

Kaitake Community Board Submission

PPC18/00048



In the matter of:
Proposed Private Plan Change 48 to the New Plymouth District
Plan requested by Oakura Farm Park Limited for the proposed
rezoning of land at Wairau Road, Oākura.

Statement of Evidence of the Kaitake Community Board
on behalf of the Oākura residents and community.

23 July 2019

**This submission, along with the appendices, is provided in digital form on the
provided USB Flash Drive**

KAITAKE COMMUNITY BOARD SUBMISSION

on

PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE APPLICATION - PPC18/00048

Introduction

1. My name is Douglas Robert Hislop. I am a retired school principal, having spent 46 years in public service, in the education sector. My wife and I live in Oākura and have been residents and ratepayers here for the past 49 years. We have two grown daughters, now with families of their own. Both girls were students at Oākura Primary School where my wife was a teacher for 30 years. My wife's family has a life-long association with Oākura, having owned a seaside cottage in the village since 1951. Her 80 year-old sister lives there permanently.
2. I was the 17th registered member of the Oākura Fire Service, a teacher at Oākura School for a number of years, and more recently on the Oākura School 150th Jubilee organising committee. I am a member of the Oākura Beach Carnival Trust, founder of the Restore Oākura urban predator trapping initiative, a foundation member of the Oākura Boardriders Club, and play a leading roll in developing and maintaining the Oākura Community Civil Defence plan. I have been a member of the Kaitake Community Board since 2004, being its Deputy Chair at that time, and subsequently its Chair from 2007.
3. My name is Michael William Pillette. I am currently Deputy Principal of Fitzroy School, a large U5 primary school in New Plymouth and have spent 44 years in education as teacher, principal and as a Massey University mathematics curriculum adviser to Taranaki schools. My wife and I live in Oākura and have been residents and ratepayers here for 40 years. My four adult children have all attended Oākura Primary School and I myself taught there for two years early in my teaching career.
4. I was a member of the Oākura Pony Club when my children were growing up and am a foundation member of the Oākura Boardriders Club. I am currently Chair of the Oākura Community Emergency Planning Committee. I have served on the Kaitake Community Board for the last four terms and am currently Deputy Chair.
5. We present this submission on behalf of the Kaitake Community Board and are authorised to do so on its behalf.

Opening Statement

6. The core purpose of a community board is to represent, and act as an advocate for the interests of its community. The Kaitake Community Board (KCB) achieves this purpose by having a local focus and providing principled representation on behalf of the Oākura community. Our members live within the community they serve, many of

them for a significant timeframe, and have a strong association with local community organisations and special interest groups within the district. Community engagement is the cornerstone of the KCB's work, and the question of whether any action will be 'for the betterment of the community' is at the heart of all discussions held and decisions made.

7. The pressures resulting from a growing population and increasing tourism demand, have the potential to put the Oākura community and its coastal environment at significant risk. To appropriately address and manage these challenges, the KCB considers it essential to take a long-term view and ensure that development is undertaken in a smart and sustainable manner that responds to both the issues and aspirations of the community, now and in the future.
8. The KCB has worked continuously and collaboratively with our community, and understand the values unique to it. We have, and continue to, engage intensively to establish a unified approach and help develop plans that accurately represent the vision the community has for their village and environment. This deep understanding of the local community has enabled the KCB to assist and support the New Plymouth District Council (NPDC) and the Taranaki Regional Council (TRC) in mapping and achieving their strategic and business objectives, safeguard and maintain their assets and develop an understanding of the impacts of governance decisions upon local residents, businesses and organisations.
9. This local knowledge is a key factor in enabling the NPDC and the TRC to fulfil their obligation of ensuring the communities under their jurisdiction have a good quality of life that achieves the best outcome for the majority. Through identification of community needs, the local and territorial authorities can accurately demonstrate how those needs will be met, through such mechanisms as long-term community plans (Kaitake Community Plan), district and regional plans and relevant policies and procedures.
(reference: Appendix Two point 9 - Kaitake Community Plan - a thirty year vision)
10. Key to the enactment of community aspirations for their local area is the use of the District Plan as an enabling mechanism to ensure development accords with values held by communities. As such, a district plan should provide certainty to the community in terms of growth, management of activities and envisaged character. As these factors change over time, updated plans are developed through engagement with affected communities, as has occurred with the proposed changes to the operative NPDC District Plan, which seeks to control unfettered subdivision of productive rural land and consequential loss of rural character and amenity.

11. The Draft District Plan clearly signals that any development in the Oākura South Future Urban Development zone (FUD) should not occur any sooner than a 10-30 year timeframe. It is noted that the proposed private plan change, subject of this hearing, has been lodged prior to any adoption of the Draft District Plan changes. **(see Appendix One - point 11/76 image)**
12. This submission from the KCB opposes the Proposed Private Plan Change and subsequent variation to conditions of an existing subdivision consent. The submission will outline the specific issues raised by the community, provide a history of Oākura Village to enable contextual understanding, and the plans for urban development that have emerged from within community consultation over time.
13. The submission will also address the important elements of village social and cultural wellbeing that are fundamental to the community, and outline the community expectations for development within the applicant's site that were formed by the required conditions within the original subdivision consent granted by the NPDC.
14. This KCB submission is underpinned by our long experience and actual understanding of local amenity values and our desire to always put people at the centre of decision-making processes. We have applied exactly the same rigour to this application as to every other issue the KCB scrutinises, no less, no more.

We believe the underlying information we provide speaks for itself and will be useful in that regard.

Future Urban Development

15. The Oākura community has always acknowledged that future growth is required and will occur. Through the KCB and the Oākura Focus Group (OFG) the community has set out to address this in a way that provides for the social, cultural and environmental well-being of Oākura. This is a mix of greenfield, adequate in the foreseeable future with present zoned land, and in-fill development within the existing footprint of the village. This work has informed NPDC decision-makers in their subsequent district-wide planning processes. Its genesis was the New Plymouth Coastal Strategy and substantial work has been continued from that point onwards. It is important to acknowledge the considerable input and expertise the OFG have provided in this regard.
(reference Appendix Two points 15/42 - Appendix Two Oākura Focus Group Terms of Reference)

16. The KCB opposes the Private Plan Change and Variation to Consent Notice to allow further subdivision of the rural land in question.
It is the considered opinion of the KCB that 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.
17. The application's premise that expanding the urban fabric of Oākura south of State Highway 45 (SH45) has long been regarded by successive Councils and the community as logical is incorrect.
18. Statements are made such as: *'developing the property for urban living is a logical and efficient expansion of the Oakura urban fabric.'* And *'Expanding the urban fabric of Oakura essentially south either side of State Highway 45 has long been regarded by successive Councils and the community as being logical. This has been evidenced in various planning documents over recent decades, and most recently in the Oakura Structure Plan 2006 and the operative New Plymouth District Plan.'* (reference: Request for Private Plan Change & Variation to Consent Notice: Oakura Farm Park Ltd 2.2.4 Logical).
19. The community has always viewed the south side of SH45 as a much loved rural landscape.
The planning action that led to the addition of the southern FUD triangle was an action taken when the owners of the land at that time indicated they wanted to establish 4ha lifestyle lots on their property. This was a relatively easy process then, but was subsequently changed during later NPDC planning reviews. In fact, the applicant stated he would proceed with a large 4ha lifestyle subdivision if his Paddocks application was unsuccessful. Many Oākura residents at the time viewed that as a real threat to the character of the rural landscape.
(reference: Appendix Two - Brief of Evidence of Michael McKie in the matter of the resource consent application to subdivide land at Wairau Road, Oakura, New Plymouth p25)
20. The FUD area in question was added with its western boundary drawn in a perfunctory manner as a possible 'safety net buffer' so as to protect the rural character of the land further to the west, and the landscape views up to the Kaitake Range. This would have allowed for three 4ha lifestyle blocks if the current owners at that time had proceeded with an application.
(see Appendix One - point 20 image)

It's worth noting that NPDC stated at the time that: *'The proposed FUD Overlay Plan Change seeks to maintain the status quo within the rural environments of the future urban growth areas identified by the FUD Overlay. This is consistent with*

maintaining rural character while recognising the diverse nature of rural land and rural land uses. Flexibility of land use is maintained while recognising that within and adjacent to the future urban growth areas, it is necessary to maintain a level of control that ensures that future urban development is not compromised by short to medium term decisions in terms of land use change. (reference: **Appendix Two - point 20 Future Urban Development Overlay Section 32 Report**)

21. If the FUD triangle was considered important, surely far more planning work would have been subsequently carried out? In fact any FUD plan change was done in conjunction with the rural review – the two working in tandem to acknowledge urban expansion over the long horizon, and to protect rural land as an important resource. The application makes that very point: *‘It was apparent that in imposing the triangular shape of the FUD on the topography, little, if any, consideration appears to have been given to the future development of the available land for urban use’*. (reference: **Private Plan Change Request PPC18/00048 P3/Reason 23.8**).
22. For it to be stated in the application that successive councils and the community have considered it logical to expand residential development in the FUD area and west of it is disingenuous. It is clear that the NPDC did not want 4ha lots spreading westward in this rural environment and established the FUD triangle as a potential method to keep control over the situation. It was done at a point in time when the subdivision of farmland in this way was easy to achieve. It was certainly not in the community’s interest for that to happen then, any more than it is now.
23. The KCB’s opinion is this had a significant bearing on Commissioner Tobin’s overall 2010 ‘Paddocks’ decision. Essentially her final determination shifted the potential 4ha lifestyle development of the FUD overlay to the end of Upper Wairau Road, urbanising it from a possible 19 4ha blocks into 27 residential lots as far removed from the farming operation as possible, and protecting the balance of the property (Lot 29) from further development. The community hasn’t had to overthink the circumstances to work that out. (see **Appendix One - point 23 image**).
24. It is now argued: *‘that it is appropriate to plan for the urban development of Lot 29 and Lot 3 in its entirety.’ To only give effect to the portion of the property in the FUD Area would not result in orderly and logical urban development, would be an inefficient use of the available infrastructure.’* (reference: **Private Plan Change Request PPC18/00048 1.6 The Planning Approach P11**).
25. The KCB rejects this premise. The Lot 29 land in question currently ensures a rural view to the west from the dwellings on the west side of Wairau Road. Rural views are also available from the SH45/Wairau Road intersection and they are further available as one travels on SH45 south-west when leaving or arriving at Oākura village. It is these views from residential lands to the open farmlands and beyond to

the Kaitake Range, which are a significant attractor to residents and visitors. This is a widely held view by the Oākura community and supported by many of the submissions opposing this private plan change application.

The proposed development will neither visually integrate with the Kaitake Range nor seamlessly merge with the rural landscape. It will adversely affect the rural character of that area forever, pushing a sprawling urban boundary much further to the west. Therefore the KCB has genuine concerns as to the adverse effects on rural character and amenity that would be generated by the proposed development.

(see Appendix One - point 25 image).

26. The KCB finds it paradoxical that the applicant went to considerable length at the 'Paddocks' hearing to expound the importance of not developing the FUD triangle area. He stated at the time: *'If the identified Structure Plan triangle is developed views up to the Kaitake Ranges will be obstructed by buildings. Ironically protection of views up to the Kaitake Ranges Outstanding Landscape is a key aim of the Structure Plan.'* He went on to say, *'the farm land was being landscaped aesthetically to maximise the beauty of the outstanding views up to the Kaitake Ranges.'* And, *'In my view all of this work is not compatible with developing the triangle area.'*

(reference: Appendix Two - Brief of Evidence of Michael McKie in the matter of the resource consent application to subdivide land at Wairau Road, Oakura, New Plymouth - point 38).

27. It is clear there is nothing in Lot 29's rural landscape that defines it as anything other than rural. It is an open production-based rural setting, not even a mixed use rural environment. Accordingly, we question the wisdom of permitting any residential development on Lot 29. Such residential development will completely dominate this highly visual rural landscape and it is inconceivable that, as this new application suggests, *the predominant Oakura village character will transition in over time.'* and *'the community of Oakura will be able to absorb and adjust to it, just as it has done in past years.'* **(reference: Request for Private Plan Change & Variation to Consent Notice: Oakura Farm Park Ltd P51)**

28. It is important to recognise at this point that through KCB led processes the Oākura community has been actively and consistently reviewing urban development both prior to and since the Tobin 'Paddocks' decision, and the community sentiment about greenfield expansion has remained consistent over that time.

29. It has been clearly identified by the community that the FUD west area is the preferred area for future growth. It adjoins existing undeveloped residential land (with approved subdivision consent) and provides a natural extension of the village in close proximity to the beach, well away from threat effects on the Kaitake Range and the Egmont National Park.

30. The KCB is aware that the two FUD landowners (Oakura Farms Limited and Pinewoods Partnership) are in agreement over the key link road between Cunningham Lane and Russell Drive and have confirmed this with the NPDC in writing. Therefore there is no landowner related impediment to FUD West being developed in an integrated and timely manner. A copy of the correspondence has been forwarded to the KCB on this matter.
(reference: **Appendix Two point 30 - A 60 planning map**).
31. In this new application the applicant now reverses his position made during his 2010 resource consent application for the 'Paddocks' subdivision. His offer then was that the FUD triangle would be retained as part of the rural balance area (Lot 29) of his property, with protected farm status and rural zoning in perpetuity. At that time he stated: *'Retaining the farm dairy unit will continue to be economic and will sustain our family and future generations of farming families with a livelihood and career opportunities now and in the future.'*
(reference: **Appendix Two - Brief of Evidence of Michael McKie in the matter of the resource consent application to subdivide land at Wairau Road, Oakura, New Plymouth - point 11**).
32. He emphasised his point by adding: *'The soil quality is a New Plymouth black/brown free-draining volcanic loam, which is excellent for pasture growth and is balanced with an excellent climate and north facing aspect. The soil on most of our Oakura farm is Class 3 which is suitable for pastoral grazing. For those reasons, and from my experience, the best productive use of the land is for dairy. reference: Brief of Evidence of Michael McKie in the matter of the resource consent application to subdivide land at Wairau Road, Oakura, New Plymouth - point 12*).
33. He went further by stating: *'The area of farm we want to retain as part of this subdivision will remain a highly productive farming unit, which needs protecting from further subdivision in our view.'*
The statements made were accepted in good faith by the community, and provided a rational starting point for the KCB in its succeeding work on urban growth and infrastructural issues.
(reference: **Appendix Two - Brief of Evidence of Michael McKie in the matter of the resource consent application to subdivide land at Wairau Road, Oakura, New Plymouth - point 13**).
34. He also drew attention to the following points:
- *'Living on a main highway SH45 is not ideal due to traffic noise and volume;*
 - *Potential higher crime rates because of exposure to SH45. For example, three of our five farms all have farmhouses which are located off main highways and we have never had any issues; however, two of our farms have farmhouses on the main highway and are regularly broken into (as Police records verify);*
 - *Concern for safety of pedestrians, especially for walking/biking commuters to school and the village amenities along SH45;*

- *NZ Transport Agency has advised us that they will not support a new road access to this area from SH45; (we also note in this regard that under our fallback position of implementing the 4ha subdivision option, NPDC has already also disallowed any road access points off the main highway; the Council has confirmed under that Subdivision Consent by consent condition that all current vehicle access points from the property are to be closed onto SH45 (including the access currently used by milk tankers));*
- *Residential housing along the main highway into Oakura (which will spread roughly to the lake we have built, shown in the photographs in Annexure 2) will in my view destroy the character of the village; at present only a handful of residential houses exist on the main highway in the main town area;*
- *Ribbon development along a main highway is considered undesirable for safety and aesthetic reasons;*
- *If the identified Structure Plan triangle area is developed, views up to the Kaitake Ranges will be obstructed by buildings. Ironically, protection of views up to the Kaitake Ranges Outstanding Landscape is a key aim of the Structure Plan. The farmland has been landscaped aesthetically to maximize the beauty of the outstanding views up to the Kaitake Ranges. All rural fences curve to the contour of the land, no pipe gates have been used, pine and macrocarpa trees have been removed. The farm buildings are in the process of being painted Karaka green and black thus creating a visual appearance of blending into the landscape. In my view all of this work is not compatible with developing the triangle area;*
- *We have had no inquiries from the public wishing to purchase in this area;*
- *NPDC has recognised a ponding issue in this triangle area.*

(reference: Appendix Two - Brief of Evidence of Michael McKie in the matter of the resource consent application to subdivide land at Wairau Road, Oakura, New Plymouth - point 38/bullet points 1-9)

35. *During the Hearing's verbal submissions the applicant also stated: 'We now wish to address the disadvantage of changing the rural zone to residential in Lot 29. The fragmentation and urbanisation of this productive, versatile land should not be compromised. It is an important resource which underpins the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district. This parcel is a highly productive farming unit, which needs protecting from further subdivision. The location protects the open landscape, giving rural appearances that should be preserved and maintained forever. The dairy farm can continue to operate, and the economic benefits of that cannot be overlooked. The importance of retaining this rural land for future farming operations to support the local, regional and national economy cannot be underestimated.'*
36. The major point in his 'Paddocks' application was that Lot 29 (66.5ha) would remain as a dairy farm, not just be left-over land from the subdivision. He argued that the 'Paddocks' subdivision was specifically created, as part of a comprehensive

development package to maintain both productive uses of land as well as maintaining rural character. Furthermore, this approach would maintain extensive views from SH45 up to the Kaitake Range. Lot 29 would be protected from further subdivision, thereby ensuring rural character and landscape values were maintained.

37. The KCB believes the applicant's testimony had a significant bearing on the final determination of Commissioner Helen Tobin at the 'Paddocks' hearing. This application now contends that the land in question is better suited to residential development than to be used in a productive rural manner.
38. The amount of productive rural land conversion has become a nation-wide concern over the past decade. This specific block occupies an area within some of the very best North Taranaki pastoral lands. The applicant also emphasises the economic benefits of dairy farming (points 29/30). However there is no doubt that a wide range of other highly productive value-added activities could operate successfully in this sloping, north-facing landscape sheltered from the cold winds from the south.
39. The KCB supports that point of view. In fact 'Food Futures' is one of the four key strategies of 'Tapuae Roa Make Way for Taranaki'. In this context the Taranaki-wide action plan seeks to extend the region's capability to add value to its existing commodity food production. This is a high level, long-term, economic development strategy led by the region's territorial authorities to transition Taranaki's traditional pastoral productivity industries into a wider range of value-added products.
(reference: Appendix Two point 39 'Tapuae Roa Make Way for Taranaki - 2017' p25-33)
40. The KCB believes the about turn in this new application demonstrates that the untested outcome assumptions and assurances given within this new private plan change application must be treated with particular caution. Important conclusions from his experts at the 2010 'Paddocks' hearing are now at variance with information in the current application.
41. This is of considerable concern on a number of levels. It calls into question the weight given by Commissioner Tobin to that expert evidence in reaching her 2010 decision. It has put at risk the professional reputations within the community of those people in terms of providing open, full, and very relevant advice that they are absolutely required to do. A crucial part of the evidence at that hearing stated that the approach taken would safeguard the rural character, as well as the rural approach to, and identity of, Oākura village. However, this subsequent application indicates the proposed significant shift in landscape character is immaterial.
42. It is widely accepted in the community that there is no credence in this application because the applicant isn't adhering to his obligations that were decided, and which

he personally offered and agreed to, in the 'Paddocks' hearing. At that hearing, Mr McKie spoke at length about his integrity.

(reference: - Appendix Two point 42 p4 Kaitake Community Board's written and verbal submission to the Tobin Hearing Commission December 2010)

43. The overriding community view is that there is no integrity in this application. We believe the applicant has materially failed to comply with the terms of the Tobin final determination and the application can hardly be construed as an investment in the community. Many of the issues around character, aesthetics, village culture etc. are the same now as they were in 2010. They haven't changed to the extent that would render those promises made at that time irrelevant in today's context.

Village Amenity Value

44. A cornerstone message in the *Oākura Community Engagement Report 2014/16*, '*Oākura - A Growing Community*' was for Oākura to maintain its village identity and character. Many residents stated this during the KCB's extensive consultation processes.

45. This was a NPDC supported project. It followed a well constructed process with the core purpose to connect with local residents to establish what was important to them. Was the Oākura Structure Plan 2006 still relevant? What was the community's vision for the future? What issues and opportunities did they want to be explored and challenged through this project?

This work was underpinned by an adaptive planning philosophy with a focus on equitable, inclusive and participatory processes to collect information about the community. It involved numerous meetings, considerable research by a constituted focus group in close liaison with the NPDC planning team.

It was well received and provided many opportunities for reflection and conversations by all those involved. It was developed as a high level document to provide the best possible and most authentic information to NPDC planners and decision-makers. This is stated in the preamble to the final report. *'The overriding theme of the project has been to determine the community issues rather than to provide solutions for them, as many are complex and challenging.'*

(see Appendix Two - Oākura Community Engagement Plan 2014, Oākura Focus Group Terms of Reference - points 15/45, and Oākura Community Engagement Project Report 2014/16)

46. The adaptive planning approach was considered essential. The world around us is relentlessly changing faster than society has ever experienced in the past. The huge changes in families, communities, workplaces and environments require better and more flexible planning foresight than ever before. Locking our community for up to 40 years into what is proposed by a 'structure plan' with something called a '*design-led*' approach will not provide that flexibility.

47. The KCB does realise that a structure plan is an important method for establishing the pattern of land use and the transport and services network within a defined area. Obviously it should provide a detailed examination of the opportunities and constraints relating to the land, including its suitability for various activities and infrastructure provision. However, as a cornerstone, surely such a plan should identify, investigate and address the potential effects of urbanisation and development on natural and physical resources not only in the planned residential development area but also in neighbouring areas. In this instance the KCB believes a valid structure plan would address Mana Whenua, natural resources, the coastal environment, historic heritage and special character. We don't recognise that detail in this proposal.
48. The Oākura - A Growing Community Project's consultation process attracted written submissions from over 100 individuals and groups. The report was intentionally aligned to the New Plymouth District Blueprint strategy, as was the subsequent KCB Community Plan that includes further sections on the Okato and Omata communities. The report took cognisance of Commissioner Tobin's 'Paddocks' determinations and all NPDC's relevant reviews, strategies and policies. **(reference: - Appendix Two point 45 Oākura A growing community Discussion Document, and Summary of Feedback)**
49. In the section 4.3.8.8 'A Growing Community' of the Request for Private Plan Change & Variation to Consent Notice: Oakura Farm Park Ltd' the application sets out to interpret this report differently. It states:
'The preamble to the report states, Part of that purpose of this consultation was to test whether it was appropriate to grow the village to the size and at the rate shown in the FUD Planning Overlay. The very strong community feedback was that the village is not ready to grow to that size in the short or medium term, or in the foreseeable future. It demonstrated the need for staged, smart and targeted growth that takes into consideration the limitations on growth including:
- 1. changes to the special character of Oakura that would arise as a result of such rapid and widely spread expansion;*
 - 2. the size and location of the school and the current school roll;*
 - 3. traffic and parking issues on State Highway 45, the CBD and foreshore areas.'*
50. It also states: *'Nowhere in the District Plan is the rate of development for FUD area specified.'* And *'Given the comprehensive urban design approach of the Wairau Estate the proposal could be considered to be 'smart growth'*
(reference: Request for Private Plan Change & Variation to Consent Notice: Oakura Farm Park Ltd P50).
51. The application's definition of smart growth is not aligned with the community's definition. It states that there is the significant benefit in using Lot 29 for urban

development, as it abuts an existing residential area and therefore offers a logical and coherent extension to the Oakura village. This, like other statements in the application, is written as a confirmed truth, when clearly it can be considered not to be.

52. The application states: *'The comprehensive approach adopted within this request, as demonstrated at the outset in the Vision and Structure document, is consistent with the objectives of this key direction, and in particular, the strengthening of and connection with the existing Oakura township, notwithstanding the outward expansion proposed. Local consultation identified the township being located either side of SH45; the proposed roundabout at the SH45/Wairau Rd intersection is a key element in this proposal to help ensure the village remains readily 'connected' as it inevitably expands.'*

(reference: Request for Private Plan Change & Variation to Consent Notice: Oakura Farm Park Ltd 4.3.8.7).

53. The KCB, as the report's author, directly challenges this assumption. This proposed development is an intensive large tract urban suburb of some 400 lots adjacent to the existing Oākura village. There is no coherent evidence that the proposal will enhance Oākura's social, community and physical infrastructure. It has no merit in adding intrinsic value to the community, and is not the logical location for further planned development, predominantly in an area never identified for future urban growth.

54. Much in-depth work has been done by the community on the future they seek for Oākura through involvement in the Coastal Strategy 2006, the Oākura Structure Plan 2006, reference to the Mana Whenua Mana Moana Position Paper 2006, further involvement through the Oākura Village Recreation and Community Facility Study 2011, the Oākura Community Engagement Project Report 2014/16 and the subsequent Kaitake Community Plan: A Thirty Year Vision 2017.

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 hasn't 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. **(Documents referenced above - see Appendix Two)**

55. During the 'Paddocks' hearing the applicant stated that, *'We also note that we were not consulted about the Oakura Structure Plan.'*

Why he believed he should have been is far from clear, as he was neither a resident or landowner in the Oākura community during the 2004/06 period when that extensive community consultation was being carried out.

(reference: Brief of Evidence of Michael McKie in the matter of the resource consent application to subdivide land at Wairau Road, Oakura, New Plymouth Point 40).

56. However, taking into account the above point, the KCB draws attention to the fact that he was well aware of the Oākura Community Engagement Project 2014/16 but did not choose to participate. In fact the KCB and a NPDC senior planner arranged and held a meeting with the applicant (as a major Oākura landowner) to provide him with a draft report and seek feedback. None was forthcoming, and we note that this meeting is not listed in the application.
57. There was never any local consultation held whatsoever regarding the addition of the FUD area south of SH45 (as the application states again in point 52 above, see also points 17 and 18).
58. The proposed development will not support local facilities and services such as early childhood centres, the school, and shops. The resulting population increase is not a sustainable growth solution for Oākura and is not part of the NPDC's long term spatial strategy for the district. The KCB contends the development is not fit for purpose and will add further unnecessary impacts in the Oākura rural and coastal environment, with financial and resourcing implications that will have to be addressed in the future.
59. It is quite clear residents want to have a sustainable community. However the KCB believes that this development will only expedite an inexorable, unwanted suburbanisation of our rural landscape and amenity values. Allowing the proposed plan change and resulting development to go ahead based on the premise that such suburbanisation is 'inevitable' will result in more than minor adverse effects through loss of village character, identity and amenity values.

Staged Development

60. We are particularly concerned that the application contains plans to intensify development in the FUD triangle by reducing lot size to 300sq/m to increase the maximum building coverage allowance from the current Residential C rule. The FUD zoning rule in the NPDC District Plan anticipates that any such reduction by any future development would by its very nature destroy the rural outlook. The KCB opposes this proposed lot size reduction.
The advanced reasons do not correlate with the in-depth work carried out by the KCB in this regard.

61. The KCB does support some reduction in Oākura village lot sizes. In fact, carrying on from the previous work done during the Oākura Community Engagement Project 2014/16, the OFG has been working throughout this year with NPDC planners on that very issue. The NPDC and KCB have arrived at a common view for possible inclusion in the new draft District Plan to go out for formal consultation with the community.
62. We understand there is a trend towards smaller section size in the draft District Plan and for the most part accept there should be some reduction in Oākura. The location of where lot sizes could be reduced and where a Medium Density Residential Zone could be implemented has been discussed at length by the OFG.
63. The outcome of those discussions, and in agreement with the NPDC planners, was that the area surrounding the Oākura shops on South Road has been identified as the appropriate area to be considered for a Medium Density Residential Zone. This area is within walking distance to the local centre and on a bus route that connects to the rest of Oākura and links back to New Plymouth CBD. The extent of the area includes those houses in close proximity to the shops and within the grid pattern oriented with the SH45. This is within an area of generally flat landform with limited views into and out of the area. This area has already undergone subdivision and infill housing. Therefore intensification is an accepted and ongoing part of the character of the area. It is the ideal location for more elderly people to live, with all local services within easy and short walking distances.
(see Appendix One - point 63 image).
64. The OFG also supported a changed General Residential Zone within the balance of current village residential boundary of 600 sq/m. with a discretionary rule of 500 sq/ m. The discretionary rule would be assisted by an Oākura/Kaitake design guide. The majority of the larger village sections (1000sq/m +) that this could apply to tend to be back from the beach and backing on to reserve areas and streams meaning there are not unmanageable adverse effects on village amenity values.
(see Appendix One - point 64 image)
65. The NPDC analysis identified that there are currently 114 sections at 1200 sq/m that could be cut to 600sq/m for infill or new dwellings replacing existing older homes right now. The properties were identified using the draft district plan residential area, excluding the possible medium density area (see point 60 above). Cross lease properties were also removed for the analysis. The analysis was based solely on property size and recognised some properties may not be able to subdivide due to topology, easements (such as right-of-ways), land covenants or location of existing buildings on site etc.

Even so there are sections 2000 sq/m or larger – in which case they could possibly subdivide into more than 2 sections. With added discretionary rule of 500 sq/m there are undoubtedly many more that have the potential to subdivide. The important point here is that the analysis did not include existing undeveloped residential land or the FUD areas.

A general and conservative estimate under this solution is there would be approximately 300 new building lots available. Taking those figures into account the KCB doubts local demand would saturate this supply before the next District Plan review.

66. Mr Comber goes to considerable length to highlight the proposed development of the Green School as a driver for urban expansion in Oākura. At this point the proposed development is mostly known about through a sophisticated publicity campaign. A resource consent has been issued for building construction to accommodate students. There is no quantitative information about who or how many students and families may eventually choose to participate. In this regard his statements are general assumptions based on no hard evidence.
(reference: Applicant's evidence - 17 June 2019, Planning Colin Comber points 63/65)
67. Mr Comber also goes to great length in alluding to further residential demand in Oākura due to the possible development of the Kaitake Trail. This is a joint project being explored between the TRC and the NPDC. The KCB disagrees with his statements. The KCB instigated the original proposal for the establishment of this destination trail and has been closely involved in the project ever since. At this point there are many parts of that particular puzzle still to be solved and a large number of fundamental decisions still to be made. His statements are in the most part suppositions only.
(reference: Applicant's evidence - 17 June 2019, Planning Colin Comber points 66/71)
68. He goes even further in point 75 emphasising: *'As the Green School and the Oakura to Pukeiti Shared Pathway become reality and move from start-up through to maturity over the ensuing 10-year planning period, and coupled with the other growth factors identified, I consider Oakura has significant urban growth pressures coming its way.'*
(reference: Applicant's evidence - 17 June 2019, Planning Colin Comber point 75)
69. The KCB considers both the Kaitake Trail, and the Green School are immaterial to this application. Consideration of future residential development in Oākura has not been part of the processes they have undertaken. To suggest either development when (or if) they come to fruition will have a significant impact on residential growth in Oākura is just speculation.

70. The KCB views its community-led solution as appropriate 'smart development'. With the addition of the Holdom greenfields land already zoned residential it is the best way forward for future village growth. This planned approach, investigated and discussed at considerable length by the OFG and NPDC is at significant variance with the contention in the application that it is clear that there is a need for even more greenfield residential expansion in Oākura.
- (reference: Statement of Evidence of Michael McKie on behalf of Oakura Farm Park Limited for this Private Plan Change Hearing p15)**
71. The New Plymouth District Plan states:
'The Framework for Growth (March 2008), the Oakura Structure Plan and the Urenui Structure Plan all identify Future Urban Growth Areas. It is considered important to ensure that any new activities do not adversely affect the environmental and amenity values, or reduce the ability to develop land in a comprehensive and integrated manner, prior to confirmation of the rezoning through a plan change process. Therefore, new activities should only be located within the Future Urban Growth Areas where their effects are compatible with the proposed future character of the Future Urban Growth Area.'
72. In line with this statement we believe that the principal residential growth of Oākura is maintained on the seaward side of the SH45. That judgement, first put into effect in the Oakura Structure Plan in August 2006, has been through a number of Council reviews (2008, 2010, and 2014) and has always been sustained. Also, the NPDC's 'Land Supply Review 2007/2027 - Framework for Growth', conducted over two years where Oākura's future needs were 'considered separately through the Coastal Strategy's 'Oakura Structure Plan' reinforces that position.
73. These above comments are consistent with the NPDC's Plan Change 15, 2013 that added a Future Urban Development Overlay, including associated rules, to provide a level of control to land use activities and subdivision within, and land use activities adjacent to, the future urban growth areas identified by the NPDC Framework for Growth (2007) and Oākura Structure Plan (2006). Therefore we believe the Oākura Structure Plan has significant relevance in this instance.
74. Although outside the scope of this hearing the KCB now believes the best long-term sustainable solution would be for the FUD designation to be removed in its entirety from Lot 29. We further suggest that for all FUD lands around the Oākura community, these should be developed with rules to maintain the rural character at the edges of the settlement. This suggestion follows on from Mary Buckland in her work for the NPDC 2010 Rural Review. She stated, *'It is really important that any expansion of Oakura is contained within the line entitled Area of Focus of the Structure Plan. Further development along the coastal area either to the west or east should be discretionary with conditions related to location, visibility, and*

retention of the natural character. It is important to have strong “edges” to both the lifestyle areas, and coastal settlements, particularly in high-value landscapes and coastal areas.’

75. The urban edge of Oākura is defined by Oākura River in the east, the beachfront in the north, the golf course in the north-west, but there is no clear demarcation to the south-west.

KCB’s opinion is that the unnamed tributary of the Wairau Stream on the west side of the Paddocks and other Upper Wairau Road properties, provides that natural landscape buffer to the visual and rural character to the south-west. The same applies to the Holdom land, with the Oakura Golf Course and State Highway 45 (SH45) buffering future residential development within that FUD area.

(see Appendix One - point 75 image)

76. The community has never envisaged that there would be further residential development on Lot 29. The NPDC also states this position in the draft District Plan of the proposed urban growth area for Oākura, except (perhaps) at some much later time in the FUD area. It shows the south FUD not being required for development until (perhaps) in the next 10 - 30 year period.**(see Appendix One - point 11/76 image).**

77. We re-state that Commissioner Tobin’s ‘Paddocks’ determination and NPDC’s own reviews and rules have provided the starting points and the fundamental principles for the KCB to follow in all its subsequent community undertakings.

78. There is much made in the application of the process of staged development. The KCB understands that the District Plan does not include a mechanism to manage that process. We believe that the forecast supply of housing clearly outstrips forecasted demand.

79. The application states: *‘the rate of development at Oakura has been, and will be, determined by market forces, that is, at the rate at which serviced lots available to the market are purchased for housing.’*

(reference: Request for Private Plan Change & Variation to Consent Notice: Oakura Farm Park Ltd P50).

Yet this is followed by the statement: *‘It is envisaged that the development of Wairau Estate will be both staged and sequential and will occur at such a rate (e.g. 10-15 sections per year) that the community of Oakura will be able to absorb and adjust to it, just as it has done in past years.’*

The KCB believes these two statements contradict each other.

(reference: Request for Private Plan Change & Variation to Consent Notice: Oakura Farm Park Ltd P51)

80. These types of claims are made a number of times in the application, but the KCB interprets them as a calculated attempt to soften the actual reality of statements. Throughout the document the use of hyperbolic phrases such as *'anticipated...at best...no more than...gradual increase.'* are used. As already stated, this development will completely dominate the local environment and the predominant Oākura village character will be lost.
81. The application also declares that: *'the existing facilities will be able to service and grow in line with the gradual increase in population.'*
(reference: Request for Private Plan Change & Variation to Consent Notice: Oakura Farm Park Ltd P59)
82. The KCB views this assertion as astonishing. The infrastructural capacity of the community is already stretched to the absolute limit in many areas, and the 2018/28 Council Long Term Plan has no inclusions to address these issues. There is scant information in the application to address how the proposed development will affect the carrying capacity of the community's infrastructure and the processes adopted to mitigate the adverse effects. Obviously, the need for further infrastructural development and funding would be required if this application is successful; yet there is a lack of clarity of what would be needed, by when, and how it should be funded.
83. It is critical to manage the impacts of activities locating in the Oākura Village environment. The KCB, the OFG and successive NPDC planners understand this. Precisely to address the infrastructural needs of the village as far back as the 2012/22 Long Term Plan process, the KCB submitted on getting urban planning underway. We also requested Council to initiate an Oākura traffic study to identify future highway, road and street network issues, and formalise a Roding Structure Plan. The Council recommendation at that time was that progress on the implementation of these projects would occur during the 2013/14 year.
84. To further emphasise the need for action, the KCB re-submitted to the 2013/14 Annual Plan deliberations. Council's recommended outcome was: *'That having considered the submission from the Kaitake Community Board relating to the District Plan and Oakura Coastal and Urban Planning and all matters raised in the report, that the Council:*
a) Continue to implement the actions set out in the Coastal Strategy 2006 and Oakura Structure Plan 2006, and
b) Carry out a review of progress toward the implementation of the Oakura Structure Plan 2006 during 2013/14 and report the findings to Council by 30 June 2014.'
(reference: Appendix Two - point 84/85 Draft Annual Plan 2013/14 Submission)

85. In the background information to this recommendation NPDC officers stated:
With regard to the requested traffic study and urban expansion, it is anticipated that detailed investigations for the rezoning of land from Rural to Residential at Oakura will commence by late in 2013/14 immediately following on from the completion of rezoning work currently being carried out at Bell Block (Areas Q, R and N). The Oakura Structure Plan will inform the Oakura urban expansion investigations and a traffic study will be an integral part of that project. Commencement of this work during 2013/14 will address the concerns of the submitter (i.e. KCB) ‘...for cohesive planning for future growth starting in the medium term’.
(reference: Appendix Two - point 84/85 Draft Annual Plan 2013/14 Submission)

This work was never undertaken.

86. In an attempt to address this issue a further time the KCB submitted at length to the Council 2018/28 Long Term Plan.
The submission requested: *‘Development of an Oākura CBD local area blueprint that programmes township upgrades and enhancements that maintain amenity and rural character values.’*
(reference: Appendix Two - point 86/87 Kaitake Community Board - Submission to the New Plymouth District Council 2018/2028 Draft Long Term Plan).

87. The KCB provided background information to the submission stating:
‘This is part of the Kaitake Community Board Plan - a thirty year vision, with a proposed timeframe of 1 - 3 years in the Community/Citizens section and is based on growth assumptions for the community. Undertaking a projected view of increased commercial activity (both sides of highway and expansion to the south) plus likely increased residential development, make this a critical component of future Oākura. A local area blueprint is required with planned infrastructural solutions where every question can be addressed. The location of retail areas and professional services, elderly housing requirements, social hub development, an essential hall upgrade, pedestrian crossings, additional parking, public toilets, etc., require identification, careful consideration and future planning. This is far better practice than remedial action.’
(reference: Appendix Two - point 86/87 Kaitake Community Board - Submission to the New Plymouth District Council 2018/2028 Draft Long Term Plan).

88. There was a lot of history preceding the submission and the KCB stated:
‘Fourteen years ago Council resolved to begin this work, as noted in the minutes of the KCB meeting on 22 November 2004.’ The relevant section reports:
‘The Council recently approved the 2004-2012 LTCCP under which provision was made for the completion of Oakura CBD improvements and facilities, improvements

in parking and reducing traffic speed in the 2005/06 financial year. In preparation for construction, the Special Projects Team is proposing to prepare a design brief and commission consultants to carry out the design and documentation work this financial year. As part of this process, it is considered appropriate to develop a mechanism for enabling representative community input into the project.

Resolved: That having considered all matters raised in the report, it is recommended that the Chairperson be delegated authority to nominate a small committee representing a typical cross-section of community interests. This group would attend regular Project Control Meetings with Council officers, initially to contribute to the formulation of the brief, and subsequently to monitor the progress of the project.'

89. The KCB's submission continued:

'Six years ago during the 2012/22 Long Term Plan process, the KCB submitted again on getting this underway. At the same time, we asked Council to initiate an Oākura traffic study to identify future highway, road and street network issues, and formalise a Roding Structure Plan. The Council recommendation provided was that: "progress on the implementation of these projects would occur during the 2013/14 year."

However, neither of these requests for integrated growth planning processes were seen necessary enough to progress during the 10-year life of the Long Term Plan.

90. Consequently, the KCB initiated a strategic planning initiative with NPDC support to re-investigate what was important to the Oākura community. That three-year project culminated in the Oākura Community Engagement Project Report - 2014/16. The worth of this report is well documented and has been used by Council in a range of settings that demonstrates the usefulness of such community-led work.

(reference: Appendix Two point 90 - Appendix Two Coastal Strategy, Oākura and Urenui Structure Plans Implementation update and outcome).

91. The KCB 2018/28 Long Term Plan submission concluded: *That report was then embedded in our subsequent Community Plan where we set out to ensure it provided the raw material, all the priorities and all the objectives to be turned into comprehensive District Plan rules, internal plans, programmes and services by staff. It is a community-led strategy looking out over an extended time horizon of thirty years. Its real worth is in the subsequent actions Council takes to progress elements embedded in it, yet any execution of it through the draft 2018/28 Long Term Plan is difficult to find.*

Bear in mind the NPDC Blueprint key directions of Community/Citizens that states: "New Plymouth District is made up of many communities and neighbourhood centres. Strengthening and connecting local communities ensures that they become successful, safe and liveable environments for residents. The Council's role is to support community, business and industry initiatives by providing high-quality public

infrastructure and a pragmatic regulatory response that helps our community achieve their goals.'

(reference: Appendix Two point 91 - New Plymouth District Blueprint, Key Directions - Community/Citizens).

92. This KCB submission gained no NPDC support for inclusion in the 2018/28 Long Term Plan. The NPDC did not see a need to allow for any infrastructure to be strategically planned and budgeted for within the LTP process. The NPDC response being: *'The Development of a CBD/township plan that programmes township upgrades and enhancements that maintain amenity and rural character is identified as a priority aspiration in years 1-3 of the Kaitake Community Board Plan. The current focus for council is to work with the community board to provide for a public toilet and some additional on-street parking. The Council is also undertaking a District Plan Review considering the appropriate land-uses and retention of the village character. Following progress with the review Council staff will work with the Community Board to determine the timing and scope of a CBD township plan.'*

It interesting to note that the KCB consistently asked the NPDC to provide a CBD public toilet since 2004 and, in reality, NPDC did not provide any extra parking, rather it provided for a hard surface to an unsightly and muddy grass parking area.

93. The applicant's planning consultant, Colin Michael Comber states: *"This planning approach has resulted in a comprehensive and integrated urban design which addresses transportation connections and accessibility, provision for active modes (walking, cycling and equestrian), provision of infrastructure, the natural environment and rural lifestyle."*

He goes on to say: *"This planning approach has resulted in a comprehensive and integrated urban design which addresses transportation connections and accessibility, provision for active modes (walking, cycling and equestrian), provision of infrastructure, the natural environment and rural lifestyle."* The KCB totally disagrees with these statements as per the many points set out in this submission. **(reference: Applicant's evidence - 17 June 2019, Planning Colin Comber point 20 and 21)**

94. He also asserts: *"There are a number of examples within the District and indeed, Oakura itself, where sub-optimal urban development has occurred through successive 'nibbling' (by subdivision), particularly where land is in smaller greenfield lots and in multiple ownership. This has resulted in residential areas that fall short of the primary aim of Objective 23. This is particularly in evidence from the numerous cul de sacs through the Oakura urban area."*

(reference: Applicant's evidence - 17 June 2019, Planning Colin Comber point 35)

The KCB disagrees with this statement. We point out that the proposed subdivision itself is one very large cul-de-sac. In our opinion it is worse suboptimal urban

development than the community's preference for future urban expansion as set out in this submission.

The Kaitake Range

95. The Kaitake Range is part of the Egmont National Park. Its lowland coastal forest is not atypical of that found in the rest of the park. The trees here are not found in the higher areas of the Pouakai Range and the mountain itself. There are nikau, titoki, kohekohe, puriri, pukeatea and karaka trees as well as a range of indigenous smaller species.
96. The Kaitake Range is a place of special significance and ensuring the protection of it is of paramount importance. The NPDC has defined the Kaitake Range as an outstanding landscape confirming: *'that development on the lowest slopes of the Range, within the ringplain should not climb any further up the slopes of the ranges.'* And stating: *'Of relevance to the rural review the assessment found that the main areas of concern are those areas where visibility combines with highly valued landscape. This means it is development on the rising slopes around Mt Taranaki and the ranges and in pockets along the coast which are of main concern to landscape character.'*
(reference: New Plymouth District Landscape Character Review 2006 and Subdivision and Land Use in the Rural Area 2009 p22/23)
97. However the applicant's consultant advances the proposition that the landscape views through the effect of the overall landscape change on the land immediately adjacent to it are appropriate and justifiable, given the development is not significant in scale and location, only limited to the site itself.
98. The KCB disagrees with that proposition. If anything, ten years on from the NPDC Character Landscape Review, the outstanding landscape amenity value of the Kaitake Range and the ring plain around it requires even more protection. Sensitive management of the surrounding landscape can help protect and enhance many of the Egmont National Park's values. The impact of this proposed development cannot be regarded as a sympathetic approach to landscape character.
99. Of even greater importance, the Kaitake Range is a site of great significance to Taranaki Iwi, acknowledged and revered as a tupuna of its younger ancestor Mounga Taranaki. This is one example of the importance of the mouri of Papatūānuku to Taranaki Iwi.
100. We understand and support the autonomous, independent and self-governing role of marae/pā and hapū within Te Ao Māori. However, we cannot find the detail in the application intended to provide a clear process on how the applicant has positively

engaged with tangata whenua, to shape the environment to highlight Māori culture and identity of this traditional rohe in an enduring manner.

101. Iwi and hāpu whanonga pono are always considered carefully by the KCB. We are deeply concerned that scant regard has been given in the application to the very necessary core Māori values of Taranaki Iwi and the exercise of kaitiakitanga by the tangata whenua of the area in accordance with tikanga Māori in relation to natural and physical resources, and their stewardship.
102. Under the Resource Management Act (RMA) local authorities must take into account iwi planning documents (**reference: Resource Management Act 1991, section 74**). In fact, a key objective of the RMA principles is to enhance the protection, reinstatement, development and articulation of our cultural landscapes, enabling all of us to connect to, and deepen our 'sense of place'.
103. The Taranaki Iwi Environmental Plan, 'Taiao, Taiora' prepared by Te Kāhui o Taranaki' with tangata whenua of Taranaki Iwi has statutory weight and decision-makers need to take into account the policies contained within it. (**reference: Appendix Two point 103 Taiao Taiora - Environmental Management Plan for Taranaki Iwi rohe**)
104. We stand alongside Taranaki Iwi in opposing any potential adverse effects on the environment through this application. Me Mahi Tahī Tātou - working together.

The Environment

105. The application's purpose is to turn this rural environment adjacent to the Egmont National Park (the Park) into a large residential housing subdivision. The KCB opposes any reduction in the protection or active management of important areas of indigenous biodiversity on Crown land.
106. *'There has been widespread loss of biodiversity across Aotearoa New Zealand, particularly in lowland and coastal environments. There is now less than 10 per cent remaining indigenous vegetation cover (which can be used as a proxy for indigenous biodiversity) throughout most of the country's lowland zone. In the worst cases, the depletion of indigenous ecosystems and the loss of biodiversity is so great that the only prospect for maintenance of indigenous biodiversity is to reconstruct indigenous habitat.'*
(**reference: Clarkson, B., Kirby C. and Wallace, K. (2018). Restoration targets for biodiversity depleted environments in New Zealand. The Environmental Research Institute, University of Waikato.**)
107. The Oākura community has a special relationship with its environment – evidenced by all of the activities the community has led and participated in over the years. Our

urban community is in very close proximity to the Park. Our beach is a significant recreation area for all ages and a major attractor for visitors. Both require ongoing and careful protection. The KCB takes environmental responsibility particularly seriously. The maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity is at the forefront of all our decision-making processes. The KCB Community Plan states: *'Encouraging ongoing community stewardship of the local environment and its biodiversity to restore and maintain natural habitats, ecosystems and viable populations of native species.'*

(reference:Appendix Two point 107 - Priorities/Environment P8).

108. The KCB works hard to raise the profile of biodiversity in our community by removing animal and plant pests that are key ecosystem threats and providing a safe environment for native species. We build public awareness on these issues through regular items posted on our Face Book pages and in the local paper (The Oakura Messenger).
109. The KCB is a member of the Taranaki Biodiversity Trust - Wild for Taranaki. Currently, we are partnering with the Taranaki Regional Council in its 'Taranaki Taku Tūranga - Towards a Predator-Free Taranaki' project. This is an \$11.7 million project to eradicate mustelids, rats and possums from the Kaitake Range and surrounding areas. As Oākura is the closest urban area to the Kaitake Range our ongoing mission is to provide and maintain an urban trapping scheme to prevent predator re-infestation into the Park. The KCB is also actively working with the Taranaki Mouna Project to return kāka, kiwi and other significant New Zealand native birds to the Kaitake Range.
110. There is a bland assertion in the application that its structure plan will be supportive of natural biodiversity, and bird life in particular. However, there are a number of untested assumptions in this application about mitigating any actual and potential effects on the environment that do not provide certainty to the community in this context. The application does not include ecological evidence addressing the impact of urban expansion on natural values, including the future environment on the Kaitake Range.
111. The application states:
'It is almost (sic) inevitable that nearby residential living will bring with it domestic and (in time) feral cats. It is now well established that cats kill native bird life and in significant numbers. Community awareness about this issue is growing. Methods to reduce or eliminate the loss of native bird life attributable to domestic and feral cats include community education, neutering of cats, keeping cats indoors as much as possible, non-replacement of cats or an outright ban.'

112. It also states: *'A contentious issue in which most communities have strong views for and against. While property owners in the adjoining 'Paddocks' are bound by a private covenant not to keep cats, it is considered that such an obligation would be difficult to enforce on the larger scale of development contemplated at Wairau Estate. Such a ban would also likely be of limited value (given the distances which household felines are known to wander) unless domestic cats were banned from a wider area e.g. Oakura urban area.'*
113. The application mentions cats using further abstruse language such as *'nearby residential living'* when the actual meaning is *'this planned development'*. It suggests cats in the more distant Oākura urban environment are as big an issue as those would be in the planned development. This is clearly misleading, as there is scant historical evidence of cats straying from Oākura onto the Kaitake Range.
114. The KCB deciphers the statements in the application as merely superficial endeavours to convince decision-makers, with no attempt to provide any solution to an especially serious issue. The Cornelis Bevers Ecological Assessment does recommend that domestic cats are prohibited from the proposed development, but the management of such a prohibition while appearing cogent in the application, will not be sustainable in the long term. Here is an example of just how far one domestic cat travels in a week in the rural environment.
(reference: Appendix One - point 114 Lucky the Cat).
115. We further note in the Applicant's Evidence - 17 June 2019, that Mr Bevers states in point 45, *"Domestic cats are already established in the area."* We view this as another statement that is not supported by evidence. The area in question in this application is the open farmland of Lot 29. While there may well be some cats domiciled on the properties on Wairau Road, separated from Lot 29 by the unnamed Wairau Stream tributary, where are these *'established'* cats? Are they on the *'Paddocks'* Subdivision where they are meant to be prohibited from? Are they roaming around Lot 29? Lot 29 and the *'Paddocks'* subdivision are the two areas bordering the Park and the areas in question here.
116. The application also states: *"In due time the Applicant is also happy to participate in a community-wide conversation about the place of domestic cats in the Oakura Township and environs."*
(reference: Applicant's evidence - 17 June 2019, Planning Colin Comber point 165)
The KCB views this as a further attempt to fudge this issue. The circumstances we are discussing are not about Oākura Village but about what is most likely to occur on this planned large tract subdivision. It is the applicant's responsibility to mitigate this serious issue on his proposed development, not try and pass it off as something occurring in the Oākura Village. There is no valid mitigation proposal being presented.

117. Regarding proximity to the Park, the proposed high-density housing lot boundary distances from the Park range from the nearest at 390 metres to the furthest at 1400 metres. The larger lifestyle lot boundaries range from 220 metres to 690 metres. We believe any urbanisation of the rural landscape adjacent to the Park will make the Park's natural areas vulnerable to further and wider threat processes. We contend that there will be a decline in biodiversity, not an increase as suggested in this application.
118. The claim therefore that there will be an increase in wildlife/biodiversity is not supported by prior experience or factual evidence. We actually don't have to think much further than rats, cats and weeds to arrive at that conclusion.
119. There is no clear evidence of how the impact of invasive plants spreading from residential lots and weed infestation would be avoided. Weedy plants are one of the greatest threats to New Zealand's parks, reserves, coasts, bush remnants, wetlands and alpine areas. Many of these are ornamental plants originally valued for their dramatic foliage, pretty flowers or colourful berries, but over time have 'jumped the fence' from gardens and gone wild. The impacts from such sources have the potential to cause serious damage to the Park's conservation values. (reference: <https://www.weedbusters.co.nz/weed-information/weed-list/>).
120. The application makes no mention of mitigation measures for other dangerous predators to native species such as rats. They are omnivorous, eating both plant and animal matter. They will feed on almost anything including grains, seeds, fruit, meat, insects and do huge damage to the biodiversity of native forest ecosystems.
121. High rat populations are unquestionably linked to residential living. Urban environmental elements provide food, water and harbourage to rodents, leading to greater infestation. It is well known that both *Rattus norvegicus* and *Rattus rattus* rats are liable to grow faster and become sexually mature more quickly in urban environments. The rat gestation period is approximately 3 weeks. In urban environments, rats can reproduce year round and have as many as 5 litters per year with 4 - 8 young per litter. (reference: **Predator Free NZ** - <https://predatorfreenz.org/secret-life-urban-rats-revealed/>).
122. This poses a very serious problem for the Park and particular regard must be given to the protection of the inherent significance of its ecosystems.
123. As a member of the Taranaki Biodiversity Trust the KCB is closely involved in the 'Taranaki Taku Turanga - Our Place, Towards a Predator-Free Taranaki' project through the Restore Kaitake plan of action. It involves removing possums, stoats

and rats from about 8,600 hectares, of private and conservation land including Oākura, the Kaitake Range and down to the coast.

124. In the pro forma letter received from the applicant's planning consultant, it states: *'OFPL is open to entering discussions with submitters and the relevant regulatory authorities to consider a 'whole of community' approach to the question of rodents, mustelids, cats and dogs in Oakura and environs.'*
(reference: Comber Consultancy letter dated 15 October 2018).
125. We point out that the KCB has already instituted a 'whole of community' approach in a wide range of environmental contexts over many years. A consistent effort is being made to nurture our indigenous biodiversity and halt its decline. We have organised and supported practical, on-the-ground projects to maintain and restore the biodiversity of our natural environment. This has enabled more community members of all ages to participate, to enjoy and learn about our biodiversity value and its benefits. We have encouraged and supported our community to actively work together, and empowered participants to make informed decisions and actions on real-life sustainability issues.
Some examples are:
- the KCB played a major part in the Department of Conservation (DoC) project to replant appropriate native species on the last piece of the Egmont National Park pastoral lease when it expired;
 - supported the development and maintenance of Oakura School's native plant nursery;
 - have led the way in Taranaki with the 'Restore Oakura' urban trapping project;
 - took a lead in the provision community dog and horse bylaw measures;
 - worked hard to set up an international Blue Flag status for the beach;
 - collaborated with Oakura School and DoC to build and locate Kororā (Little Blue Penguin) breeding boxes on the foreshore;
 - encouraged and supported the replanting of native species on the Oākura Pā site; and
 - made a huge impact on foreshore erosion through the soft armoring of beach foredunes through ongoing spinifex and pingao plantings.
- (Appendix One - see point 125 images a-h).**
126. All of these activities require volunteer support. That support has been attracted through genuine public engagement and a great deal of ongoing personal time and effort over many years. This collective community action has built numerous neighbourhood links and social capital benefits, helping to make Oākura Village what it is today. These enhancement, restoration, reconstruction and active management actions are wide-ranging. They have helped foster a connection between residents and nature and provide for the understanding and exercise of kaitiakitanga.

127. The planned large tract development is adjacent to a particularly high-risk environment that is undergoing an intensive pest control project that requires long term management. The KCB does not believe the solution to this issue can be addressed through the consultant's misguided attempt at piggybacking onto an already existing whole-of-community approach and advancing the expectation that local volunteers will be responsible for mitigation measures on his proposed subdivision now and in the future. Our community approach should not be advanced as the solution to the obvious biodiversity issues this development will create. The reinvasion of predators to the Park is a reality that cannot be addressed by a few glib assurances.

128. The removal of exotic animal and plant threats is crucial for preserving the ecological integrity of native ecosystems within the Park. A major goal of the Department of Conservation's Egmont National Park Management Plan is *'To manage the park from an ecological perspective to ensure that its indigenous biological diversity and health are sustained and improved.'*

(reference: Appendix Two point 118 - Egmont National Park 2.2 GOALS and [https:// www.doc.govt.nz/about-us/our-policies-and-plans/statutory-plans/statutory-plan-publications/national-park-management/egmont-national-park-management-plan/](https://www.doc.govt.nz/about-us/our-policies-and-plans/statutory-plans/statutory-plan-publications/national-park-management/egmont-national-park-management-plan/))

It is stated that: 'The Applicant undertakes pest and weed control on the OFPL site in conjunction with and regularly monitored by the Taranaki Regional Council.'

(reference: Applicant's evidence - 17 June 2019, Planning Colin Comber point 166)

The KCB suggests any that has been carried out is not of a standard that provides reassurance to the community or to the authorities responsible for the Egmont National Park environs.

We believe the context of this particular matter in the application is of national significance and has nation-wide ramifications. Land use changes, introduced predators and pests continue to threaten our most precious ecosystems, native plants and wildlife. The parameters of this issue cannot be defined by the applicant.

129. Our fundamental questions in this regard are:

What is the stance of Taranaki Iwi?

What are the opinions of the Department of Conservation, Ministry for the Environment, Federated Farmers, Landcare Research, and other associated national environmental stakeholders on this threat?

What are the opinions of the Taranaki Mounga Project and the Restore Kaitake stakeholders who have a huge financial stake in their current operations?

What bona fide measures can the applicant put in place to ensure there are no adverse effects on the local and wider environment and its biodiversity that meets community expectations?

What responsibility will the applicant take to ensure any required measures are sustainable now, and in the future?

We suggest that the ecological assessment undertaken to date for this application is deficient given the context of the proposal, and suggest further assessment, working with key parties is required to address the gaps in this information.

130. We note that in the *'Final Decision of Independent Commissioner Helen Tobin - March, 2011'* for the applicant's 'Paddocks' consent hearing that there was to be follow-up monitoring of wetland birds (especially the Spotless Crake) and similarly, the Goldstripe Gecko by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist, undertaken at the consent holder's expense after the proposed subdivision works and residential development had taken place and into the future. The results of this monitoring were to be forwarded annually to NPDC and TRC for a period of 5 years from the issue of the s223 certificate.

(reference: Conditions Section 14/Ecology Point 14.6 P116 and 14.7 P117)

131. After making numerous requests to NPDC from January 2019 onwards the KCB received the information about this requirement on 20 June. We note that the s223 Certificate for the conditions referred to (14.6 to 14.7) was issued on 20 February 2019, with the first Monitoring Report for Wetland Birds and Goldstripe Gecko due by 21 February 2020.

The KCB questions if it is normal practice for such critical ecological monitoring only to commence more than nine years after the conditions were imposed?

132. If this is normal practice, we question the relevance of these conditions and how they could possibly relate to conserving the biodiversity of the area? If this is not normal practice, surely there must be 'Paddocks' decision consequences relating to the lack of follow-up by all parties? We question what is the status of other required monitoring to have been carried out by NPDC and other authorities such as the QEII Trust, to check that conditions set out in the Tobin Report have been, and are being adhered to?

We have observed the considerable infestation of Woolly Nightshade on the QEII covenanted block within the Paddocks subdivision and find that particularly disturbing. Birds, especially native kererū, disperse those seeds. This invasive species forms dense stands, prevents the establishment of native seedlings, and slows the regeneration rate of native bush.

(see Appendix One - point 132 image).

It is interesting that Cornelis Bevers in his expert evidence for the 2010 'Paddocks' subdivision application submitted that, *'Kereru are strongly suspected of using the western forest remnant on-site for breeding, as they were seen doing display dives from there.'*

(reference: Appendix Two point 132/146 - Preliminary Ecological Values Assessment: Wairau Road subdivision, Oakura 5.3 Rarity/Special features).

We also note in the Cornelis Bevers' Summary of Evidence (point 12) it is stated *"There are no threatened species known to be present on site."*

Yet the Spotless Crake is classed as an 'at risk relict', and the Goldstripe Gecko, has very limited national distribution, but does have a toe in our biodiversity door here. The Oākura area provides a small enclave and has a significant role in the conservation of this gecko. Both these endangered species were present on-site leading up to the 'Paddocks' hearing and decision.

Drinking Water

133. The applicant's consultant 'Red Jacket Ltd' confirms there is adequate water supply available to accommodate the full scope of the proposed development. We note that position has now changed in the applicant's expert evidence. It is now being stated in this evidence by Mr Comber that, *'The Applicant's advisers have (now) concluded there is sufficient proven aquifer capacity to service, with on-demand water supply, 248 residential lots within the Structure Plan Area.'*
(reference: point 22 Statement of Evidence of Colin Michael Comber)
134. However, it is on record that Council has stated that; *'The extent of the Oākura aquifer and its recharge zone is unknown, making proactive protection difficult.'*
(reference: David Langford NPDC Infrastructure Manager).
135. There are risks associated with the aquifer, which is the source water for Oākura, that have not been researched. There is no understanding of how many bores, other than Council's, penetrate the Oākura aquifer; or how many septic tanks are currently in the catchment area.
136. The KCB believes those risks (and others) must first be understood, rather than just taking the water network supply and its health for granted (as was the case in original application). A high standard of data-based risk management solutions needs to be in place prior to any major development.
137. The existing knowledge base does not provide surety that supply maintenance and safety can, and will be maintained if this large tract housing development is approved. Failure to maintain the water supply network could not only occur during

event conditions but might occur slowly over time and not necessarily be detected in a timely manner.

138. The KCB believes that it would be negligent to approve this private plan change application prior to a comprehensive, scientific study of the Oākura aquifer and its associated, complex hydrology being carried out. We understand that NPDC is currently carrying out remedial measures to ensure an ongoing water supply for the 2019/20 summer. We also understand that central government now requires territorial authorities to enforce drinking water standards more stringently.

We do know that the Oākura Fire Service has real difficulties with lack of sufficient water pressure for fire fighting in areas of the village. We believe it's presumptuous to conjecture that the aquifer water would be made available for the water supply for residential growth only.

139. We note that Mr Comber states, *"The Applicant has noted the Council may be requiring additional land in the future on which to locate additional reservoir capacity. Mr McKie has identified additional land within OFPL adjoining the existing water treatment plant site that may serve the Council purposes and would be happy to discuss how this may be acquired. A plan showing the additional available land on offer is shown in Appendix M attached."*

(reference: Applicant's evidence - 17 June 2019, Planning Colin Comber point 152)

This is quite erroneous. The NPDC has no plans for a new reservoir on Lot 29.

(reference: Appendix Two - point 139 email from NPDC Three Waters Manager).

Stormwater and Wastewater

140. The Wairau Stream headwaters and tributaries are entirely confined within the property in question. It is this catchment system that will carry all stormwater from the proposed development. Regardless of any suggested mitigations, all stormwater flow paths ultimately lead into the Wairau Stream.
141. The response for stormwater management in the application is;
'Stormwater within lots will be disposed of by way of underground soakaway within lot boundaries. Stormwater from roads and the public spaces will be disposed of into the natural gully systems. Bunds will be constructed within these natural features to attenuate stormwater flow within the existing watercourses to ensure hydraulic neutrality is maintained. (i.e. stormwater flows post-development are no greater than those occurring before development). The control of stormwater run-off from the local roading network can be easily achieved in the gully system of the central tributary of the Wairau Stream with the formation of retention ponds; the proposed short retention time of the ponding water is unlikely to negatively affect the raupō and flax beds in the gullies.'

142. The KCB knows a plethora of impermeable surfaces is inevitable if this application is allowed. Impermeable surfaces generate stormwater run-off that can contribute to flooding, erosion and the release of contaminants into waterways. While the phrase 'easily achieved' may embellish this application there is little doubt stormwater run-off is causing downstream effects for the community since the 'Paddocks' subdivision was approved. Expert advice provided then made many reassuring comments about stormwater detention. Statements were presented such as:
- *'The proposed subdivision will not result in increases in peak stream flow downstream of the flood retention facility.'*
 - *'There will be negligible effect on flood flows in the main channel of the Wairau Stream including in the vicinity of Tasman Parade and the Old Boys Surf Club.'*
 - *'A number of submissions raise concerns regarding increased flows and erosion in the Wairau Stream.'*
 - *'I believe that the proposed stormwater infrastructure as outlined in the Infrastructure Report adequately obviates all such concerns.'*
- (reference: Statement of Evidence of Colin Lloyd Bell on behalf of Oakura Farm Park Ltd. in the matter of the resource consent application to subdivide land at Wairau Road, Oakura, New Plymouth)**
143. The catchment management conditions imposed in the *'Final Decision of Independent Commissioner Helen Tobin - March 2011'* appeared stringent enough at the time, offering on-site capture of 100% of all stormwater runoff, but clearly the downstream reality demonstrates that this is a particularly serious issue. This is of specific, and increasing concern for many property owners on the seaward side of SH45. No doubt the applicant will argue that the escalated issues are nothing to do with the 'Paddocks' subdivision. However as this image clearly shows the Paddocks subdivision isn't immune from flash flooding. **(see Appendix One - point 132 image).**
144. In spite of assurances that stormwater is, and will be, released in a manner aligned with natural flow regimes this isn't the community's experience. Stormwater run-off in the tributary and Wairau stream substantially increases during high rainfall events. The stream cannot handle the amount of water coming from upstream. This has caused soil erosion on both sides of the stream. The stream edge is the property boundary on the first five houses on Lower Wairau Road past the Wairau Road/SH45 intersection and four of the first five houses on the Tasman Parade end of Lower Wairau Road, and part of the sixth. There is no esplanade strip buffer. **(see Appendix One - point 144 images (a) - (e)).**
145. The NPDC Sewage Transfer Station on the Shearer Reserve land on the west side of the stream opposite these properties occupies the lowest point in Oakura, to allow the gravity-driven sewage network to work efficiently. If something goes

wrong, its capacity for emergency dry weather storage is 8 hours. In wet weather events this could be halved to as little as four hours.

146. The applicant's planning consultant states: *'There are no known reticulation capacity issues with wastewater.'*
(reference: Applicant's evidence - 17 June 2019, Planning Colin Comber point 57)
The KCB challenges this statement. NPDC does not have a sewerage containment standard and no stormwater modelling has been carried out. The only option in the event of an emergency is for overflow migration into the Wairau Stream, 200 metres from the mean high tide mark. There's also the question of risk to the major sewer that crosses the stream bed at the same location.
(see Appendix One - point 146/150 image)
147. Already NPDC, as a protection measure, has had to provide hard rock armouring on the stream edge adjacent to Sewage Transfer Station. Unfortunately this causes further issues. Erosion events are just transferred to the end of the rock wall provisions. There are seven 90 degree directional changes in the last 300 metres of the stream before it reaches the bridge. The KCB believes that artificially altering the natural flow regime in a climate of increasing high rainfall events and then having to initiate remedial actions will be the unfortunate and costly outcome.
(see Appendix One - point 147 Wairau Stream erosion video clips (a and b, and video locations image).
148. With the increased flow in the stream, sand is often stripped out from beneath the Wairau Stream bridge and stream mouth. This allows the tide to surge up into the stream. High rainfall events are often associated with stormy seas. If there is a high tidal back flow under such conditions the stream drainage system is then overwhelmed and exceeds capacity, putting more inundation pressure upstream of the bridge. **(see Appendix One - point 148 images a-g).**
149. There is a general consensus that a greater frequency of high-intensity rainfall events associated with the predominantly accepted climate change scenarios is unavoidable. There is a need to address the Oākura community's expectations regarding stormwater collection, management and disposal into the Wairau stream and its tributaries. Without a robust and workable management system aligned with natural flow regimes, overflow and its results are inevitable.
150. Our beachfront area will be placed at further erosion risk as well. The beach comprises of a thin veneer deposit of sand overlying an intertidal boulder platform eroded from volcanic deposits. Sand volumes on the beach are highly variable and erosion events can be exacerbated by high volumes of floodwater stripping away sand and its protection function, pushing the erosion line closer to house owners on the western end of Messenger Terrace, and the Tasman Parade road reserve. Bear

in mind there is a sewer line on the Messenger Terrace beachfront servicing 17 residences. (see Appendix One - point 146/150 image)

151. We question how the proposed stormwater management system design can effectively address the quality of runoff from the site, protect against increased streambank erosion, meet flood control objectives, and not affect the beachfront? The KCB believes the proposed system will not be fit for purpose. The community will not accept a 'develop and clean up later' process in this regard.

Safeguarding Water Biodiversity

152. The Wairau Stream headwaters and tributaries provide the sole watercourse for the stormwater run-off for the proposed subdivision. The KCB believes this will result in escalating water contamination through the increased use of pesticides, detergents and other dissolved toxins by the increased residential population. The applicant cannot just treat this stream as a drainage network for the removal of stormwater and other water waste from his proposed development.(see Appendix One - point 152 image)
153. High concentrations of zinc, copper, and polyaromatic hydrocarbons most usually derived from vehicle sources are commonly found in stormwater from urban areas. The KCB believes that the intensification in urban pollutants will degrade the unnamed Wairau Stream tributaries and Wairau Stream. However there is no mention of any stormwater pollutant mitigation measures in the application.
154. Neither are there specific plans and concepts provided for public scrutiny about the importance of this freshwater catchment downstream from the proposed development, regarding what native species (fish, bird species, insects with aquatic larval stages) are established and depend on it for feeding, dispersal, breeding, or over-wintering to complete important parts of their life history.
155. It can also be expected that the levels of suspended sediments will increase significantly. Suspended sediments can smother the bottom of the stream bed with fine particles. This will not only reduce water clarity and increase turbidity but will decrease the suitable habitats for aquatic invertebrates, fish and plants. Increased sediment deposits also reduce the stream's capacity to buffer flood events causing localised flooding. It is well known that drainage and reclamation, flood management schemes, earthworks, stormwater and other point discharges can have a negative impact on indigenous freshwater species and habitats.
156. There is currently no information provided on the reliability of previous mitigation to prevent sediment increase and protect native species habitats in the Wairau Stream and its tributaries. Are there banded kōkopu, giant kōkopu, common bully, inanga,

redfin bully and other species present in the stream? The KCB knows there are eels in the stream habitat, a local resident feeds them. Has any work been done to identify whether they are the New Zealand long fin species (*Anguilla dieffenbachi*)? DoC specifies their conservation vulnerability status as 'At Risk: Declining'.

157. The application references the storage of stormwater in retention ponds to ensure hydraulic neutrality. These are to be constructed through excavation in the shallow natural gully wetlands on Lot 29. There is no evidence presented that demonstrates what effect the construction of these proposed stormwater storage systems will have on the biodiversity that is currently present in these areas, or what the ongoing effects will be. Once ecosystems are disturbed to a great extent, and species are lost, the loss in diversity is difficult to restore. Yet, these are the very areas that the application suggests where biodiversity will be enhanced through the development.

It is interesting to note that Cornelis Bevers in his expert evidence for the 2010 'Paddocks' subdivision application submitted then that. *'The numerous small wetland areas within the tributaries of the Wairau Stream on-site are significant in terms of representativeness at both a district and regional level.'*

(reference: **Appendix Two point 122/146 - Preliminary Ecological Values Assessment: Wairau Road subdivision, Oakura 5.1 Representative**).

158. NPDC promotes Oākura Beach as one of the region's premier summer destinations.
159. The polluting process will become especially prevalent during low rainfall periods when the stream discharge rate is at its lowest velocity. Oākura Beach is a popular destination during summertime and in general terms, this is when the beach is at its busiest and stream discharge rates are lowest.
160. Small children and toddlers invariably play in the Wairau Stream lagoon, in fact, parents encourage them to do so rather than in the more boisterous sea. (see **Appendix One - point 160 image**).
161. The KCB believes there is a duty to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects on the environment caused by this proposal. Our expectation is that the application would include these issues.

Oākura School

162. The application states: *'The Ministry of Education is responsible for ensuring communities are provided with sufficient school capacity. Oakura will be no different.'* (reference: **Request for Private Plan Change & Variation to Consent Notice: Oakura Farm Park Ltd 4.3.88 p59**). We disagree with the contention that the consequences the proposal would have on the school is only a Ministry of Education concern. In this

regard, the KCB contends the application should demonstrate some social responsibility to the community.

163. The KCB has a clear understanding of national education property guidelines. (reference: <https://education.govt.nz/school/property/>). The guidelines point to continually adding classrooms to existing school sites rather than purchasing land and building new schools. The Ministry of Education rarely takes into account the amount of open space a school has in its property entitlement guide.
164. The extra classrooms needed to accommodate the additional student numbers at the school, generated by the proposed subdivision would seriously diminish the existing sports field space. The school field is used for tennis, netball, hockey, basketball, soccer, rugby and cricket, and for daily free play activity during intervals. Apart from Corbett Park, this is the only sports field in Oākura. Losing part of this field would have a significant effect on the entire Oākura Community.
165. We need more sports ground space now, and this proposed development will make matters much worse. The single available public sports field, Corbett Park, is in Māori ownership, leased to NPDC; and as a very low lying area has considerable drainage issues.
- The school grounds are an essential component in meeting the current sport and recreational needs of not only the community but also the children in the wider district. By wider district, we refer to teams from around Taranaki (Hawera, Stratford, Inglewood, Waitara and New Plymouth) playing on the school fields in the winter sports season. The grounds are also an important hub in the regular sporting exchanges between school teams in inter-school competitions. Reducing the school's open space capacity will severely restrict local community involvement in such activities.
- It will also compromise the physical education and free play activities of students during the school day. Both are essential developmental attributes, contributing in a very major way to their cognitive, physical, social, and emotional well-being.
166. Our open spaces and recreation facilities, developed over the years through many hours of voluntary effort by local community groups hold a special place in the heart of residents. They contribute positive benefits to the community's social, physical and mental well-being. We need to protect and preserve our recreation areas, not diminish them.
167. There is an offer of a restricted 'kick a ball' area in the proposal but that area could not meet the necessary criteria as a suitable space for organised sports. It would not compensate the community for the subsequent decrease in sports field space at Oākura School.

Traffic Impacts on the Roding Network

168. The KCB believes the applicant's Traffic Impact Assessment contains a number of untested assumptions. We are very concerned that this application could be accepted on the basis that the negative aspects are minor, could be resolved at a later date or are the responsibility of other authorities i.e. New Zealand Transport Authority or the NPDC.
169. There is no analysis of how the Traffic Impact Assessment is aligned with the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport that sets the strategic direction to drive improved performance from the land transport system across New Zealand.
170. Much is made about how useful the proposed roundabout would be to provide solutions for increased traffic impacts. While the KCB doesn't have the technical expertise to make a considered judgement about roundabout construction we still regard its development as an unlikely scenario.
171. This is due to the irregular alignment of the Wairau Road intersection with SH45, the steep contour of the existing SH45 section to the east of the intersection, and the fact that the Matekai Stream crosses the highway at the bottom of the dip only 150 metres from the intersection through an earth tunnel dug in the 1930s. We don't believe there is sufficient detail about the roundabout for anyone to have a considered view on its construction or appropriateness.
172. With this lack of clarity, the KCB is concerned that the NPDC has already signalled its development in Year 4 of the 2018/28 Long Term Plan. We also note that in the peer review of the Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) that using a roundabout as a traffic calming feature is not recommended.
173. The analysis of the impact of the extra traffic likely to be created by the proposed development was only at the Wairau Road intersection with SH45, while obviously significant effects would be much more widely spread through the village and beyond. The required traffic engineering solutions to maintain the free flow and safe movement of vehicular, pedestrian, cycle and equestrian traffic would be so large that there would have to be major amenity consequences throughout the village. These were not addressed adequately in this application. Other expert advice has been added later and we will leave that for other experts to consider its relevance.
174. There is no data on the effects on traffic movements at the intersections of Donnelly Street/The Outlook with SH45, or Dixon Street//Hau Lane/Butlers Lane with SH45, and therefore no proposal to address any issues that would undoubtedly arise. For example, the eastern 50km restricted speed zone begins only 115m from

the pedestrian traffic island in the centre of SH45 adjacent to this junction. Global data states a medium-sized car with good tyres travelling at 100kph on a dry road needs a stopping distance of 98m. On a wet road that stopping distance increases to 122m. The minimum sight distance to enable a driver coming from New Plymouth to see a vehicle entering SH45 from one of the three side streets and perform a sudden stop before reaching the conflict point is compromised even further by the steep SH45 entrance to the village. Similarly vehicles travelling through the village from the west do not come into view of those drivers from the east until those vehicles are within 50 metres of the intersection. If there is a stationary vehicle ahead waiting to turn into Dixon Street approaching traffic cannot be seen at all.

175. Personal observations and anecdotal evidence demonstrate that many vehicles travelling east through Oākura are already increasing their speed by the time they reach the Dixon Street//Hau Lane//Butlers Lane intersection. Many do not adhere to the 50kph speed restriction, as they view that stretch of the highway only as part of a route connecting their departure and arrival points. This is especially relevant at this particularly busy intersection, dangerous for all users. It is an intersection used by vehicles to enter and exit the 4Square mini-market parking space and adjacent parking areas. It is used by vehicles turning to travel to other destinations in either direction on SH45. It is frequented by pedestrians of all ages to access services in the immediate area, or as a through-point to reach other destinations such as the school. It is regularly used by large service vehicles such as refuse collection trucks and those providing supplies to local businesses. **(see Appendix One - point 175 images a-e).**
176. Of particular concern is that the assessment of the impact of additional traffic is limited to its effect on other vehicular traffic, not on pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians or road frontages, and is expressed in terms of time delays, queue lengths and crash risks.
177. There is no comment about noise, air quality, or other environmental factors related to traffic, which would extend along SH45 through the village and are not limited to junctions or to motor vehicles. Vehicle movements entering and leaving private premises, businesses, on-road carparks and also pedestrian crossing movements would all be adversely affected by the significant increase in vehicle movements on the highway and in Oākura generally. Within the 50kph restricted zone there are 7 street entrances, 2 enclave entrances servicing 13 properties, and 17 driveway entrances. **(see Appendix One - point 177 image).**
178. We have been unable to identify any data showing peak demand times for CBD parking, what the stresses on parking availability will be within certain walking distances of the CBD services, downstream issues for vehicles parking in Dixon

Street and the effects on fire engines exiting the Oākura Fire Station in an emergency, future parking availability for hall users, appropriate solutions for the collection of students from Oākura School, or congestion effects on the Oākura beachfront. The proposed development will have a major effect on these issues. It is at a distance to both the CBD and beach that would result in most trips between the subdivision and those destinations being made by vehicles. The lack of clarity is concerning as no data is provided and no solutions are offered.

179. We note that as long ago as 2008 NPDC recognised the need to *'extend Donnelly Street through to Upper Wairau Road in Oakura to improve the connectivity of the road network in this rural township'*.
(reference: NPDC Strategic Study Summary Report of Transport Issues and Options 14 Traffic Management Measures p38).

As recommended in this report, funding for such an upgrade should be part of a development contribution from residential subdivision. We question what dialogue has been carried out with the NPDC on this point?

We also note: *"It also ventured that forming Hussey St to connect through to Butlers Lane, with travel in one-way direction from the current cul de sac head on Hussey St via Butlers Lane, would provide an opportunity for improved traffic circulation in the locality of the school."* (reference: Applicant's evidence - 17 June 2019, Planning Colin Comber point 161)

The KCB understands there is an archeological site location on the road reserve that impedes such a development.

180. The KCB has submitted to the NPDC on a number of occasions to initiate a comprehensive traffic study to identify future highway, road and street network issues, but NPDC has never considered that this was necessary. We believe that fact indicates a lack of support from council planners for any large tract residential development proposal such as this at this time.

Proposed Pedestrian Underpass

181. It is stated that: *'The pedestrian underpass proposed under SH45 southward of the Wairau Rd intersection will provide safe passage for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders moving between Upper Wairau Road and the beach and associated facilities.'*
(reference: Private Plan Change Request PPC18/00048 2.2.6 Forward-looking and addressing community needs/bullet point 3 P16).
182. It is contended that: *'To promote the safe passage of pedestrians and other active modes across SH45 a pedestrian underpass(for walking, cycling and horses) is*

considered an important element in the safe and efficient road transportation network at Oakura and SH45 in particular’.

(reference: NPDP Private Plane Change PPC18/00048 Council Report June 2018 Reson 23.9)

183. The KCB views this claim as nonsensical. We believe it is being promoted as the solution to the safe movement of all those wishing to cross the road. But does it? The underpass will deposit all users onto the seaward side of the busy SH45, adjacent to the Wairau Road/SH45 intersection and in very close proximity to where the 100km open road rule changes to the 50km restriction. Users (presumably pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders, parents with toddlers, children heading to and from school etc.) will then have to travel some distance on the side of the SH45 to negotiate the intersection and/or the proposed roundabout to move on to, or back from, their destination. Roundabouts are constructed for the more efficient movement of vehicular traffic, not for the safety of other users. The applicant actually states the obvious: *‘A roundabout typically performs better than a crossroads in terms of safety for vehicles, but not so well for vulnerable road users i.e. cyclists and pedestrians.’*
- (reference: Private Plan Change Request PPC18/00048 Wairau Road/State Highway Intersection p24)**
184. Much is made of how desirable the overall development would be for horse owners. A Rural E Environment Area is planned as a discreet area: *‘to enable rural lifestyle living and particularly for those among the local equestrian community’*. To suggest horse riders would use the underpass, safely circumnavigate the intersection, and travel down to Oākura Beach demonstrates a complete lack of regard for the circumstances.
185. The application alludes to a horse trail from the seaward side of the underpass to the beachfront. However there is no connecting esplanade strip from SH45 to the beachfront. This means all users heading that way would have to travel nearly a kilometre down busy Lower Wairau Road. In spite of knowing this, the application continues to promote this trail to the horse owners’ fraternity.
- (see Appendix One - point 174 image)**
186. The lack of trail connection was brought to the applicant’s attention (and his experts) at a meeting with the KCB on 13 April 2016 and again on 24 May 2017. We also pointed out at the time we would not support an equestrian trail on the esplanade strip (see points 176 - 179 below). After the second meeting Mr Comber stated in an email to the KCB that, *“The underpass concept is more in the ‘nice to have’ than ‘need to have’ category. NZTA have told us that while they have funding for stock underpasses they have nothing for pedestrian/cyclists/horses. If it was to proceed in the fullness of time a joint funding approach (NZTA/NPDC/McKie) would most likely be the only way it could be realised in any event. While it is early days*

yet it is an idea we would like to test through the plan change process; the feedback from the community will no doubt be a significant factor as to where the idea ends up.” (see Appendix Two - point 175 Comber email)

187. The KCB restated that fact yet again at the Pre-Hearing Community Meeting at Oākura Hall on 28 January 2019. On the very same day the applicant’s team was still advancing this ‘probability’ to submitters at the Pre-Hearing Equestrian Meeting, stating, *‘that the proposed underpass could connect with a future esplanade reserve/strip (shown on District Plan Map A61) heading down the valley to Messenger Tce and onto the beach.’*
(reference: point 15 Equestrian Pre Hearing Meeting Report)
188. At that 28 January meeting the response to the KCB about this issue was that an easement could be obtained through the future subdivision of the Holdom FUD area on the seaward side of SH45. However the Holdom FUD area is not one of the land parcels involved. There is a 2ha lifestyle block to the west (**Lot 1 DP 7959**) and five residential lots to the east (**Lot 1 DP 10230, Lot 1 DP 7359, Lot 2 DP 7359, Lot 3 DP 7359 and Lot 4 DP 7359**) whose common boundary is the lifestyle block. In 2008, after KCB requests, NPDC did undertake enquiries about obtaining an easement along the boundary of the lifestyle block. This was firmly rejected by the landowner and the KCB recently confirmed this is still the case.

We note the KCB concern, as expressed, was not included in the Kaitake Community Board and Groups Pre Hearing Meeting Report. The report only states: *‘The Kaitake Community Board then questioned as to where the pedestrian route goes after the underpass. The applicant detailed that the underpass will pass between the red house and Okato side of the culvert and will link with the associated esplanade strip between SH45 and Messenger Terrace.’*

(reference: point 33 Kaitake Community Board and Groups Pre Hearing Meeting Report)

- 189 Under these circumstances we find that the statement by Mr Comber in his Applicant’s Evidence is at odds with what has occurred: *“Submitters concerns have been carefully considered and mitigations proposed where appropriate. These include proposing local road access from SH45 and the bridal trail network being extended to the SH45/Wairau Rd intersection.”*

(reference: Applicant’s evidence - 17 June 2019, Planning Colin Comber point 23)

190. It is unlikely the 2ha lifestyle block, with its very large stately residence will ever become a residential development. However if in the future some solution was arranged to complete an easement connection the KCB would oppose horse riders using the SH45/Tasman Parade as a horse trail. (We do note the applicant’s team believes the current esplanade strip ends at Messenger Terrace). Tasman

Parade is often inundated with vehicles and pedestrians. It is a very busy environment and not conducive to horse riding activity.

(see Appendix One - point 190 Images (a) and (b))

191. The Shearer Reserve end of the trail is a heavily frequented recreation area and picnic spot. It has a children's playground, basketball half court, and skatepark in constant use. There is an attached family picnic area and the KCB is currently negotiating with the NPDC to set up a mountain bike area in the reserve for local teenagers. It is a very popular community gathering spot and is an entirely inappropriate location for access by horses.
(see Appendix One - point 191 Images (a) and (b))
192. The NPDC category for this area is a Destination play space. This is the highest classification in the New Plymouth District Play Space Framework, classed as a Premium play space for the whole district that is a major attraction (or within a major attraction/destination) for residents and visitors.
(reference: Appendix Two point 180 - Open Space Sport and Recreation Strategy - 30 years).
This framework supports the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Strategy Objective 2.3 *'The quantity, location and quality of play space equipment is strategically planned'* and the directly related initiative of *"Maintain a network of destination, community and neighbourhood play spaces as outlined in the New Plymouth District Play Space Framework.*
193. It should also be recognised that horses are banned from Oākura Beach from 9am to 6pm during daylight saving time for 26 weeks of the year.
(reference: Appendix Two point 181 Public Place Bylaw Part 27 Restricted Activities - Horses).
194. To allude that this is a possible horse trail in the future to garner support for the subdivision proposal is just an insincere non sequiter. The provided evidence casts serious doubts on the credibility of the application.

Proposed Bund

195. The proposed noise attenuation bund to be built alongside SH45 to diminish the residential housing set back requirement will mean the total loss of the rural views up to the Kaitake Range. A 2-4m high 600m structure is a formidable construction. It is an artificial feature and will severely undermine the current natural features and ambience of the western entrance to Oākura village.
196. The proposal sets out to embellish the bund construction by suggesting the provision of a walkway to a cafe type development at the small pond on the western side of Lot 29. **(see Appendix One - point 196 Image).**

The KCB does not support the development of commercial activity outside the CBD area, except for some small scale commercial operations on the Oākura beachfront. This is the preferred position of the community as set out in the Oākura Community Engagement Report - 2014/16.

197. The proposed walkway is isolated and remote from the village centre, with difficult pedestrian access. There is no connection to the village pathway network. If allowed this brings into focus the question of it being mainly accessed by vehicle traffic. The KCB questions what parking would be required, and where it would be located?
198. The amount of the extensive earthworks to build the bund and other major earthworks within in the proposed development raises real concerns. The adverse effects on the environment that will eventuate, and the movement of SH45 traffic during its construction should not be underestimated.

In Summation

199. The Oākura community has been actively, and consistently reviewing urban development through successive processes, and the community sentiment about urban development and greenfield expansion has remained consistent over time. Over the years the community has obviously grown and changed, but the initial attractions that have drawn everyone here have remained constant. At the same time those that live here have accepted residential growth and the gradual urbanisation of Oākura village.
200. That acceptance has resulted in much reflection and discussion about what is the best way forward. Here you have a large and engaged community group of residents who have participated in a wide range of processes to arrive at a common view of how they wish their community to develop over the years. Many, if not most, have volunteered their energy, time and financial donations to build what we have here today. It is clear they require that investment to be protected.
201. We believe that building relationships is the groundwork for the constructive dialogue that is required on such a project. We have never established an open and easy relationship with the applicant, as we have done with other individuals and groups in many contexts over the years.
202. The KCB was asked to meet with the applicant and his team on two occasions (13/04/2016 and 24/05/2017), ostensibly to discuss ideas with us as the local community leaders. In both cases we were presented with detailed concepts to show what his intentions were. While we were asked some questions, it became

clear the agenda was already cast in stone and the meetings were only held to ascertain if the KCB would be useful to it. We note that both those meetings are not recorded in the application.

203. The KCB also held a meeting with the applicant, along with a senior NPDC planner, to provide a draft of the Oākura Community Engagement Project report and to seek feedback from him. None was received and this meeting is not recorded either.
204. When reading the supplied documentation we find it is written in such a way to suggest there has been a positive relationship in the applicant's dealings with the community. The applicant himself states, *'We have listened to and have a very good understanding of the Oakura community's concerns.'*
We ask, if this is the case, why have there been so many submissions opposing the application?
(reference: Statement of Evidence of Michael McKie on behalf of Oakura Farm Park Limited - Relationships, point 17)
205. In retrospect that is not surprising, as the applicant does not live locally. The community is told that his experience in developing means he has the very best knowledge of what is needed. That is the community can be shaped on behalf of local people from the outside looking in. We find that approach particularly unhelpful. Many in our community feel they are being coerced into accepting an unneeded and unwanted subdivision.
206. There has never been any explanation why the applicant has deviated from his pledge made to Commissioner Tobin to ensure the balance of his farm remained rural in perpetuity. The KCB, the community, and we suspect Commissioner Tobin, accepted his assurance as a certainty. It provided confidence to the community, and the subsequent springboard for the KCB to search out, engage with the community and plan with the NPDC for the best way forward for the community to grow and develop over time.
207. There is a considerable lack of clarity in much of this application. The KCB is concerned that will be many negative cumulative effects if this application is confirmed.
The KCB maintains that:
- The proposed subdivision is in the wrong location for future growth;
 - Future growth in Oākura, involving much community engagement, has been carried out to develop a sound and realistic plan.
 - The community wants the rural landscape character on the south side of SH45 protected;
 - The biodiversity threats to the Kaitake Range and the Egmont National Park are genuine;

- The Kaitake Range is a site of great significance to Taranaki Iwi;
- Major traffic related issues will be generated by the subdivision;
- Downstream stormwater issues are not successfully mitigated in the application;
- Not enough research has been carried out to ascertain the size of the aquifer and its replenishment rate;
- Over crowding of Oākura School will lead to a deterioration educational outcomes for its students; and
- The subdivision will compromise the community's natural and social environment, and endanger the rural character and the associated amenity values of Oākura.

208 Much effort has been put into this private plan change application to reinvent our community in way that very few of us want it to become. The KCB contends that the application fails this test in many instances.

The adverse impacts to the environment, to public amenity values, to sense of place, and to lifestyle enjoyment will be born by the residents.

The cost overruns to mitigate residual risk will be born by the ratepayers.

We urge this Hearing Commission to reject this plan change in its entirety.

209. This concludes our advocacy on behalf of the community.
Mō tātou, ā, mō kā uri ā muri ake nei – for us and our children after us.

Appendix One Images - in Appendices folder in provided USB Flash Drive

Name	Kind
point 11/76 image.jpg	JPEG image
point 20 image.jpg	JPEG image
point 23 image.jpg	JPEG image
point 25 image.jpg	JPEG image
point 63 image.jpg	JPEG image
point 64 image.jpg	JPEG image
point 75 image.jpg	JPEG image
point 114 - Lucky the Cat.mp4	MPEG-4 movie
point 125 image(a).jpg	JPEG image
point 125 image(b).jpg	JPEG image
point 125 image(c).jpg	JPEG image
point 125 image(d).jpg	JPEG image
point 125 image(e).jpg	JPEG image
point 125 image(f).jpg	JPEG image
point 125 image(g).jpg	JPEG image
point 126 image(h).jpg	JPEG image
point 132 b image.jpg	JPEG image
point 132 image.jpg	JPEG image
point 144 image(a).jpg	JPEG image
point 144 image(b).jpg	JPEG image
point 144 image(c).jpg	JPEG image
point 144 image(d).jpg	JPEG image
point 144 image(e).jpg	JPEG image
point 146/150 image.jpg	JPEG image
point 147 image.jpg	JPEG image
point 147 Wairau Stream erosion video locations image.jpg	JPEG image
point 147 Wairau Stream erosion video(a).mp4	MPEG-4 movie
point 147 Wairau Stream erosion video(b).mp4	MPEG-4 movie
point 148 image(a).jpg	JPEG image
point 148 image(b).jpg	JPEG image
point 148 image(c).jpg	JPEG image
point 148 image(d).jpg	JPEG image
point 148 image(e).jpg	JPEG image
point 148 image(f).jpg	JPEG image
point 148 image(g).jpg	JPEG image
point 152 image.jpg	JPEG image
point 160 image.jpeg	JPEG image
point 175 image(a).jpg	JPEG image
point 175 image(b).jpg	JPEG image
point 175 image(c).jpg	JPEG image
point 175 image(d).jpg	JPEG image
point 175 image(e).jpg	JPEG image
point 177 image.jpg	JPEG image
point 185 image.jpg	JPEG image
point 190 image(a).jpeg	JPEG image
point 190 image(b).jpeg	JPEG image
point 191 image(a).jpg	JPEG image
point 191 image(b).jpg	JPEG image
point 196 image.jpg	JPEG image

Appendix Two Documents - in Appendices folder in provided USB Flash Drive

Name	Kind
Brief of Evidence of Michael McKie in the matter of the resource consent application to subdivide land at Wairau Road, Oakura, New Plymouth.pdf	PDF Document
Coastal strategy implementation plan February 2008.pdf	PDF Document
Coastal strategy mana whenua mana moana February 2006.pdf	PDF Document
Coastal strategy parts 1-2 April 2006..pdf	PDF Document
Coastal strategy parts 3-6 April 2006.pdf	PDF Document
Coastal strategy parts 7-9 April 2006.pdf	PDF Document
ManaWhenuaManaMoana2006.pdf	PDF Document
Oākura Recreation and Community Facility Study Report 2011.pdf	PDF Document
Oakura Structure Plan.pdf	PDF Document
point - 15/45 Oākura Focus Group Terms of Reference and membership.pdf	PDF Document
point 9 - Kaitake Community Plan - a thirty year vision.pdf	PDF Document
point 20 Future Urban Development Overlay.pdf	PDF Document
point 30 A60 planning map.pdf	PDF Document
point 39 - Tapuae Roa Action Plan - 2017.pdf	PDF Document
point 42 p4 - KCB 2010 Paddocks Hearing Written and Verbal Submission.pdf	PDF Document
point 45 Oākura Community Engagement Report.pdf	PDF Document
point 45 - Oākura A growing Community - Summary of Feedback.pdf	PDF Document
point 45 Oākura Community Engagement Plan 2014.pdf	PDF Document
point 48 - Oākura A growing Community - Discussion Document.pdf	PDF Document
point 74 - Mary Buckland Landscape Assessment.pdf	PDF Document
point 84/85 - Draft Annual Plan 3013/14 - submission.pdf	PDF Document
point 86/87 - KCB Submission to 2018/28 LTP.pdf	PDF Document
point 90 -Coastal Strategy, Oākura and Urenui Structure Plans Implementation update .pdf	PDF Document
point 91 - New Plymouth District Blueprint.pdf	PDF Document
point 103 - Taiao Taioara - Environmental Management Plan for Taranaki Iwi rohe.pdf	PDF Document
point 107 - Priorities/Environment P8.pdf	PDF Document
point 118 - Egmont National Park2.2 GOALS.pdf	PDF Document
point 122/146 - Reports Wairau road subdivision ecological assessment June 2010.pdf	PDF Document
point 139 - Three Waters Manager email.pdf	PDF Document
point 186 Comber email.pdf	PDF Document
point 192 - Open Space Sport and Recreation Strategy.pdf	PDF Document
point 193 Public Place Bylaw Part 27 Restricted Activities - Horses.pdf	PDF Document