the community. It will have significant negative impact on our environment and our people for years	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			to come. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S189 Craig Peter William</b>					
189.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter stresses that this Plan change is proposed by a single entirety, solely for their enrichment. No consideration has been given to improving infrastructure in the community to ensure quality of life is retained. "Compliance" with RMA does not mean it is of benefit to our community or our environment. I don't support this plan change. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S190 Bianca Ruakere</b>					
190.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes that Oakura is not equipped to deal with influx of people. Neither the school, medical, or retail services are adequate, nor is the existing infrastructure. The development would also fundamentally change the nature of a small coastal village as it is currently envisioned by its residents. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S191 Dominique France Blotti</b>					
191.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter is totally against the "Plan Change". The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S192 Patricia Anne Brodie</b>					
192.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter enforces that it is inappropriate to open a high-density subdivision on Taranaki National Park boundary (this would be the first here). View shaft looking towards National Park would be compromised. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S193 Keith Mclean Brodie</b>					
193.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that it is not the right place to establish high density residential and take productive land. Totally against construction of high density residential adjacent to National Park. Will the applicant contribute 100% of infrastructure upgrade cost? View shaft from SH45	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			will be severely compromised. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S194 Candida Fox</b>					
194.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes the proposed development is too close to National Park boundaries and will have significant impact on the 'predator free' aim. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S195 Joseph Thomas Churchman</b>					
195.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter stresses that Wairau Rd is already dangerous and congested at intersection, with few cars obeying 50km/h speed limit and it is dangerous to cross with children. Road is only paved on one side and not pedestrian friendly, particularly near Donnelly St track (to school). More people and cars will make this worse. Entrance to development should be off SH45, and less houses should be built. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S196 Sion Iwan Bridge</b>					
196.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes that the proposed development would have wide ranging, detrimental and irreversible effects that are not mitigated by this proposal. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S197 Kate Evans</b>					
197.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter lives on Donnelly St, behind school, and believes that traffic is bad enough at school now. School is already full and cannot accommodate potential number of new entrants. The beauty of village and its surrounds in low population density, the roads, shops, and the beach will all change beyond recognition. Without adequate planning this will be an annoying mess. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S198 Chris Evans</b>					
198.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter notes that they are thoroughly opposed to the proposal for majority of reasons stated in PF1, particularly the impact to infrastructure and quality of life. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

<b>S199 Alan Kindler</b>					
199.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter stresses that they do not believe proposal is in best interests of majority of community. It will mainly benefit those who are proposing the change. Oakura infrastructure is inadequate to support significant urbanisation. Wairau Rd urban rezoning will result in permanent, irretrievable loss of the rural character of the Oakura township. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S200 Clare Elizabeth Leven</b>					
200.1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter urges that the proposed development is too big. It is too close to National Park. Community had already been consulted on how it wants to develop, now this seems to be ignored. Traffic from Wairau Rd will greatly increase. The submitter was under impression that if The Paddocks was developed, then rest of farm was not going to be developed! The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S201 Toni Maree Peacock</b>					
201.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter notes that the beauty of Oakura is its size. It provides the small town, close community feel and an easy laid back lifestyle. A subdivision of this size will have so many negative effects and strain the small towns infrastructure not to mention its environmental impacts with us trying to go predator free. The submitter stresses that it is hard enough to get a park at the beach now in summer time let alone adding another 400 sections. There is other land already set aside for future development. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S202 Sioban Luttrell</b>					
202.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Plan Change because it's just too big and will just create chaos and disharmony in our village. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S203 Madaleine Bourke</b>					
203.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter wants to know who will maintain roads? Intersections? The sections are too small! Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S204 Finn Bourke</b>					
204.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter details that the Plan Change doesn't fit visually and too close to National Park. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S205 Shirley Lynette Fisher</b>					
205.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter does not believe that the current infrastructure will cope with the proposed development, particularly the roading and stormwater. The proximity to the National Park will also have a detrimental affect especially if there is an increased cat population. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S206 Erica Thompson</b>					
206.01	General (not specified)	Oppose	The submitter believes the new development would adversely affect Oakura School. The submitter has attended Oakura School for the last 8 years. The submitter has had large class sizes of over 30 students. The submitter has also lost 2 areas of outdoor play space to fit in new classrooms. The submitter believes the developer is not responsible for building a new school so who will be responsible for the increase in school students and where they go.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S207 Alexandra Thompson</b>					
207.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter stresses that it would be detrimental to the community for the NPDC to approve an 'individuals' proposal of this size that doesn't fit with both the community and the council's effects and plans over the previous years. To allow such a plan would negate all community and	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			council discussions and work put into the area over the years for controlled development. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S208 Catherine Julia Lennox</b>					
208.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Problems with excess traffic/congestion and noise – the submitter lives on Wairau Road (Tui Grove) and the proposed subdivision will mean a dramatic increase in traffic going up and down Wairau Road. The building traffic along will cause noise and damage to surfaces and make it extremely unsafe on a road that only has a foot path on one side and is already cracked/damaged. The submitter is very concerned about the safety issue and taking my young child out on foot or bicycle and having to tackle huge volumes of traffic. There is very little parking in the village or beach and no room for more parking. The congestion in such a small place will be detrimental to quality of life.</li> <li>2. Proximity of high density housing to the National Park – green spaces need to be protected; once lost we can never regain them. The proposed subdivision will have a devastating effect on wildlife with the likely increase in pests (cats and rats) that the area is working hard to reduce. To allow development of this scale to happen so close to the National Park is taking away some of Taranaki’s biggest assets as people come here for beautiful countryside and outdoor pursuits.</li> <li>3. Water runoff – the proposed 58ha of what will mostly be hard surface is likely to increase the volume of water in the stream running past the playpark and out to the beach. This has capacity to create environmental and safety hazards.</li> <li>4. High density of proposed housing lots – taking the minimum section size down to 300m sq is not in keeping with the rest of Oakura’s environment. Will this will set a precedent for other developers.</li> <li>5. No capacity at the School for growth of this size – the school is unlikely able to expand sufficiently or quick enough to cope with increased registrations. Road safety is already an issue around the</li> </ol>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>school and the increase in traffic would make this a health and safety issue.</p> <p>6. Lack of facilities in Oakura for such a massive population rise – there is only one playpark in Oakura for children and while the new subdivision sets aside some land for green space it is not enough for a population increase of this size. Oakura does not have the coastal walkway or any other facilities for a dramatic population increase.</p> <p>7. Developer suggests his farm is not viable therefore should be allowed to subdivide further (he has already established a large area for the paddocks) – the land is still suitable for food production and there are many possibilities to diversify; doesn't give due justification for taking away a large area of farmland.</p> <p>8. There is already lots of development happening in Oakura – this is sufficient to enable growth at an appropriate pace.</p> <p>Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S209 Ingrid Whalen</b>					
209.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concerns around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional pests – rats, cats, dogs next to the National Park</li> <li>• Traffic / noise</li> <li>• School full / overcapacity.</li> </ul> <p>Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S210 Dr Jeanette Drury-Ruddlesden</b>					
210.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter strongly objects to 'access' to this development via Wairau Rd. If this development goes ahead, provisions should be made for access from the main highway '45'. There is enough land to widen the access/exit, similar to the 'Tapuae' model. This proposal will have significant adverse effects to the local environment. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S211 Barney Walker</b>					
211.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes infrastructure inadequate. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S212 Max Shearer</b>					
212.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter stresses that this subdivision will be terrible for Oakura as it is unsustainable, and it is not possible with Oakura's current infrastructure. This proposed subdivision also goes back on what the council said would be the housing growth for Oakura which was 4 houses. This planned subdivision would be over triple that limit. Ultimately this is not how the submitter wants Oakura to grow and as a 17 year old for the submitter this would destroy the village feeling of Oakura.  Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S213 Belle Evans</b>					
213.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter does not want this to happen as the beach would be so crowded and the school would be overwhelmed with another 400 or so kids, when it is such a nice little school it would be ruined. Also the submitter lives across the road from the school and can barely get down Donnelly at 3pm now, think about another 300 cars! Please don't do it, it would ruin little old Oakura.  Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S214 Kris Robinson</b>					
214.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter purchased a section in the Paddocks with the view (or under the pretence) that it would not be further developed. The current state of the existing QEII covenant is not maintained and the submitter believes it is a disgraceful picture of what this should be. No maintenance, limited planning, also sporadic tree planting and overgrown with noxious weeds.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S215 William Howard</b>					
215.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about 300 more cars on the Wairau St/SH intersection. The increased runoff will make Wairau Stream even more unpredictable. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S216 Bruce Donald Hookham</b>					
216.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes the traffic is bad enough as it is! Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S217 Jennie Aitken-Hall</b>					
217.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter details that the community celebrates their wonderful and diverse community in Oakura. It is the best place in the world – please don't change it. Growth is part of life but let it be slowly and organically, not accelerated by this proposal. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S218 Sam Mortensen</b>					
218.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter wants children to grow up in a safe, healthy, friendly community surrounded by a beautiful, clean environment. The submitter believes this proposal doesn't align with community backed growth strategy. This development is completely unnecessary and adverse environmental effects unable to be mitigated – please don't do it.  Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S219 Hannah Elisabeth White</b>					
219.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes this subdivision will affect the playcentre which is a fantastic resource for local families around the area. It would be a real shame to lose this should the school decide to take over the building.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S220 Sarah Markert-Emans</b>					
220.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the Plan Change will warp Oakura's environment with only one development. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S221 Joseph Emans</b>					
221.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter stresses that the Plan Change is too big – only one development. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S222 Elayne Kessler</b>					
222.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter stresses that Oakura needs infrastructure first, then slow growth. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S223 Ruth Elizabeth Morgan</b>					
223.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter raises environmental concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will not ensure the 'predator free' stated intentions.</li> <li>• Not enough thought given to the effect of current proposal – short sighted.</li> <li>• Protected area in danger.</li> </ul> Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S224 Narelle Frampton</b>					
224.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter is seriously concerned about the impact of additional housing, cars and people will have on the village particularly for the school. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S225 Karen Cave</b>					

225.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes the proposal will lead to overcrowding in the village. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
--------	---	--------	--	---	--------

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
-------------------------------------	----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	--------------------	----------------------

<b>S226 Mike Vickers</b>					
--------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

226.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes this proposal is a complete waste and loss of agricultural land. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
--------	---	--------	--	---	----------------

<b>S227 Kate Ponga</b>					
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

227.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter details that intensive development is better suited to town! Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
--------	---	--------	---	---	----------------

<b>S228 Chris Kindler</b>					
---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

228.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes there is insufficient schooling and medical facilities will be too stretched. Against such a huge number of houses. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
--------	---	--------	---	---	--------

<b>S229 Murray Hewitt</b>					
---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

229.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter notes that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing infrastructure will not cope with increased housing.</li> <li>Predator free aspirations will be compromised.</li> <li>Protected area will be endangered.</li> <li>Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
--------	---	--------	---	---	--------

<b>S230 Emma Hislop</b>					
-------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

230.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter raises that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community infrastructure will not cope with increased population.</li> <li>Huge environmental concerns – will not ensure the predator free stated intentions.</li> <li>Protected area in danger.</li> <li>Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
--------	---	--------	---	---	----------------

<b>S231 Philippa Dinnison</b>					
231.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter stresses that the density of the housing is a concern, was expecting a similar size to current Paddocks development. With the additional people at the south end of the town the submitter has concerns over traffic, especially up Wairau Road where my children walk	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			to school. Can the school cope with additional pupils – the submitter understands it is near to limit now. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S232 Campbell White</b>					
232.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the size of the subdivision is not supported by infrastructure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schooling</li> <li>• Parks – inadequate</li> <li>• Loss of potential green corridor from mountain to sea</li> <li>• Transport lacking – cycle/walkways.</li> </ul> The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S233 Susan Freeman</b>					
233.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter queries where is the consultation of the impact? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Illegal</li> <li>• Misleading</li> <li>• Reneged on original agreement Where is our bridal path?</li> </ul> No infrastructure for our schools to support such a large subdivision. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S234 Claire White</b>					
234.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes there are significant traffic, transport, cultural and social effects that would be adverse for our community with this development. Due to its large scale and failure to adhere with current planning requirements and procedures put in place to give time for consultation and solution finding to meet infrastructure needs. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S235 Mikisela Nyman</b>					
235.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter details that Oakura is the Raglan of New Plymouth. To increase the number of houses by 30-45% in one go is ill thought through and will destroy the village feel. It's going to be an upmarket 2 <sup>nd</sup> home place for Aucklanders. The environmental impacts are great. Infrastructure and schools are not adequate to handle that kind of population increase. This is pure greed, not strategic, not sound. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S236 Steven King</b>					
236.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter raises that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oakura is a beautiful spot, don't destroy it.</li> <li>• The infrastructure won't be able to handle it.</li> <li>• Traffic will be terrible.</li> <li>• Overspill effects are massive.</li> <li>• Environmental effects will be huge.</li> </ul> The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S237 Samuel J Kustel</b>					
237.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes that the proximity of the development is too close to the National Park. The precedent this would set would undoubtedly put other areas of this beautiful country at risk. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S238 Stephen John Roberts</b>					
238.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter raises that there are too many sections for the subdivision – reduce the amount. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S239 Alwyn John Dinnison</b>					
239.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter has concerns regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic to Wairau Rd, only one footpath, no crossing.</li> <li>• Section size appears small, is there no minimum required?</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan appears disproportional to Oakura's current size.</li> <li>Can current infrastructure / services cope i.e. school?</li> <li>Is the plan not to grow towards sea side of Main Road?</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S240 Sacha Maria Bull</b>					
240.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is against the rezoning and over densification of Oakura. The impact on the town infrastructure, school, road, beaches would not be in keeping with the character of the area.</p> <p>The impact on the local environment would be significant and detrimental. There are more responsible ways to develop and more consultation needs to be had around these issues with the local community.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S241 Gareth Luttrell</b>					
241.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned regarding over population. Roads too busy. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S242 Andrew Paul Sherwood-Hale</b>					
242.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises environmental, social and cultural effects. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S243 Ian Douglas Corrigall</b>					
243.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned around unbridled importation of immigrants into NZ and Oakura is very detrimental to the infrastructure of a small country town. Not only does it make for rapid inflation but the values of the community change. This does not take into account the huge amount of traffic and the schooling issues.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S244 Rinn Frances Willetts</b>					
244.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter has two school-age children – one attends Oakura school and the other Kaitake kindergarten – and is concerned about the impact this development will have on the schools. Wants Oakura School to continue to be a small school. Does not believe the School can accommodate this development without being compromised, and therefore adversely affecting the children. Environmental effects are also of great concern. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S245 Lizaan Sherwood-Hale</b>					
245.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter raises environmental, social and cultural effects. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S246 Sara Elizabeth Frey</b>					
246.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes this is not a suitable or sustainable viability for Oakura. The scale is far too large for the infrastructure of the community to sustain. A small-scale development would be possible, but this is ridiculous. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S247 Thomas Paul Ellison</b>					
247.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter stresses that this is development is by far completely out of proportion for the size of the current community and the infrastructure it can withhold. Not opposed to growth and development, but there are limits to growth and this by far exceeds that alongside the current growth we see here. It not only puts pressure on the local infrastructure, roads, schools, and amenities but also a huge potential impact on the environment being so close to one of our National Parks. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S248 Gillian Elizabeth Gibbon</b>					
248.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes that the proposed development is disproportionate to the size of Oakura and will put a huge strain on all of the effects mentioned below [refer pro forma submission]. The areas already identified for future urban development by the community board, council and people of Oakura allow for a more sympathetic and balanced expansion of the village. The wants of one should not take precedence over the needs of many. Please plan Oakura's future together. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S249 Ian Peter Gibbon</b>					
249.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes that this development would have a significant impact on the Oakura Fire Brigade, Police and Ambulance service. Does not believe that a roundabout at the SH45 / Wairau Road junction is viable. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S250 Kate Louise Hinton</b>					
250.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter details that the proposed subdivision is far too dense and will place too much pressure on already stretched infrastructure – particularly the school. The existing plan for land zoned for subdivision in Oakura has been well thought out and should be kept to. Has lived at 109A Wairau Rd and has found the intersection with Wairau and South Rd extremely dangerous. Further traffic will make the whole village more dangerous for parents and children. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S251 Hannah Brieseman</b>					
251.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about traffic, parking and schooling. Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S252 Sara Jayne Matheson</b>					
252.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes that the application to change the plan will be detrimental to Oakura. The current and proposed infrastructure will be insufficient to cope with the additional stresses. The negative impacts on the community and the environment outweigh any benefits to the population.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S253 Gina Milestone</b>					
253.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is very concerned about the effect the proposed plan change will have on the community. Concerned on the strain it will put on the existing infrastructure, the changes that will need to happen with the school to accommodate extra pupils, the increase in traffic and concerns of safety in regard to this, and also the proximity of the national park to the plan change.</p> <p>Also concerned that the Oakura community and “feel” of the community will only be changed for the negative with the potential of such a large population increase. The submitter wants their kids to grow in in an Oakura not too different to the one they grew up in.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S254 Francois Husillos</b>					
254.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter is worried about such a large and compact subdivision happening so close to a National Park. This would open the door to more happening around NZ where we should preserve this. We can't stop people coming to such an attractive location but believe they should be bigger sections in order to fit visually in the landscape and physically with the growth capacity of Oakura. There should be more information on how the matching infrastructures will be funded and managed (school, roading, sewage, beach parking, etc).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).		
<b>S255 Paul and Penny Holdcroft</b>					
255.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter's property is alongside the stream and the highway. Their property has been flooded before and worry once again about runoff creating another flood.</p> <p>The increased traffic along Wairau Road will making living on Wairau Road unbearable and dangerous. If anything, access to the new subdivision should come straight off the proposed roundabout through the submitter's property, therefore not creating any extra traffic up Wairau Road.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S256 Melissa Henwood</b>					
256.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes the effect this will have on the village and its environment is large. The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S257 Chris Edward Henwood</b>					
257.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter raises the effect this will have on the village is huge. The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S258 Kaitake Community Board</b>					
258.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S259 Adam Christopher Thame</b>					
259.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S260 George Poole</b>					
260.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S261 Graeme Mitchell</b>					
261.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S262 Mark Bridges</b>					
262.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S263 Tobias Looker</b>					
S263.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S264 Christophe Massa</b>					
264.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S265 Greg Shearer</b>					
265.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S266 Sam Dixon</b>					
266.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S267 James Harrop</b>					
267.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S268 Rowan Deuapt</b>					
268.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S269 Paul Donald Coxhead</b>					
269.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S270 Patricia Rae Coxhead</b>					
270.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S271 Elli Pillette</b>					
271.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S272 Jenna Pillette</b>					
272.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S273 John Tooman</b>					
273.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S274 Jan Bisset Brash</b>					
274.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S275 Heather McKinnon</b>					
275.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

<b>Submitter &amp; Submission Point Number</b>	<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Decision Requested</b>	<b>Recommended Decision</b>
<b>S276 Glenys Mair Farrant</b>					
276.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S277 Ruth Brieseman</b>					
277.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S278 Gary Brieseman</b>					
278.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S279 Ed Shearer</b>					
279.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S280 Shelley Tipler</b>					
280.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S281 Howard Evans</b>					
281.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S282 Christopher Edward Taylor</b>					
282.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S283 Christopher DJ Curd</b>					
283.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

<b>Submitter &amp; Submission Point Number</b>	<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Decision Requested</b>	<b>Recommended Decision</b>
<b>S284 Irene More</b>					
284.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S285 Dominic Barson</b>					
285.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S286 Corrin Grace Pryce-Baxter</b>					
286.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S287 Rowan Paul Oldfield</b>					
287.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S288 Jane Elizabeth Shearer</b>					
288.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S289 Michael Leonard Gibbon</b>					
289.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S290 Bruce Gordon Duggan</b>					
290.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S291 Suzanne Bloch-Jorgensen</b>					
291.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

<b>Submitter &amp; Submission Point Number</b>	<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Decision Requested</b>	<b>Recommended Decision</b>
<b>S292 Andrew Kingsley</b>					
292.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S293 Edward Roger Thompson</b>					
293.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S294 Barry Ross (Sam) Sutherland</b>					
294.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S295 Vicki Maree Looney</b>					
295.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S296 Tanya Farrant</b>					
296.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S297 Neil McLauchlan</b>					
297.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S298 Emma Kate Taylor</b>					
298.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S299 John Malcolm Quilter</b>					
299.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S300 Harry Nikau Looney</b>					
300.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S301 Mack Julian Looney</b>					
301.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S302 Brenda Lee Frampton</b>					
302.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S303 Warren Alexander Green</b>					
303.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S304 Neville Courtney Frampton</b>					
304.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S305 Karl Looney</b>					
305.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S306 Wendy Elizabeth Marshall</b>					
306.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S307 Hamish Shearer</b>					
307.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S308 Margaret Rose Fleming</b>					
308.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S309 Zaki Shamas Din</b>					
309.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S310 Heather Mary Weston</b>					
310.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S311 Kim Anne Fredrickson</b>					
311.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S312 Jillian Murdoch</b>					
312.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S313 Geoff Shearer</b>					
313.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S314 Melissa McQuaig</b>					
314.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S315 Joanne Hill</b>					
315.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S316 Dorrien Andrews</b>					
316.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S317 Phoebe Ruth Andrews</b>					
317.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S318 Ian Blair Ives</b>					
318.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S319 Helen Anne Ives</b>					
319.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S320 Marion Anne Duff</b>					
320.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S321 Adam Karl Hinton</b>					
321.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S322 Daisy Din</b>					
322.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S323 Toby Din</b>					
323.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

<b>Submitter &amp; Submission Point Number</b>	<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Decision Requested</b>	<b>Recommended Decision</b>
<b>S324 Paul John Haskell</b>					
324.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S325 Lisa Ann Haskell</b>					
325.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S326 Jill Angela Shearer</b>					
326.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S327 Maree Milestone</b>					
327.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S328 Yvonne Adele Blatti</b>					
328.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S329 Darrell Farmer</b>					
329.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S330 Michael Gerard Yardley</b>					
330.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S331 Julie Helen Yardley</b>					
331.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S332 Pamela Anne Frame</b>					
332.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S333 Ian Stewart Frame</b>					
333.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S334 Julia</b>					
334.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S335 Douglas Hislop</b>					
335.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S336 Audrey Stockman</b>					
336.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S337 Desmond Stockman</b>					
337.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S338 Natalie O'Donnell</b>					
338.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S339 Katy Hutchins</b>					
339.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S340 Gloria Zimmerman</b>					
340.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S341 Kathleen Anne Fraser</b>					
341.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S342 Christopher John Thame</b>					
342.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S343 Pauline Gay Thame</b>					
343.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S344 Dona Suzanne Bell</b>					
344.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S345 Joanne Mary Francis-Alles</b>					
345.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S346 Lagen Kumeroa</b>					
346.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S347 Gillian Slaney</b>					
347.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S348 Nina Lobb</b>					
348.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S349 Barbara Hawkins</b>					
349.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S350 Christy Warke</b>					
350.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S351 Julia McNeil</b>					
351.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S352 Shanon Carmel Dowsing</b>					
352.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S353 Maree Brown</b>					
353.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S354 Hayden Corkin</b>					
354.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S355 Margaret Anne Constance</b>					
355.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

<b>Submitter &amp; Submission Point Number</b>	<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Decision Requested</b>	<b>Recommended Decision</b>
<b>S356 Fiona Sorensen</b>					
356.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S357 Gabrielle Lloyd</b>					
357.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S358 Elizabeth Barrientos</b>					
358.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S359 Janet Sweet</b>					
359.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S360 Jessica Mahood</b>					
360.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S361 Yulan Imhasly</b>					
361.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S362 Juraj Krajci</b>					
362.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S363 Lubos Krajci</b>					
363.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S364 Marie-Jose Griffin</b>					
364.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S365 Michael William Pillette</b>					
365.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S366 Hanan Michael Pillette</b>					
366.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S367 Michelle Louise Benton</b>					
367.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S368 Belinda Pickford</b>					
368.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S369 Allen Douglas Charteris</b>					
369.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S370 Clare Sherlie Charteris</b>					
370.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S371 Lynne Le Roux</b>					
371.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S372 Shelley Dawn Landon-Lane</b>					
372.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S373 Robyn Jacqueline Prentice</b>					
373.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S374 Patrick Murray Brien</b>					
374.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S375 Stuart G McKinnon</b>					
375.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S376 Fay Rosalie Looney</b>					
376.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S377 Tanya Hansen</b>					
377.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter notes that a smaller scale subdivision in Oakura of up to 30 lots would be supported. The scale of this subdivision is inconsistent with the Oakura village environment and would have environmental effects on the community that are more than minor. The proposal does not achieve the principles of the RMA. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S378 Ann Geraldine Hikaka</b>					
378.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes that the proposed plan change will adversely impact the Oakura village by increasing population density which will undermine the unique character of the village.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<p>The submitter also notes that it will change the current equestrian friendly activity character of Oakura village making equestrian activity a high risk one because of increased traffic, population and urbanisation. Undermines the Regional Plan to be pest free and see the return of native flora and fauna.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S379 Robert and Carlene Dobbie</b>					
379.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitters do not agree with the new subdivision of land, Oakura and surrounding areas are losing the beauty of nature by endless new housing, and having the infrastructure, sewage and water supply. The submitters want to look up at the mountain to see the beauty of the ranges, not new houses.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S380 Francis Farmer</b>					
380.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S381 Nicholas Field</b>					
381.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S382 Mike Hareb</b>					
382.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter notes that there are no infrastructure in village to allow so many sections.</p> <p>If anything at all, increase section size to 1 acre same as upper Wairau Paddocks area!</p> <p>Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S390 Luke Florence</b>					
390.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overcrowding. Surfing.</li> <li>• Sections too small.</li> <li>• School not big enough.</li> <li>• Keep the village like a village.</li> <li>• Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S392 Claire Florence</b>					
392.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents will lose the village feel, as that is why they live here.</li> <li>• Not enough infrastructure as it is!</li> <li>• Overcrowded school and shops.</li> <li>• Also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S397 Catherine Ongley</b>					
397.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Plan Change for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S398 Rosalind McFetridge</b>					
398.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S399 Kama Ambrose</b>					
399.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S400 Brady Cates</b>					
400.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

<b>Submitter &amp; Submission Point Number</b>	<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Decision Requested</b>	<b>Recommended Decision</b>
<b>S402 Lee William Webb</b>					
402.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S403 David John Smith</b>					
403.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S408 Janko Reinders</b>					
408.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S409 Constance Rebecca Reinders</b>					
409.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S411 Valerie Neil</b>					
411.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S421 Patricia Elsie Hardy</b>					
421.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Plan Change for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S422 Jan Roebuck</b>					
422.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S423 Matthew Brash</b>					
423.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S424 Wayne Looker</b>					
424.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter details in addition to the significant adverse effects, the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intensity of the development – the intensity of the development is totally inappropriate for the environment for which it intended;</li> <li>• National Park – impact on the neighbouring National Park of an intense development;</li> <li>• Social impact – impact upon the current residents of Oakura, many whom have purchased properties for the unique social characteristics the village now possesses;</li> <li>• Stormwater risks – risks to downstream properties from adverse weather events as intensity of rainfall increases due to climate change;</li> <li>• Visual impacts – detracting from the magnificent views of the National Park from SH45 and the immediate surrounding area;</li> <li>• Impact on existing Paddocks purchasers – existing property owners in the Paddocks subdivision were marketed rural vistas and lifestyles that will be significantly compromised by the proposed scheme plan change;</li> <li>• Maintenance – existing reserve area have been poorly maintained and exhibits a likely indicator as to how future reserve and common areas will be looked after in perpetuity.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S425 Grant Looker</b>					
425.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises in addition to the significant adverse effects, the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intensity of the development – the intensity of the development is totally inappropriate for the environment for which it intended;</li> <li>• National Park – impact on the neighbouring National Park of an intense development;</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social impact – impact upon the current residents of Oakura, many whom have purchased properties for the unique social characteristics the village now possesses;</li> <li>• Stormwater risks – risks to downstream properties from adverse weather events as intensity of rainfall increases due to climate change;</li> <li>• Visual impacts – detracting from the magnificent views of the National Park from SH45 and the immediate surrounding area;</li> <li>• Impact on existing Paddocks purchasers – existing property owners in the Paddocks subdivision were marketed rural vistas and lifestyles that will be significantly compromised by the proposed scheme plan change;</li> <li>• Maintenance – existing reserve area have been poorly maintained and exhibits a likely indicator as to how future reserve and common areas will be looked after in perpetuity.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		
<b>S426 Philippa Holman</b>					
426.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter has concern around, in addition to the significant adverse effects, the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intensity of the development – the intensity of the development is totally inappropriate for the environment for which it intended;</li> <li>• National Park – impact on the neighbouring National Park of an intense development;</li> <li>• Social impact – impact upon the current residents of Oakura, many whom have purchased properties for the unique social characteristics the village now possesses;</li> <li>• Stormwater risks – risks to downstream properties from adverse weather events as intensity of rainfall increases due to climate change;</li> <li>• Visual impacts – detracting from the magnificent views of the National Park from SH45 and the immediate surrounding area;</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on existing Paddocks purchasers – existing property owners in the Paddocks subdivision were marketed rural vistas and lifestyles that will be significantly compromised by the proposed scheme plan change;</li> <li>• Maintenance – existing reserve area have been poorly maintained and exhibits a likely indicator as to how future reserve and common areas will be looked after in perpetuity.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>		

Table 2: Late submissions (received after submission deadline closed)

There were 9 late submissions made on PPC18/00048 which were received after the deadline for when submissions had been closed. These submissions were subsequently accepted and considered as part of PPC18 process.

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S427 John Newton</b>					
427.01	General – Wairau Estate Oakura	Oppose	The submitter opposes due to overcrowding.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Reject
<b>S428 George Newton</b>					
428.01	General – Wairau Estate Oakura	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Plan Change.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S429 Lee Newton</b>					
429.01	General – Wairau Estate Oakura	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Plan Change.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S430 Louis Newton</b>					
430.01	General – Wairau Estate Oakura	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Plan Change.	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S431 Paul Frederick Bishop</b>					
431.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter believes the proposed plan will have significant adverse environmental consequences to the Wairau Stream and the Oakura beach that it runs into. The submitter is concerned that the intense urban zone with small lot sizes will increase water runoff to the stream. The runoff will not be clean and will pollute the stream and popular beach just downstream. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

Submitter & Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested	Recommended Decision
<b>S432 Toby Dixon</b>					
432.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept
<b>S434 Fiona Ann Tait</b>					
434.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes that there is insufficient infrastructure to support this venture currently. The schools and preschools are full; there is no supermarket; there are very few public toilets available. Beach and park freedom camping and high summer use bring problems of public members using parks/fields as toilets and this is dreadful! When crime occurs, or police needed, there are few resources on which to call. More resources should be put in before you increase the population to a point where the 'Paradise found feel of Oakura becomes paradise lost'.</p> <p>The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro Forma Submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
<b>S435 Karen J White</b>					
435.01	General – Wairau Estate Structure Plan Zoning	Opposed	<p>The submitter is strongly opposed to the rezoning by development of upper Wairau Road. There is a lack of infrastructure to support the proposed development e.g. school, road into town, lack of sufficient parking throughout the community. Concern is given that the proposal will lead to debasing by changing the fabric and tone of the township the submitter bought into.</p> <p>Infill housing and its detraction – traffic, pressure on amenities and especially water and sewerage. 400 houses doubles the village population. Destroying rural views will decrease the value of properties. The submitter details that they pay huge rates to live in a semi-rural coastal village – not suburbia.</p> <p>Future housing in Oakura should be incremental -organic in growth matching supply and demand. New housing sections should be on Lower Wairau Road – as there is three access options – it is not so visible and is on the sea side of Oakura creating less parking demands on the beach areas (walk to beach).</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part

**S436 Charles Jonathan Cotton**

436.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Opposed	The submitter believes that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ There are too many houses in the proposed plan. This will result in too many people and cars.</li><li>○ Excess housing capacity will adversely effect prices of existing property.</li><li>○ There will be years and years of construction traffic. No provisions for horses (e.g. bridle ways).</li></ul>	Reject/ decline the Plan Change in its entirety.	Accept in part
--------	---	---------	---	---	----------------