

**BEFORE THE NEW PLYMOUTH DISTRICT COUNCIL
INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of a request for Private Plan Change NPDC PLC18/00048
by Oakura Farm Park Limited to rezone land at Oakura
within the New Plymouth District

**RESPONSE OF MICHAEL MCKIE TO EVIDENCE OF SUBMITTERS OPPOSING THE
REVISED PROPOSAL AS SET OUT IN THE FURTHER EVIDENCE OF ON BEHALF OF
OAKURA FARM PARK LIMITED**

2 December 2019

LACHLAN MULDOWNEY
BARRISTER

P +64 7 834 4336 **M** +64 21 471 490
Office Panama Square, 14 Garden Place, Hamilton
Postal PO Box 9169, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240
www.lachlanmuldowney.co.nz
Instructing Solicitor: Ellice Tanner Hart

INTRODUCTION

1. This evidence is presented in response to the further evidence presented by various submitters in opposition to the revised, scaled back proposal.
2. I note the Commissioner's directive that unnecessary repetition of evidence already given and that new matters are to be avoided, and so will leave the detailed technical responses to the various experts who will give evidence on behalf of Oakura Farm Park Ltd (OFPL).
3. At the time of the initial hearing of this plan change in July 2019, I was unexpectedly hospitalised, and was unable to attend. This was very disheartening, and I was very proud of my family for representing me at the hearing, particularly given the strength of negative community feeling presented by many submitters.
4. It appears that even with the amended proposal, the community opposition remains, and that some submitters question my motives and overall approach. I want to set the record straight, and for that reason, I feel a personal response from me is necessary.

MY RESPONSE

5. The evidence presented at the hearing by submitters in opposition to the project was reviewed closely by me. I strongly believe that the original proposal, which included provision for aged care housing opportunities, equestrian lifestyle blocks, a new roundabout and underpass, open spaces and residential sections would have made a wonderful contribution to the community of Oakura.
6. However, the evidence presented gave me cause to reflect carefully on whether I should persevere with the original vision or modify the proposal to respond to the concerns raised. I and my family decided to make changes to reflect the community concerns.
7. We did this because despite some of the community sentiments expressed, we do care about what is right for Oakura. While I don't personally live in Oakura, my immediate

family does. They are part of the community, walking and driving in the village, swimming at the beach, and participating in daily life here at Oakura.

8. On my instructions, the technical team have scaled down the plan change, and effectively started again in terms of location, layout and design, all within the original footprint. While I am personally disappointed that the original vision for the plan change will not be realized, 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 Oakura in the future.
9. I reject the suggestion that the changes are not a genuine effort to address community concerns. I note that submitters refer to the 'stub roads' as an indication of an intention to come back and extend the project in the future.
10. The roading lay out has been prepared under the advice of technical experts. The layout 'future proofs' the subdivision for possible growth in the long term, should that one day, long into the future, be deemed appropriate. I am advised that this approach represents sustainable planning and consideration for future generations. To demonstrate OFPL's commitment to the proposed scale of the plan change, I refer to the submission which it has made to the New Plymouth District Council's Proposed District Plan (PDP). The submission seeks the same outcome as that sought under this process.
11. Finally, I wish to respond to the criticisms surrounding The Paddocks subdivision. Firstly, I hope that the commissioner sees The Paddocks subdivision as clear evidence to my commitment to delivering a quality residential environment to Oakura.
12. 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 notice would need to be qualified to say that it would apply only for as long as the land was zoned rural. This recognized that it was not in perpetuity, but may one day be subject to change, if the zoning changed. This possibility was clearly signaled by the Council at that time with the notification of Plan Change 15 and the placement of the

FUD overlay on our land. Everyone who purchased in the subdivision should have been aware of this important qualification.

13. It concerns me that submitters suggest I misled them on this point. I believe the terms of the consent notice are clear. It also concerns me that submitters use this as an indication of untrustworthiness
14. I hope that through the changes we have introduced into the plan change in response to the concerns raised, that the solutions now proposed will be regarded by the community as genuine, and something that will work for all. Regardless of the outcome of the plan change application, I will look forward to strengthening relationships and communications with all in the Oakura community.

Dated 2 December 2019

Mike Mckie