

New Plymouth District Plan

Private Plan Change PPC18/00048

December 2018

Summary of Submissions Addendum

Wairau Road, Oakura Rezoning



Plan Change PPC18/00048: Wairau Road, Oakura Rezoning: Summary of Submissions and Decisions Requested by Submitter Addendum

Contents

Plan Change PPC18/00048: Wairau Road, Oakura Rezoning:	1
Summary of Submissions and Decisions Requested by Submitter Addendum.....	1
1. Introduction.....	2
2. Addendum to the Summary of Submissions and Decisions Sought	2
3. Further Submissions.....	2
4. Process From Here.....	3
5. Submitters	4
6. Summary Of Decisions Requested.....	4
Table 1: Pro Forma Submissions.....	5
Table 2: Summary of Individual Submissions.....	7
Appendix 1: List of Submitters and Contact Details.....	11

1. Introduction

Since notifying the summary of submissions, the Council has been contacted by some of the 27 submitters who did not provide contact details in their original submission. Contact details have now been provided by 19 of these submitters, and NPDC has now accepted these 19 submissions as complete. The Council is notifying this addendum document to the summary of submissions for those 19 submissions on Proposed Private Plan Change 48 (PPC18/0048) Wairau Road, Oakura Rezoning. This addendum and further submission process does not affect or change any other submissions or further submissions made on the plan change.

2. Addendum to the Summary of Submissions and Decisions Sought

Twenty-seven submissions were originally received on Plan Change 48 which contained no submitter contact details. A submission must contain the contact details of the person making the submission, or the name and address of an agent if someone has been employed to act on their behalf. Given no contact details were provided, these original submissions were considered incomplete and could not be accepted by the Council and included in the previous summary.

Following notification of the Summary of Submission Points by Submitter document, the Council was contacted by some of the 27 submitters who did not provide contact details querying why their submission was not included in the document. These submitters subsequently provided their contact details and requested their submissions be accepted. Since the original summary of submissions document was notified, the Council has obtained contact details for 19 of the 27 original submitters. Furthermore, for one original submission received it was initially believed that the submitter requested their details be withheld. The Council has subsequently been contacted by this submitter who has provided their contact details and wishes for their submission to be accepted. The Council has not been contacted by or been able to reach the remaining seven submitters.

This addendum contains a summary of the submission and decision requests for the 19 submissions plus those additional submissions with details initially withheld. These additional submissions are being notified for further submissions.

3. Further Submissions

The following people may make a further submission on the submissions included in this addendum, in the prescribed form:

- a) Any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; and
- b) Any person who has an interest in the plan change greater than the interest that the general public has; and
- c) The local authority itself.

A further submission may only express support or opposition to a matter raised in an original submission, and must provide reasons for supporting or opposing the matter in the original submission. The further submission must not raise new points. Further submissions must be in writing and be in the manner prescribed in Form 6 of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees and Procedure) Regulations 2003 and must state whether you want to be heard on your further submission. Further submission forms are available and can be viewed at:

- Civic Centre, Liardet Street, New Plymouth;
- Library and service centres at Bell Block, Inglewood and Waitara;
- Puke Ariki and community libraries; or
- Online at newplymouthnz.com/planchanges

Please send further submissions to New Plymouth District Council, Private Bag 2025, New Plymouth 4310, Attention: District Planning Team or email to submissions@npdc.govt.nz.

The closing date for receiving further submissions is 5pm on Friday 14 December 2018. Within five working days of lodging it with the Council, you must serve a copy of it on the person(s) who made the original submission(s).

4. Process From Here

Once the further submissions period has closed on 14 December, a hearing date will be set and an independent planning report will be produced by the Council. The planning report will provide an impartial assessment of the merits of these submissions, including whether the matters raised are valid considerations under the Resource Management Act (RMA). It will also contain any recommended amendments to the plan change to address matters raised by submitters.

Before a formal Council hearing is held, a pre-hearing meeting may be held to help clarify, mediate or facilitate a resolution on any matters raised in submissions.

The planning report will be circulated to all submitters and further submitters in advance of the formal Council hearing. At least 10 working days' notice will be given of the hearing date.

Anyone can attend the Council hearing, however only those submitters who have indicated that they wish to be heard will have the opportunity to speak. Submitters can nominate a representative or consultant to speak on their behalf. The Hearings Commissioners will consider all relevant matters before making a recommendation to the Council for a decision.

All submitters will receive formal notice of the decision on the plan change, including the reasons behind the decision reached. The decision will also be publicly notified.

Any submitter who is not satisfied with the decision has the further opportunity, under Clause 14 of Schedule 1 of the RMA, to lodge an appeal with the Environment Court.

5. Submitters

The table in Appendix 1 of this document provides the names and addresses of all those who had previously made a submission without providing contact details to the Council in relation to proposed Private Plan Change 48, and who have subsequently provided their details to the Council and have now had their submissions accepted. Each submission has also been assigned a unique reference number in accordance with the numbering of the Summary of Submission Points by Submitter document. The purpose of the table in Appendix 1 is to help any person who makes a further submission on a submission provided explicitly in this addendum to meet their legal obligation to supply a copy of their further submission to the person who made the original submission. The copy must be sent to the original submitter within five (5) working days of submitting the further submission to NPDC.

6. Summary Of Decisions Requested

The tables below in this document summarise the decisions requested by submitters on the proposed Private Plan Change 48 that were not originally included in the Summary of Submission Points by Submitter document. These tables are to enable people to establish whether a submission might be of interest to them. Please refer to the full submission for full details.

In addition to the reference numbers assigned to the submissions received (i.e. S2, refers to Submission Number 2), a unique numeric identifier (i.e. 2.01) has also been applied to the specific points/matters raised in each submission in order to provide greater specificity and extra clarity. This unique identifier should be specifically referenced in any further submission you may wish to make relating to an original submission. The submissions below have been summarised in numerical order.

Table 1: Pro Forma Submissions

As summarised in the original summary of submissions, many submitters on PPC18/00048 completed a template submission, referred to as pro forma submission. All of the 20 submissions in this addendum were a pro forma submission, through some submissions also included additional text. To minimise duplication and to be as concise as possible in this summary document, we have summarised the pro forma submissions in Table 1 below – this is the same summary of the pro forma submissions in the original summary of submission document. Where submissions contained identical information from the pro forma submission, we have provided a cross-reference to the pro forma submission (PF1) in the individual submissions summarised in Table 2 below. Pro forma submissions that contained additional specific or handwritten comments (i.e. in addition to the pro forma submission) are included in the individual submitter submission point summaries in Table 2.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
Pro Forma 1				
Multiple submitters (see Table 2 below which refers to each person who made a Pro Forma submission)				
PF1	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is not the most appropriate or suitable way to achieve the purpose of the RMA or the stated objectives of the plan change or the objectives of the existing New Plymouth District Plan. The proposal is not designed to accord with and assist, nor will it assist, the territorial authority to carry out its functions in order to achieve the purpose of the Act. The plan change will not properly give effect to, and is contrary to and inconsistent with, the Regional Policy Statement for Taranaki, the New Plymouth Coastal Strategy, the Oakura Structure Plan, the Land Supply Review 2007-2027 Final Framework for Growth, the Oakura Community Engagement Project Report 2014/16 and the Kaitake Community Plan: a thirty year vision and is not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the New Plymouth District Plan. The plan change will have significant adverse effects on the environment (including the quality of the environment) including (but not necessarily limited to) significant adverse: 	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Environmental, social and cultural effects. ○ Amenity values, landscape (including visual) and rural character effects. ○ Lighting and light overspill effects. ○ Noise, vibration and privacy effects. ○ Traffic and transport effects (including compromising the effective, efficient and safe land transport system in the public interest) and effects on the surrounding roading network (in terms of functioning, integrity, capacity and safety). ○ Infrastructure, services and community infrastructure effects. ○ Stormwater, sewage, water supply and wastewater effects. ○ Agricultural land (in terms of loss of and fragmentation of agricultural land) and soil. ○ Conservation effects. ○ Reverse sensitivity effects. ○ Earthworks effects. ○ Construction effects. ○ Cumulative effects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The adverse effects will not be, nor are capable of being, adequately or appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated. ● The proposal is not a sustainable use of the land resource the subject of the change, and overall the plan change will not be efficient or effective; neither does it properly consider alternatives. Further, there has been a lack of proper or any meaningful consultation. ● The plan change will not achieve sustainable management and is contrary to the purpose and principles of the Act. 	

Table 2: Summary of individual submissions

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
S384 Leonie Smith				
384.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter strongly opposes the building of more houses. The submitter believes the proposed amount will impact on the feel and specialness of Oakura Village. The submitter details that Oakura will become another suburb like Bell Block or Highlands Park. This is not what the submitter came to Oakura for. The submitter believes that Oakura's amenities will be overloaded e.g. water, roads, sewerage, etc, which the submitter believes will probably result in higher rates for the rest of the Oakura population. In addition, the submitter believes the development will contribute to the overcrowding of the school, which the submitter believes is already full.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S385 Heather Robyn Looker				
385.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concerns around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic congestion. • Environmental damage. <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S386 Jono Watts				
386.01	General - the plan Change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter has concerns regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overcrowding. <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
S387 Stephen John Butland				
387.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes the proposed development will have the following effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pressure on infrastructure, services. • Overcrowding. • Cheaper housing, social impact. <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S388 Marine Derore				
388.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter details that they do not see the benefit in this proposal and that it will not benefit Oakura's residents, or Oakura's environment. The submitter stresses that the proposed development is not suitable to Oakura Village, its residents want to keep it like it is and this is why it's value keeps going up. The submitter notes that Oakura might be one of the rare places left with green spaces, national park tracks and great community.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S389 Tony Graeme Willetts				
389.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter details that they do not think Oakura has the infrastructure to support this development. The submitter believes the proposed development will have a negative impact on Oakura's precious ecosystem/environment. As a parent, the submitter worries about how the development will affect Oakura's local schools.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
S393 Christine Gruys				
393.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter wants Oakura to be left as a village not a rapidly developed town with dense subdivision creating a completely new environment that Oakura is not prepared for. The submitter also opposes for the reasons outlined in Pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S396 Shaun Thomas Churchill				
396.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S404 Sharon Thomas				
404.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S405 Helen Lamb				
405.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S406 Michelle Jane Beekman				
406.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S407 Neal Pullen				
407.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S410 Stephanie Marie Griffith				
410.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
S415 Jarran Neil Colman				
415.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S416 Jack Kurta				
416.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S418 Sarah Churchill				
418.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S419 John Briesemann				
419.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S420 Christina Wells				
420.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.
S433 Glenda May Tyrrell				
433.01	General - the plan change in its entirety	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes that Wairau Road should remain rural zoning. The submitter notes that major roadworks and infrastructure would be required and the traffic generated by such a large subdivision on State Highway 3 would cause major problems. The submitter stresses that the intermediate years at Oakura School would have to move to New Plymouth, which would disrupt the present cohesiveness that is currently enjoyed.</p> <p>The submitter opposes for the reasons outlined in pro forma submission PF1 (refer Table 1 above).</p>	Reject/decline the plan change in its entirety.

Appendix 1: List of Submitters and Contact Details

Submitter No.	Submitter Name	Submitter Address		Submitter Email
384	Leonie Smith	6b Donnelly Street	OAKURA	
385	Heather Robyn Looker	291 Surrey Hill Road RD 4	NEW PLYMOUTH 4374	rayandheather@farmside.co.nz
386	Jono Watts			jonno@energyndt.co.nz
387	Stephen John Butland	PO Box 610	OAKURA 4345	mdelfos@xtra.co.nz
388	Marine Derore			ziglionemarina@gmail.com
389	Tony Graeme Willetts			rinnwilletts@gmail.com
393	Christine Gruys	21 Donnelly Street	OAKURA	crisseg@outlook.com
396	Shaun Thomas Churchill	84 Wairau Road	OAKURA	shaunchurchill@xtra.co.nz
404	Sharon Thomas	1469 South Road RD 4	NEW PLYMOUTH 4374	shazraybee@gmail.com
405	Helen Lamb	15 Donnelly Street	OAKURA	
406	Michelle Jane Beekman			beekmanmichelle@gmail.com
407	Neal Pullen	2 Manuka Place	NEW PLYMOUTH	
410	Stephanie Marie Griffith	88 Buller Street	NEW PLYMOUTH	steph.griffiths@hotmail.com
415	Jarran Neil Colman	22 Downe Street	NEW PLYMOUTH 4310	
416	Jack Kurta	36 Hamblyn Street	New Plymouth	jack@taranaharcourts.co.nz
418	Sarah Churchill	84 Wairau Road	Oakura	sarahchurchill@xtra.co.nz
419	John Briesemann			johnbrieseman@hotmail.com
420	Christina Wells			christinawells26@yahoo.co.nz
433	Glenda May Tyrrell	292 Plymouth Road RD 4	NEW PLYMOUTH 4374	glendamay@mail.com