

PPC84 summary points

- Start with a couple of high level observations, and then move into the remaining discrete points of difference, along with some brief thoughts deriving from yesterday's discussion about the detailed rule package.
- 95% in alignment, and the remaining 5% are more matters of detail rather than deal breakers – is important thought to get the details right
- Urban form – Spatial Plan is helpful – the plan change provides a more nuanced approach to how best to develop this area whilst maintaining and enhancing natural values – whilst assessments necessarily tend to focus on effects, there are significant environmental gains with this proposal. NRPS & integration with infrastructure
- NPS-UD: 'urban environment' definition – 4 variables: 1) time frame; 2) geographic extent of 'shared employment and housing market'; 3) intention; 4) population (normally resident vrs holiday homes). Council has wrestled with this greyness and has resolved that it does not apply – a view not taken on whim but underpinned by careful assessment. But accept it is grey – not urban over the short-medium/ 10 year term. Probably yes over the long term/ 30 year period.
- Not critical to this plan change as it does deliver a WFUE so doesn't offend NPS-UD directions. Is some nuance around walking and cycling connections which I'll address under transport matters, but am confident that the provisions can be designed to provide confidence that such connectivity is delivered. Does however have wider implications for Council – will become a Teir 3 Council with obligations to undertake regular capacity monitoring/ forward planning, removal of car parking standards etc. Of course the panel is delegated authority to make a recommendation re their findings, so are not constrained – simply noting that their finding on this matter has broad strategic/ work programme implications.

Wastewater and septic tank section sizes

- 2 reticulated solutions that are both plausible
- No provisions that require either reticulated option to be taken up – a different future owner could look to do the entire block on septic tanks.
- Not an appropriate solution if implemented en masse
- May be appropriate for small clusters/ isolated dwellings – Mr Rankin talked about the ad hoc development of the existing lifestyle blocks for pockets of low density housing
- If this is indeed the preferred scenario – vast majority reticulated with occasional low density lots on septic tanks, then I don't see what the great concern is re adopting

the ODPs long-standing requirement of a minimum 3,000m² lot size – we know that for the great majority of cases sites of this size can be serviced by on-site septic systems.

- And if you want to go smaller then there's a discretionary consent pathway where you can demonstrate your bespoke system design/ house plans will work

Transport

- Again broad agreement – outstanding matters really come down to how much do you want to rely on generic wording in the rules re future assessment vrs providing a bit more direction as to the delivery of some key outcomes.
- Paper road – shown on the planning maps as grey (unformed road) with formed roads shown as white. Activities within these roads is managed via Chapter 11 – formation and maintenance of roads is permitted where in accordance with design standards; RDIS if not meeting standards. No activity status specified to use a road reserve for non-roading purposes so innominate (DIS)
- Old Waipu Rd – confirm it's just the formation of the northern section up to cove rd – as shown on the amended structure plan attached to my rebuttal.
- Tara Road shared path – if a southern connection with shared path is available, then Tara Rd upgrades are simply a footpath extension from 104 tara Rd to the site access. If a southern connection is not available when the northern two thirds develop, then Tara Rd needs to include a shared path to Moir St – otherwise there is no safe cycle connection from the northern two thirds of the site to the village centre and school. Whilst such an arrangement may be an interim solution until the southern connection is provided, given the routing/ land ownership challenges to the south this interim position could be a number of years.
- Southern connection – whilst not necessary it is beneficial – want to give it the best chance of being successfully delivered. As such I don't see a downside in adding the blue route to the structure plans sought by Berggren Trustees. Likewise added an alternative walking and cycling route option through the church to increase prospects of it being delivered.
- Highlighted on the structure plan the Tara/ Moir intersection. Am mindful of the thinly stretched staff resource at KDC and that those assessing future RCs may well have little knowledge of what's been discussed here – therefore want to make it clear what the key transport issues are that they should turn their minds to – easiest done by visually illustrating on the structure plan.

- Staging rules – only where critical re safety/ efficiency. More generally cost allocation and staging to be negotiated via subdivision process, rather than front-loaded as part of the plan change. Tends to be the front-load approach only where it is critical and the plan change can't occur without it. Not that much upgrading needed beyond the site – tara/ moir intersection, old waipu up to cove, southern link & ped/ cycle link.
- Similar re 3-waters – always a tension at plan change stage re level of detail required re design and funding and how much needs to be determined now vrs can be safely left for subdivision and regional consenting processes

Ecology

- Narrowed down to a discrete matter re track building. Tracks are a great feature and obviously the local track trust is doing some good work. Choice is simply should construction of some 3km of tracks through an important remnant bush block be permitted, or RDIS – is a simple rule with an activity status that is not unduly onerous. Simply adds confidence that any future vegetation clearance will be properly assessed and if need be undertaken subject to conditions to protect natural values.
- Need for a bat survey to be explicit as an information requirement rather than rely on generic references to ecological assessments

Community Hubs

- Hub C- if Panel was cautious re scope, then options could be to just remove the Tara Rd pod as the other option is more internalised/ less likely to trigger the prospect of someone submitting had they known. Another option would be to remove hub C and simply make education facilities a RDIS or DIS activity status.
- Hub D – note extent – just 110 not 104 – indeed eastern properties outside of the plan change area. Is a 1ha+ site, so as notified could do 10 dwellings. Under the hub can do 8 dwellings plus 1,000m² of shops/ community- so a change but not a big change. And importantly has RDIS status that is open to s95 so any future development will be assessed in terms of effects on neighbours – we're simply establishing a framework for that assessment.

Provisions

- Policies – may be a bit over written, but I'm Ok with some aspirational outcomes – are framed as encourage and promote rather than require

- SUB – DEV1-R19(c) – really trying to say “if the subdivision application only covers part of the structure plan, then the application just needs to deliver that part of the network included in the application site” rather than a subdivision in one corner being expected to deliver the entire network on day 1.
- A-I or j? I read it as intentional – a-I are DIS, whereas j remains RDIS but with additional matters of discretion.
- Minimum lot sizes – is RDIS if you don’t comply cf. NC for ODP Resi zone. So is an achievable consenting pathway should, for instance, 600m lots be proposed at the southern end.
- Note Commissioner Lambeth’s question re second units for the southern lifestyle block sites – currently these sites have a rural zoning and a DIS status for second units with a minimum site size of 20ha in a harbour overlay – shifts to RDIS and 1,000m² – so much more enabling. And if these sites do already contain a consented second unit then they can retain them
-