

# **PLANNING REPORT ON PLAN CHANGE 8 PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE REQUEST: KUMARA JUNCTION DEVELOPMENTS LTD.**



## **Introduction**

1. My name is Rebecca Beaumont. I have nine years experience in resource management and planning, all working on the West Coast. I have worked for the Westland District Council for five years. I am familiar with the locality of the plan change proposal and have visited the site.

## **Report Content**

2. This report assesses a privately initiated plan change to rezone 74 hectares of land at Kumara Junction from 'Rural' to 'Small Settlement' with additional development controls. It seeks to provide further opportunity for growth in the locality of Kumara Junction.
3. This report:-
  - (i) Summarises the changes to the Westland District Plan sought by the plan change;
  - (ii) Describes the site subject to the plan change request and the wider locality;
  - (iii) Outlines the statutory framework against which the plan changes must be assessed;
  - (iv) Discusses the relevant District Plan provisions;
  - (v) Outlines the nature of submissions on the plan changes
  - (vi) Assesses the matters raised by the submission, by topic;
  - (vii) Assesses the plan changes against Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA);
  - (viii) Lists the recommendation to accept or reject the plan change, and any submissions, in whole or in part, with reasons, and any resulting amendments to the plan changes as notified.

As a report on a private plan change request, this report does not seek to replicate information within the plan change application, and adopts assessments, provide comments on, concurs with or departs from information within the report as appropriate.

## **The Proposed Plan Change**

### **Plan Change 8 – Kumara Junction Developments Ltd**

4. PC 8 seeks to rezone 74 hectares of land from 'Rural' zone to 'Small Settlement'. The land is located on a terrace extending from State Highway 6 to close to the Taramakau River in the north. The Eastern boundary of the site is the Midland Industrial Rail Line. The site utilizes existing access from the State Highway along Sanctuary Place. Roughly one third of the land is currently developed into 34 sections, serviced by Sanctuary Place as a spine road, and two right of ways and two Council roads. The land is vegetated, with the character of the existing development being dwellings nestled within the bush. As the site extends to the north east, the vegetation becomes less dense.
5. The plan change has been applied for as Westland District Council staff stated that further subdivision of the land would be considered to be creating new settlement, and consequently would be in conflict with Policy 4.3. The District Plan required new settlements to be considered through the plan change process.
6. The proponents of the plan change consider the rezoning will provide for a specific character of development in the rural area on a discreet site which. In the applicant's view the plan change allows for the completion of the developer's vision for the land, on a site that is suited for the development and has little environmental effects.
7. The plan change request outlines the amendment of the planning maps to demonstrate the zoning of the land as Small Settlement. Specific rules are proposed to retain and extend the character of the existing development: principally, the retention of vegetation along the boundaries of each section, a minimum allotment size of 2500m<sup>2</sup> and requiring development to occur in accordance with the 'Outline Development Plan'.
8. References to the area are also requested in the methods and anticipated environmental outcomes of the Settlement Character Policy, and to the description of the Small Settlement zone. The performance standards for the Small Settlement zone and the subdivision section would require additions regarding compliance with the concept plan, minimum allotment sizes specific to the plan change area, yard setbacks, and the retention or planting of vegetation. Forming the indicative road shown on the concept plan, subject to compliance with the Westland District Council Code of Practice, would be a permitted activity. The specific changes required in the plan, and further amendments, are described in the recommended decision of this report.

## **Notification of the proposed Plan Change and submissions received.**

9. Plan Change 8 (PC 8) was received by the Westland District Council on 30 March 2012. The Council formally accepted the Change under Section 25 (2)(b) of the RMA on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2012, after discussion with the applicant led to minor alterations to the format of the plan change proposal. These amendments related to providing clarity to the plan change description, adding rules to achieve intended components of the plan change and removing proposed changes perceived to be unnecessary by Council.
10. PC 8 was publicly notified on 29 May 2012. The period for submissions closed on 29 July 2012.
  - 31 submissions were received on the proposed Plan Change
  - 24 submissions supported the Plan Change. A number made specific reference to conditions to manage particular effects or to retain specific aspects of the character of the development proposed.
  - Four submissions were opposed to certain aspects of the Plan Change proposal.
  - One Submission opposed the entire proposal and one was neutral.
11. Following the closure of submissions, the applicant entered into discussions with the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) regarding matters relating to the upgrading of the intersection with the State Highway. The Plan Change was amended to include a provision requiring further assessment of traffic safety at the time that the allotments of the subdivision reached a certain level. Following this amendment, the NZTA withdrew their submission and provided a letter of support.
12. The summary of submissions was notified on 2 August 2012 and the period for further submissions closed on 16 August 2012.
  - 26 further submissions were received.
13. The summary of submission and decisions requested report and the further submissions are attached as Appendices B and C.
14. Four submitters stated a wish to be heard. One further submitter wishes to be heard in relation to their further submission

## **Description of the Site and Locality**

15. Roughly one third of the land is currently developed into 34 sections, serviced by Sanctuary Place as a spine road, and two right of ways and two Council roads. The land is vegetated, with the character of the existing development being dwellings nestled within the bush. As the site extends to the north east, the vegetation type changes to become more open, before changing to thicker,

regenerating vegetation through the north of the site. Carson Creek crosses the site. A number of smaller waterways also cross the site and are under 3 metres in width.

16. The adjoining land is a mixture of rural residential lifestyle blocks on the western edge of the terrace, and rural farmland that is used for a range of agricultural uses. The midland line adjoins the eastern boundary of the site. To the east of the site is Kumara Junction, which contains a cluster of rural-residential dwellings, a complex advertising spiritual retreats, and a café.
17. Rural residential subdivision has been steady in the Westland District over the last five years, although tapering off recently. Kumara Junction is a popular growth area, evidenced by the previous four stages of subdivision undertaken by the applicant, and recent approved subdivision and land use proposals on adjacent land owned by the Lees. Land to the north of Hokitika is popular due to the short commute to both Greymouth and Hokitika town centres. Growth within Kumara, the closest area of land zoned “Small Settlement” has increased following the development of the cycleway. Growth within Kaniere, Kokatahi and Kowhitirangi, Rimu, Woodstock and Ruatapu and Ross, also Small Settlement zoned has occurred over the last five years, although land remains available for further development within these areas. The character of these settlements is different to the highly vegetated character of the proposed plan change site.

## **Statutory Framework**

18. The proposed plan changes must be assessed against Part II of the Resource Management Act 1991 ‘Purpose and Principles’ and the objectives, policies and rules of the operative Westland District Plan which give effect to the RMA. In addition, the proposed plan changes must not be inconsistent with the West Coast Regional Policy Statement or any relevant regional plans. In accordance with the above, the following key principles guide the assessment:-

### **1. Sustainable Management**

19. Part II of the RMA defines the meaning of sustainable management (Section 5) and sets out matters of national importance and other matters to be provided for or had regard to (Sections 6 – 8) (see Appendix D). Management of the use, development and protection of land must occur in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and health and safety while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects of activities on the environment.
20. It is considered that the proposed plan change will be generally consistent with Part II of the RMA. The proposed plan change will facilitate additional development in an area that, subject to appropriate mitigation measures, is suitable for such development.
21. The matters of national importance have been explored during the processing of the private plan change request and Kumara Junction Developments Ltd has provided an assessment from their subdivision engineer Rob Hall, in relation to on site effluent disposal, and an ecology report from Jan Derks. On site effluent disposal and possible contamination of groundwater through cumulative effect is a matter of contention for this plan change. This matter is discussed in further detail below.
22. Section 7 lists further “other matters” to be considered. These include the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources; the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values; maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment; any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources. These matters were considered when forming the District Plan and specific matters pertaining to this plan change are further evaluated in the assessment of submissions.
23. Section 8 specifically requires Council’s to take into account the Treaty of Waitangi. Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Makaawhio and Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae were provided copies of the plan change notification and the applicant states that consultation was undertaken prior to lodgement of the Plan Change. Pre lodgement consultation with Ngati Waewae has led to the inclusion of an Accidental Discovery Protocol as an appendix to the plan

change request. The Council does not hold any record of items of significance on the proposed site.

## **2. Section 32 of the RMA**

24. Before making a decision on the proposed plan changes, the decision maker must address the matters set out in Section 32 of the RMA, 'Consideration of alternatives, benefits and costs'. These matters are set out in Appendix F. The evaluation must, in essence, examine the extent to which each objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act; and whether, having regard to their efficiency and effectiveness, the policies, rules, or other methods are the most appropriate for achieving the objectives. The applicant has provided an assessment of the Plan Change request under section 32 of the RMA and the Council is required to ensure that it has undertaken its own assessment prior to its decision. The evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of the Plan Change request in achieving the purpose of the Act, and the objectives and policies of the Plan. As previously discussed, this assessment does not seek to replicate the section 32 generated by Kumara Junction Developments Ltd.

## **3. Regional Policy Statement/Regional Plans**

25. The applicant has provided an assessment against the Regional Policy Statement and the Regional Plans on page 16 and 17 of the request.
26. Section 75(3 - 4) of the RMA requires that the district plan must give effect to the regional policy statement and shall not be inconsistent with any regional plan of its region in regard to any matter of regional significance or for which the regional council has primary responsibility. The West Coast Regional Policy Statement was made operative on 10 March 2000. The West Coast Regional Council has not submitted on the plan change request, although I am aware that there were discussions relating to onsite effluent disposal prior to lodgment of the plan change. The plan change does not seek to alter any existing objectives and policies of the district plan which currently gives effect to the policy statement.
27. The West Coast Regional Council have released their decisions on the West Coast Regional Land and Water Plan and notified that all remaining inoperative provisions will become operative on the 24<sup>th</sup> September 2012. This Plan contains rules relating to on site effluent disposal, which is a matter of concern to a number of submitters. The applicant has provided an assessment from their engineer that addresses the provisions of rule 77 of the Regional Plan. It is likely that allotments in close proximity to Carsons Creek may require discharge consent under Rule 77. The plan change request states that this will be able to be achieved utilising secondary systems. This is supported by the Westland District Council Building Inspectors.

28. It is considered that the plan change is consistent with the relevant regional council planning documents.

#### **4. District Plan Objectives and Policies**

29. The Westland District Plan was made operative on 1 June 2002. The plan change does not propose any changes to the District Plan objectives and policies, although statements are proposed to the explanation sections of the policy. Accordingly, the plan change application includes an assessment of the proposal against each of the relevant existing District Plan objectives and policies. I concur that the proposed plan change is in accordance with the Objectives and Policies of the District Plan, subject to some minor amendments, which are addressed under the relevant objectives and policies below. Proposed Plan Change 7, notified on the 24<sup>th</sup> August 2012, does not impact upon this Plan Change proposal.

##### *Objective 3.4 Infrastructure and Servicing*

30. 3.4.1 To ensure that all servicing activities are carried out in a manner, and in locations, which avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse environmental effects.

3.4.2 To ensure the activities located adjacent to infrastructure do not adversely affect the safe and efficient use of those resources.

##### *Policy 4.6 Infrastructure and Servicing*

A The efficient provision and development of all future services and infrastructure within the District shall be encouraged.

B The roading hierarchy shall be used as a factor in determining the acceptability of activities (including subdivision), which affects traffic flows or the road resource; and the standards of access required.

C The formation, construction and maintenance of any transport communications or other service facilities should be carried out in a manner which maintains environmental quality.

D Requirements for infrastructure and services will be on a user pays basis where such users can be identified.

F the efficient provision of refuse disposal facilities will be encouraged.

31. Supporting information in relation to power, telecommunications has been provided as part of the application. Proposed assessment matters for subdivision include the consideration of the need for a waste transfer station when subdivision will result in more than 100 lots.

32. The plan change request briefly discusses the consideration of an onsite communal wastewater treatment plant and dismisses this idea as uneconomic and not necessary due to the ability of the land to support on site waste water

treatment systems. The provision of a communal system would require ongoing management by Council and therefore its ratepayers and would require significant investment to construct in the early stages of the development. However as the development of the land progresses there would be efficiencies for effluent to be processed communally. It is accepted that, with the appropriate assessment under the West Coast Regional Council rules adverse effects will be able to be mitigated and the effluent disposal able to comply with the Objectives and Policies.

33. The request outlines a proposal for the extension of Sanctuary Place to be constructed to the standard of the Westland District Council Code of Practice for Engineering Works. It is likely that in the near future, Westland District Council will fully adopt New Zealand Standard 4404 as a standard for engineering works within subdivisions. This reflects existing engineering work within the subdivision, which is to NZS4404, with some agreed departures. The plan change is therefore proposed to be amended in this regard.
34. The plan change request outlines in sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 alterations to the Settlement Character Methods and Anticipated Environmental Outcomes. These provisions seek to provide information within the Plan of the developer's vision and include phrases relating to high natural amenity, integration of buildings, night sky views, and minimal light pollution. This information is not contained elsewhere within the proposed changes to rules. It is noted that there is no statutory obligation to have methods or anticipated environmental outcomes within the Plan and the Council is considering whether these should be examined during the ongoing review of the Westland District Plan.
35. The proposed additional description of the Small Settlement Policy Unit contains a description of the vision of the developer. It is not considered necessary to add the entire sentence, and reference to the Kumara Junction Developments Ltd land could be made within the list of townships within the Small Settlement Policy Unit.
36. Overall, I concur with the applicant that the proposed plan change is in accordance with the objectives and policies of the Westland District Plan.



## **Assessment of Submissions**

37. There were 31 submissions received on Plan Change 8 and 26 further submissions. These are attached as Appendices B and C and the key issues raised in submissions are discussed below:

### **Effluent disposal and onsite cumulative effects.**

38. Four submissions raised concerns at the potential for cumulative effects of onsite effluent disposal on surrounding groundwater. Three of these submissions specifically raised these concerns in relation to the decreased allotment size enabled by the Plan Change. These submissions sought requirements for secondary treatment systems in order to mitigate these concerns. The plan change has been accompanied by an assessment undertaken by R Hall which states that the ground can accommodate soak hole treatment. In my view, unless the committee is of a mind to retain the allotment sizes at 5000 m<sup>2</sup>, sufficient information has been provided at this stage to ensure that no further provisions are required in the Plan Change relating to effluent disposal. It is likely that allotments adjoining Carsons Creek may require discharge consent from the West Coast Regional Council.
39. A submission has raised concerns that surrounding ground water takes will be contaminated. Further evidence was not provided in relation to this concern.
40. The Westland District Council has recently submitted to the West Coast Regional Council Land and River Plan suggesting that provisions were added to Rule 77 relating to cumulative effects of effluent disposal. This was not supported in recent decisions on the Plan. It is noted that the West Coast Regional Council and Community and Public Health did not submit after pre-application discussion. Individual on site soakage can be assessed during each stage of submission and no further additional rules are required to be added to the Plan.

### **Street lighting**

41. A number of submissions in support of the Plan Change sought to retain the character of the development through the prevention of street lighting. There are no proposed rules within the plan change that would direct or restrict the provision of street lighting within the development, apart from the anticipated environmental outcome within the settlement character policy. For completeness, as the plan change has a possible yield of over 250 allotments, serviced by one spine road, in Council's view street lighting will be necessary along Sanctuary Place. The focus of this street lighting would be at the intersections, and it is noted that no dwellings are proposed to access directly off Sanctuary Place so any street lighting will be screened by vegetation. The Council will not require street lighting along the roads off Sanctuary Place.

Further discussions around the provision of street lighting, including the possible use of bollard lighting, is more appropriately undertaken at the time of subdivision consent application. The control matters for subdivision include existing provision to enable this discussion. No further alteration to the District Plan is deemed necessary

### **Walkway to the beach**

42. Submitters supported the inclusion of a walkway to the beach shown on the Outline Development Plan. The sole provision within the plan change request that relates to the provision of the walkway is the Outline Development Plan (ODP), and no timeframe is given to when the walkway will be provided, however each stage of development will need to address compliance with the ODP and the developer now also has a clear direction of support from residents within the development. No further changes are necessary to be made to the plan change request. The Outline Development Plan should be approved depicting the walkway.

### **Retention of the vegetation buffers along the boundaries of the allotments**

43. The proposed provisions to ensure that the vegetation along the boundaries of each title is retained to screen the dwellings, or planted if such vegetation exists, is supported by the majority of submitters. This component of the plan change request is critical if the current character of the development is to be retained as development progresses. Current residents within the Plan change clearly value the existing character and amenity of the subdivision. Ensuring that the clearance of vegetation is restricted and that buffer zones are left along the boundary of the development is central to the plan change. It will lessen the dominance of what will become a significant housing development within Westland. The submissions should be accepted and the provisions inserted into the plan.

### **Traffic impacts and road access**

44. 12 submissions specifically raised the provision of a footpath and kerb and channeling within the plan change area. Similar to street lighting, there are no provisions within the plan change that specifically relate to the requirement or otherwise of a footpath or kerb and channeling. This level of detail would normally be contained in a subdivision consent. Due to the submissions received, the Westland District Council has given consideration to the specific standard of roading required within the future stages of the development. For completeness, it is the view of Council staff that future stages of subdivision within the proposal will be required to form a footpath along Sanctuary Place. At the time of subdivision consent, a discussion can occur with the developer as to whether this takes the form of a kerb and channel system, or the use of swales and a physically separated footpath. There will also be the opportunity to discuss whether or not the footpath is required to be sealed. Along the local

roads within the development, pedestrians and cyclists will share the carriageway with vehicles.

45. Speed limits were raised by submitters. It would not be appropriate to discuss provisions within the District Plan that control the operating speeds of roading within the District. This can be discussed at the time of future subdivision. This component of the submissions should not be accepted by Council.
46. One submitter considers that the existing roading within the plan change is unsafe, and that the roading requires upgrading. As discussed above, apart from a reference to the subdivision standard referred to when developing roading, all other detail of the roading within the subdivision is more efficiently dealt with through the subdivision process.

### **Heritage**

47. The New Zealand Historic Places Trust has submitted on the plan change and requested that a note be included with the Plan Change that ensures that the developer is aware of the provisions of the Historic Places Act and that there may be archaeological items in the vicinity of the Plan Change. This is a matter that Council usually identifies at subdivision stage. It would also be inappropriate to provide provisions within the District Plan providing a note on this particular site only. A note could be included with the Plan Change decision that has no statutory weight that would achieve the purpose that the Trust has requested.

## Section 32

48. As discussed previously, section 32 imposes a duty on local authorities to undertake a further assessment and evaluation of the alternatives benefits and costs of the subdivision before a decision is made under the First Schedule. The assessment of alternatives, benefits and costs of rezoning the site was included in the plan change request and notification and is appended to this report (Appendix E). A number of alternative options for achieving the purpose of the Plan Change are considered. These are to retain the status quo (option 2) or the development of the site under the existing zone provisions (option 3).

49. **Option 1: Plan Change 8 – Rezone from rural to residential**

*Effectiveness of achieving the purpose of the Act?*

Facilitating the continued development of a site with an established market, in a location that is able to mitigate the potential effects is directly providing for the purpose of the Act.

*Efficiency and Effectiveness of achieving the Objectives and Policies of the District Plan?*

The proposal is consistent with the current objectives and policies of the plan and will provide additional rules to ensure that the concept plan is adhered to. As no further Objectives and Policies are required, creating an additional zone would not provide greater efficiency. The current proposed rules require exact stormwater and servicing design to be considered during subdivision stage rather than being imposed as additional rules in the plan. These matters are matters that Council has retained control over during subdivision. The proposal is necessary for community wellbeing and viability, maintains environmental quality and amenity, enables provision of infrastructure and services and does not generate adverse effects.

*Benefits?* Additional provision of specific character of development within District. Retention or planting of indigenous vegetation through covenants and proposed provisions.

*Costs?* Indigenous vegetation will be cleared during the construction of the roads and building sites. Enabling development of a new settlement area in competition with existing settlements such as Kumara , potentially diverting potential development that would otherwise strengthen those communities. However, the specific character of the development is not replicated in the existing Small Settlement zones elsewhere in the Westland District. If cumulative effluent disposal causes effects on groundwater, this will adversely effect users of groundwater bores in the vicinity.

50. **Option 2: Status Quo**

*Effectiveness of achieving the purpose of the Act?*

Retaining the status quo would leave the front third of the land developed, and a new use would be required for the remainder of the site. Kumara Junction Developments have stated that they have existing demand for further development sites, and this would not be realized.

*Efficiency and Effectiveness of achieving the Objectives and Policies of the District Plan?*

The indigenous vegetation on site would be retained. The further development of the site is restricted.

*Benefits?* Rural land is retained on site.

*Costs?* Productive use of site will most likely require the removal of the indigenous vegetation to maximize available land on site.

51. **Option 3: Develop the site under the existing rural zone provisions.**

*Effectiveness of achieving the purpose of the Act?*

In order for Kumara Junction Developments to continue their planned development under the current plan provisions, a subdivision and land use consent would be required. It would be likely that, due to the scale, the applications would be publicly notified. This would lead to a piecemeal discussion with the community about effects of the proposal. The proposed plan change allows for clear consultation to be undertaken with the community to occur, and will provide certainty to the applicant, regardless of the outcome.

*Efficiency and Effectiveness of achieving the Objectives and Policies of the District Plan?*

The subdivision of a large scale development proposed by this plan change would not be supported by the objectives and encourages consideration through plan changes.

*Benefits?* If development is over 5000m<sup>2</sup>, site will stay in “rural’ use.

*Costs?* Productive use of site will most likely require the removal of the indigenous vegetation to maximize available land on site. This would not require resource consent from Council if the clearance proceeds progressively.

## **Conclusion:**

52. In my opinion, the PC 8 is in accordance with the RMA and the Westland District Plan objectives and policies, and can be approved subject to, and District Plan amendments as set out under recommendations below.

## **Recommendations:**

1. That PC 8 be adopted, subject to the following amendments:-
  - A note be added to the Plan Change decision stating the following:

“There are recorded archaeological sites in the vicinity of the proposed work. The applicant is advised to contact the New Zealand Historic Places Trust for further information. Work affecting archaeological sites is subject to a consent process under the Historic Places Act 1993. If any activity associated with this proposal, such as earthworks, fencing or landscaping, may modify, damage or destroy any archaeological site(s), an authority (consent) from the New Zealand Historic Places Trust must be obtained for the work prior to commencement. It is an offence to damage or destroy a site for any purpose without an authority. The Historic Places Act 1993 contains penalties for unauthorised site damage”
  - Proposed rule 6.2 (c) (iii) is amended to refer to the standard NZS4404.

“The construction and formation of the indicative roading shown on the Kumara Junction Developments Outline Development Plan in Section 5.3A and related local access roading within the development, provided any roading and associated services are designed, constructed and formed in accordance with **NZS4404**.”
2. The wording of the District Plan be altered to incorporate the new rules, explanation and descriptions as set out in the plan change application with the above amendments.
3. That decisions be made on the submissions and further submissions as follows:-
  - **Submission 1 – Mark Batty – Accept in part**.

The Plan Change proposal should be approved. No provisions are made to restrict street lighting.
  - **Submission 2- Graham Pullman – Accept in part**

The Plan Change proposal should be approved. No provisions are made to restrict street lighting.

- **Submission 3 – Evan McGill – reject**  
 The Plan Change is recommended to proceed. Information has been provided indicating in sufficient detail for this Plan Change that effluent disposal can be undertaken on site without contamination. Rural agricultural activities on adjoining titles are not impinged by the proposal.
- **Submission 4 – Ken Hill – reject**  
 The submission sought that the size of sections be retained at 5000m<sup>2</sup>. With provisions imposed on to retain vegetation, the amenity of the development will be able to be retained. It is not necessary to require secondary treatment at this stage, although these may be required by the West Coast Regional Council at the time of subdivision.
- **Submission 5 – Ila Lee – reject**  
 The submission sought that the size of sections be retained at 5000m<sup>2</sup>. With provisions imposed on to retain vegetation, the amenity of the development will be able to be retained. It is not necessary to require secondary treatment at this stage, although these may be required by the West Coast Regional Council at the time of subdivision
- **Submission 7 – Janene Fagan – accept in part**  
 The plan change should be approved. There could be adverse effects if the roading within the subdivision is not designed to an adequate standard and amendments have been recommended in this regard.
- **Submission 8 – Harold Lee – reject**  
 It is not considered necessary to require amendments to the wastewater provisions within the plan change.
- **Submission 9 – Sam Hartwig – accept in part**  
 The Plan Change should be approved and the existing character of the development retained. It is not appropriate for speed limits to be imposed through the District Plan.
- **Submission 10 – Jeni Blacktopp – accept in part**  
 Plan Change should be approved and the existing character retained. Provisions relating to adequate design of roading are suggested, but these do not relate to speed limits, nor specific requirements for the footpath.
- **Submission 11 – Tim Blacktopp – accept in part**  
 Plan Change should be approved and the existing character retained. Provisions relating to adequate design of roading are suggested, but these do not relate to speed limits, nor specific requirements for the footpath.
- **Submission 12 – Ann Baker – accept**

Plan Change approved and existing character retained. Provisions within the plan change will not relate to footpaths or street lighting specifically.

- **Submission 13 – Loraine and Kirk Haworth – accept**
- **Submission 14 – Graeme & Karen Odams – accept**
- **Submissions 15 – Dawn Nolan – accept**
- **Submissions 16- Ian Stewart – accept**
- **Submission 17 – Helen Ruston – accept**
- **Submission 18 – Amanda Matthews – accept**
- **Submission 19 – Jonathan Liu – accept**
- **Submission 20 – Gail Hutchby – accept**
- **Submission 21 – Craig Hartwig - accept**
- **Submission 22- Glenn Cockburn - accept**
- **Submission 23- Vicki Willmott - accept**
- **Submission 24- Elana Watson – accept**

Plan Change approved and existing character retained. Provisions within the plan change will not relate to footpaths or street lighting specifically.

- **Submission 25- Graeme Walcott - accept**  
Plan change will be approved.
- **Submission 27 – Lauren Ching & Alister Wells - accept**  
Plan Change approved and existing character retained. Provisions within the plan change will not relate to footpaths or street lighting specifically
- **Submission 28 – Louise & Steve Ross – accept**
- **Submission 29 – Murray & Sharon Jordan – accept**
- **Submission 30 – Lloyd Valentine- accept**  
Plan Change approved and existing character retained. Provisions within the plan change will not relate to footpaths or street lighting specifically
- **Submission 31 – New Zealand Historic Places Trust – accept**  
A note is proposed to be included in the plan change decision.



## **List of Appendices**

- Appendix A – Plan Change Concept Plan
- Appendix B – Summary of submissions
- Appendix C – Further submissions received
- Appendix D – Part II of the Resource Management Act 1991