

INTRODUCTION

My name is Theresa Wilcox. My husband and I moved to Waitara from New Plymouth in 2002, nearly 19 years ago to escape the urban living of close neighbours. We wanted a lifestyle block providing us with space, privacy and less of hearing neighbours phone conversations. More importantly, we did not want views of neighbouring houses.

We purchased a 1.63 hectares (4 acres) block of land which had a small established horticulture business. We now graze sheep, and our neighbour uses the land on rotation with their own property to graze their horses. Our property is surrounded by rural blocks and sits opposite the Johnston Street site.

I make my non expert submission on the Private Plan Change 49 (PPC) to rezone the land by Johnston Street from Rural Environment area (with future urban development overly) to Residential Environment Area A and open space as per the structure plan.

I am opposed to the proposed PPC. I am not against urban development; I just believe it must be in the right spot and a natural extension of its environment. The proposed site does not run naturally along the Waitara township boundary. It only has a minuscule overlay to Waitara and otherwise it is surrounded by rural zoned farming land. It is a protruding invasion into the rural environment.

I am passionate about Waitara and I have always viewed it as a boutique sea and river side township with so much potential.

The areas I will cover are

1. Lack of Consultation
2. Reverse Sensitivity/Visual Amenity
3. Future Urban Overly
4. Roading
5. Site Plan
6. Wastewater
7. Recommendations to the Commissioners

LACK OF CONSULATION

Point 5.1 S42A of the New Plymouth District Council (NPDC) report, notes the applicant consulted with adjoining landowners prior to the plan change request being formally lodged. This is not correct. As an interested party, directly affected by the PPC, I was not consulted with prior to the plan change request being formally lodge with the NPDC. At no time had I been verbally approached from the applicant or held any discussion on the plan change directly with the landowner.

The first time I became aware of the PPC change was when I accidentally dropped a pile of junk mail destined for the recycle bin and happened to firstly pick up the flyer from Landcorp and I took a look at it. I was in shock. My immediate thought was, I am going to lose my rural environment. I had dated the flyer as received 22nd November 2018.

According to S42A, on 22 November 2018, the very same date I had dated the flyer, Hareb Investments Limited lodged a PPC request with NPDC. Does junk mail constitute consultation?

The only consultation I have had on the proposed private land change was a pre-hearing meeting called by the NPDC and through the submission process. I note on 20th January I contacted, by email, Kathryn Hooper for the reports and application.

There has been an imbalance in consultation, as a directly affected party I would appreciate the same level of engagement in meaningful consultation with the applicant as has been given to other interested parties.

REVERSE SENSITIVITY/ VISUAL AMENITY

The proposed site is surrounded by a rural area. As such comes rural activities, for example

Machinery noises

Maize Cropping

Rural Smells

Poultry farming and associated odours

Burn offs

Dairying activities - Calf season

These all expose rural landowners to complaints from urban neighbours. Conversely my property is in line of site to the proposed subdivision, I moved to a rural environment to get away from this.

There has not been enough done by the applicant to mitigate reverse sensitivity and visual amenity to properties on Raleigh Street.

Mr Bain in his report "conclude rezoning of the site will create permanent landscape change for all of the surrounding neighbours" unquote. Noting amenity effects would affect the neighbours on Johnson street more than Raleigh Street. My property is slightly set back however I still have line of vision directly onto the site from several angles, not to mention site of coastal sea. To say I am less affected from this site than Johnston street neighbours is incorrect.

Larger lot sizes are proposed on the site plan for rural neighbours on Johnston street side and North side however again as a rural neighbour on Raleigh street, this option has not been proposed to ease the urban / rural conflict. I would just like to draw your attention that both Johnson Street neighbours and Raleigh Street neighbours are separated by a road, both will suffer visual impact and reverse sensitively.

The planting of trees does not serve as a buffer from urban to rural. Trees are lined through urban townships as a form of beautifying an urban street and as such the lining of trees (spells) says urban not rural. As noted on the site plan tree planting is to increase the amenity of the entry experience into Waitara. Second trees can hinder line of vision for driving including when exiting/entering driveways and of course ongoing maintenance.

It was suggested to add a "No Complaints" covenants to mitigate effects of reverse sensitivity with surrounding rural zone. I see on S42 amendment, under the proposed rules, this has been crossed out. I recommend this be reinstated and the covenant must be registered on the title of the land and this would need to be done before land/house package is sold.

The Rules mention Roof Colour & Cladding Colour and recommends colour controls be placed on roof colours for dwellings along Johnston street road boundary – the same should apply along Raleigh Street.

FUTURE URBAN OVERLAY

My comments are as follows on the Future Urban Development overlay (FUD) on the site. I would like to say

1. I personally had no idea the land and FUD overlay until this PPC process started
2. I moved to my property some years before the land area was designated with FUD overlay.
3. A FUD overly just identifies at a point in time an area, for potential urban development it does not give a certainty or a right to urban development. It is there to allow provision for the interim control of specific land use activities
4. This status can change at any time on review of the district plan, it is not a given
5. For the record I support the NPDC in their proposed district plan to remove the FUD on this site and the sites opposite Borthwick Street on Waitara township side.
6. The NPDC S42A report states there is 49.1 hectares of undeveloped residential zoned land in Waitara (675 Lots), Stage 3 of Aratapu Street in Waitara will creates 55 lots, a development proposed on Bayley Street for up to 60 lots.
7. In addition, there is continued construction of dwellings in Bell Block, Whalers Gate and Marfell areas with about 68 KiwiBuild Homes being constructed. (PLC10/00025) About 48 hectares is being proposed to be rezoned in Cowling Road, Tukapa street and Frankley Road to Residential A Environment Areas. Areas along Smart Road have FUD. This is in addition to infills within the district and observation of sections being subdivided. To say the NPDC are not meeting the needs of housing capacity, would be incorrect.

ROADING

This is a major area of concern. From my nearly 20 years of observation Raleigh street, as a gateway into Waitara, services motor vehicle, buses, trucks, campervans, livestock movements, tankers, cyclists, Vehicles towing trailers, horse floats, motor boats etc (Waitara Wharf is extremely popular for launching boats). The point here is the road is at capacity to support existing traffic flow.

Natasha Reid of New Zealand Transport Authority (NZTA) noted funding has been received for construction of the Tate Road & Princess Street roundabouts, with construction commencing early 2022 with completion end of 2024. This is nearly four years away, provided everything goes to plan. There is still lack of information on whether Neilson Street will be closed off. At this stage, the SH3 plan shows it as no right hand turn only. This means traffic heading south toward New Plymouth from Waitara will either head out from Princess street or Raleigh Street, adding additional stress on Raleigh Street.

This imposes further traffic onto Raleigh Street. Then on top of this is a vehicle traffic from a possible additional 100 households. Even an additional 50 lot development would add additional stress to Raleigh Street.

With this all means

1. Major disruptions to traffic flow as the roundabouts are construction over a prolong period.
2. Heavy machinery and increased noise levels from construction
3. Heavy investment required for Raleigh street upgrade – I do not know if this is even on the NPDC funding plan
4. Ongoing safety issues
5. The propose site plan only having footpaths along Raleigh street on the West side.

What I am trying to say is Raleigh street is a gateway from SH3 into Waitara, it needs to remain sparse so as not to congest the gateway and having the lifestyle properties and rural environment it currently has, support this.

It has been raised to reduce the speed restriction from 80km per hour to 50km per hour along Raleigh Street (although this is for other authorities to implement). I comment:

- I appreciated this reduction from a possible safety perspective however reducing the speed further diminishes the rural zone.
- The current 80km will allow a natural traffic flow from SH3 once the speed reduction to 80km/hour is implemented on SH3
- It is not the speed that is the real issue it is the roading infrastructure on Raleigh Street, which cannot support increased traffic flow.
- The reason I can see 50km zone is being pushed is not really because of safety or what is appropriate for Raleigh Street gateway into Waitara, but so the access roads off the site plan are within planning requirements distance from Johnston Street end and Ranfurly street end and so the subdivision can commence prior the SH3 upgrade being completed.

If you can appreciate I do not fully understand the meaning of the Rule titles, but if I am reading the amendment to the proposed rules correctly, it has been agreed NPDC has the ability to either grant or decline the subdivision based on the potential effects of traffic safety prior to completion of SH3 upgrade, where speed restriction is more than 50km per hour and with no written approval from NZTA (which means subdivision can occur prior to completion of SH3 upgrade). It also means subdivision can occur where speed restriction is less than 50km per hour without consideration of the effects on traffic safety.

I object to this. In the best interest of safety, traffic management, I recommend no subdivision activity occur until such time as the SH3 upgrade has been completed (or go to Non-Complying Activity). I do not understand how the subdivision can take priority over traffic safety.

SITE PLAN

Comments regarding the site plan as follows.

In the residents pre hearing meeting Residents on Johnston Street, which back onto the site, noted they have conditions on their titles that specify their fence is their responsibility and that they have ownership (i.e., no joint ownership of fence with the neighbour).

As per Mr Bain report, 70% sites between Tate Road and Waitara residential boundary are about 1000m².

As a natural continuation of housing along Raleigh Street, mitigation of reverse sensitivity for rural properties on Raleigh Street, in keeping with larger sections sizes of Waitara township, and allowing for a more open environment along Raleigh Street as a gateway into Waitara, I would like to see larger lots of about 1000m² along Raleigh Street from Johnston Street end to Borthwick Street.

Mr Bain also noted "A road link from Johnston Street was also considered in order to avoid two entrances off Raleigh Street, but this was rejected, in part, on potential amenity traffic effects on residents of Johnston Street."

Firstly, the reason this was rejected, as per comment made by Kathryn Hooper residents Pre Hearing meeting, was it was going to cost too much.

I would like to see the access road near the corner of Raleigh street and Johnston street be moved to exit off Johnston street. This reduces number of exists onto Raleigh Street. Second the proposed access road is right opposite my property to the extent that at night I will exposed to vehicle lights directly into my house. Repositioning the access road on to Johnston street would mean it is opposite farmland and not a domestic dwelling therefore actually not impacting on amenity traffic effects on residents on Johnston Street.

On lot sizes. I disagree people are wanting to live on smaller sections. The issue is larger lots are becoming less available due to planning requirements.

WASTEWATER

My only comment here is in an article which appeared in Stuff dated 26 October 2020 where Central Government has given \$37 million for the NPDC wastewater treatment plant to replace the plants ageing thermal dryer. We have an aging treatment plant and increasing demand on its use. I can only rely on the experts on the Three Waters that this infrastructure can support current and future (2-5 years) proposed urban subdivisions.

In summer we are facing water restrictions earlier and earlier to conserve water supply. Increase urban subdivision is only going to add more pressure on water supply during this time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I respectfully make the following recommendations for the Commissioners to consider:

1. Reject the Private Plan Change in its Entirety.

However, should the Commissioners recommend to the NPDC to proceed with PPC then I respectfully make the following recommendations for consideration:

2. The same reverse sensitivity and visual amenity mitigation factors that apply to Johnston Street apply to Raleigh Street.
3. Increase lot sizes to average 1000m² from corner of Johnston Street to end of Borthwick Street.
4. Move the access road on Raleigh Street at Johnston Street end to Johnston Street.
5. Right hand turning bay into Borthwick Street
6. Reinstate the "No Complaints" covenants to mitigate effects of reverse sensitivity with surrounding rural zone. And it must be registered on the title of the land and this must be done before land is sold. Although this is not to be an exclusive option to mitigate Reverse Sensitivity.
7. No subdivision activity to occur until such time as SH3 upgrade has been completed.

