



# Summary of Submissions

## Johnston Street, Waitara Rezoning



Te Kaunihera-ā-Rohe o Ngāmotu  
**New Plymouth  
District Council**



# Plan Change PPC18/00049: Johnston Street, Waitara Rezoning: Summary of Submissions and Decisions Requested by Submitter

## Contents

Plan Change PPC18/00049: Johnston Street, Waitara Rezoning:.....	1
Summary of Submissions and Decisions Requested by Submitter .....	2
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	3
<b>2. Further Submissions</b> .....	3
<b>3. Process from here</b> .....	4
<b>4. Submitters</b> .....	4
<b>5. Summary of Decisions Requested</b> .....	5
<b>Table 1: Summary of individual submissions</b> .....	6
Appendix 1: List of Submitters and Contact Details.....	30

## 1. Introduction

This document, Summary of Submissions, summarises the decisions requested or inferred for each submission received on the Proposed District Plan Change 49 (PPC18/00049) Johnston Street, Waitara Rezoning. Where no decision has been specifically requested, Council Officers have where possible, inferred the decision requested from the text of the submission.

The Proposed District Plan Change 49 was publicly notified on 25 June 2019 with the period for submissions closing on 23 July 2019.

A total of 18 submissions were received in relation to Proposed District Plan Change 49 and this report provides a summary of those submissions in accordance with Clause 7 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

Full copies of the submissions are available and can be viewed at:

- Civic Centre, Liardet St, New Plymouth;
- Library and service centres at Bell Block, Inglewood and Waitara;
- Puke Ariki and community libraries; or
- Online at [newplymouthnz.com/planchanges](http://newplymouthnz.com/planchanges)

## 2. Further Submissions

The following persons may make a further submission, 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 of submission. 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 at the above listed locations.

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](mailto:submissions@npdc.govt.nz).

**The closing date for receiving further submissions is 5pm Monday 2 September 2019** and 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).

### 3. Process from here

Once the Further Submission period has closed (2 September), a hearing date will be set and a Planning Report identifying and summarising all the submissions received will be produced. The Planning Report will provide an impartial assessment of the merits of these submissions, including whether the matters raised are valid considerations under the 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 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.

### 4. Submitters

The table in Appendix 1 of this document provides the names and addresses for service of all those who made a submission in relation to Proposed District Plan Change 49. Each submission has also been assigned a unique reference number. The purpose of the table in Appendix 1 is to help any person who makes a further submission 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 New Plymouth District Council.

## 5. Summary of Decisions Requested

The tables below in this document summarise the decisions requested or inferred by submitters on Proposed District Plan Change 49. These tables are to enable people to establish whether a submission might be of interest to them. The summary is not a substitute for inspecting the original submission itself, and it is recommended that this is done once you have identified any submissions of particular interest.

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(s) 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.

A submission (#17) requests a decision to rezone their land to residential – submissions can only cover matters within the scope of the Proposed Plan Change 49 which is limited to the site of the plan change, therefore this request is considered outside scope. However, this submission point is included for completeness.

Table 1: Summary of individual submissions

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S1 Central House Movers</b>				
1.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Support	The submitter believes the future growth for the district is needed.	That the proposed private plan change be approved in its entirety.
<b>S2 Justine Lehmann</b>				
2.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Support	The submitter believes the proposed development will be hugely beneficial for the community and that the rezoning should go ahead as planned. The submitter comments that Waitara needs this boost to its economy and infrastructure.	That the proposed private plan change be approved in its entirety.
<b>S3 Michael Miners</b>				
S3.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Support	<p>The submitter declares their association with the applicant in a professional capacity in the supply of banking services. The submitter details that there is no suggestion of a gain being made personally were the plan change to progress as presented.</p> <p>The submitter details that the applicant has made a significant contribution to the improvement in quality and supply of residential housing in the Waitara District through his in-fill building activity.</p> <p>The submitter believes the proposal as presented represents a superb opportunity for the NPDC to meet the objectives of its Future Urban Growth plans in a logical location both socially, economically and infrastructurally.</p> <p>The submitter notes that there will be an onus on the local authority and NZTA to invest in roading, particularly at the intersection with SH3 – although the submitter already believes there is.</p>	That the proposed private plan change be approved in its entirety.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S4 Gary and Marlene Malcolm</b>				
S4.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Support	The submitter believes that Waitara needs new housing, that there is a shortage of accommodation and that the proposed development would be great for Waitara.	That the proposed private plan change be approved in its entirety.
<b>S5 Julie Anne Weston</b>				
5.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the plan change if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A safe turning bay is created for turning into Borthwick Street</li> <li>• A speed restriction of 50 km's per hour is put in place</li> <li>• A footpath is put in from the start of the subdivision into Waitara township on Raleigh Street</li> <li>• If the submitter's section is also available legally to be divided into 350m<sup>2</sup> sections if required</li> <li>• Footpaths are provided on Raleigh Street</li> <li>• Put acoustic glass in neighbouring houses (including the submitters) to compensate for noise of earthmoving, construction extra traffic noise</li> <li>• A green space is created on the proposed road frontage on Raleigh Street</li> <li>• Street lighting is provided.</li> </ul>	Should the plan change be approved, the requested infrastructure is provided and changes to the submitter's property are made.
5.02	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Support in part	The submitter questions whether it is safe to have vehicles exiting onto Raleigh Street.	The plan change should not be given the go ahead before sufficient services and infrastructure are in place.
<b>S6 Colin Cameron</b>				
6.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Support	The submitter believes that the proposed development is exactly what North Taranaki needs to increase the supply of affordable housing for people trying to get on the property ladder. The submitter details that the location of the proposed development will boost Waitara.	That the proposed private plan change be approved in its entirety.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S7 Kathleen Weston</b>				
7.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Support in part	<p>The submitter wants to see the following changes made to the proposed plan change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sections on Raleigh Street should be 'larger lots' as a buffer to rural neighbours</li> <li>• The internal road should enter from Johnston Street and exit lower Raleigh Street</li> <li>• Upgrade of Raleigh Street and Borthwick Street intersection, to include a right turning bay on Raleigh Street into Borthwick Street</li> <li>• A footpath on Raleigh Street for the length of subdivision – Johnston Street to Ranfurly Street.</li> </ul>	Should the plan change be approved, design changes are made and requested infrastructure is provided. The internal road should enter and exit from Johnson Street and Ranfurly Street for safety.
<b>S8 Iain Robertson</b>				
8.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Support	The submitter believes the demand for housing in North Taranaki is very tight. The submitter details that Waitara is a great value area and that this development will allow many people to get into the housing market.	That the proposed private plan change be approved in its entirety.
<b>S9 Brett and Anne MacDonald</b>				
9.01	Section 1.3 - Vision, Table 2.2, Section 17.3 Additional traffic, Section 9.8 Traffic Report, Section 6.3.1 and Section 9.7 Character of area.	Oppose in part	The submitters believe that the area should keep its rural character as much as possible and agree with the larger section buffer zone along rural boundaries. However, the submitters query, with two landscape plans provided, one showing more sections than the other, they wonder which plan will actually be implemented. The submitters' preference is the plan with fewer sections as these proposed sections directly adjoin the submitters' sections and it would affect their current rural outlook and character.	The plan change should not be given the go ahead before sufficient services and infrastructure are in place.



Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
9.02	Section 1.3 - Vision, Table 2.2, Section 17.3 Additional traffic, Section 9.8 Traffic Report, Section 6.3.1 and Section 9.7 Character of area.	Oppose in part	<p>The submitters detail that the ambiguity of the two plans also affects the traffic effects that any new subdivision will cause to Raleigh Street, Johnston Street and the SH3/ Raleigh Street intersection. The traffic table provided from 2015 does not reflect current traffic movements.</p> <p>The submitters believe the proposed slip lanes into the new subdivision accesses with nothing in the Johnston Street/ Raleigh Street intersection will cause confusion and be a safety risk.</p> <p>The submitter believes the statement 'not anticipated to have any discernible impact on safety or performance of the road' is incorrect.</p> <p>The submitter notes that despite promises over time, by both Council and Government to spend money to fix the known road issues identified in the immediate area of this proposed plan, there are still no concrete decisions or time frames as to exactly what will be done and when.</p> <p>The submitter details that until these changes are made and in place they believe it would not be prudent to making significant plan changes such as this plan change proposal, which would affect not only current and any new land owners, but all road users.</p>	The plan change should not be given the go ahead before sufficient services and infrastructure are in place.
9.03	Section 1.3 - Vision, Table 2.2, Section 17.3 Additional traffic, Section 9.8 Traffic	Oppose in part	The submitter is also concerned that Council has identified issues in the downstream of this area with both storm water and sewerage infrastructure. Further pressure should not be added to what the submitter deems to be an already struggling system by adding more connections.	The plan change should not be given the go ahead before sufficient services and infrastructure are in place.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
	Report, Section 6.3.1 and Section 9.7 Character of area.			
9.04	Section 1.3 - Vision, Table 2.2, Section 17.3 Additional traffic, Section 9.8 Traffic Report, Section 6.3.1 and Section 9.7 Character of area.	Oppose in part	The submitters detail that once sufficient services and infrastructure are in place, this would enhance the value of the area and township as a whole, and is worth getting right first, for the benefit of all landowners and ratepayers. The submitter believes this plan change area is one of the gateways to Waitara town and done well, it would showcase the benefits of living in the area.	The plan change should not be given the go ahead before sufficient services and infrastructure are in place.
<b>S10 Marilyn and Pat Cadle</b>				
10.01	Section 1.3 – Vision, Section 2.2 – Table 2, Section 1.7.3, Section 9.8 – Traffic ITA Report, Section 1.7.7, Section 6.3.1, Section 9.7.	Oppose in part	The submitter raises issues with specific matters in the plan change document including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 1.3 Vision – the submitter notes that in regard to road frontage lots description that only lots exiting onto Raleigh Street are noted as being road frontage sections. There is no mention of Johnston Street lots.</li> <li>• Section 2.2 - Table 2 – the submitter notes that 25 road frontage lots exiting onto Raleigh Street are indicated. However, large lots on Johnston Street are not labelled as road frontage.</li> <li>• Section 9.8 – Traffic ITA Report – The submitter notes in regard to Appendix F that the Landscape Plan L1.0 Revision 01 – from Traffic Report differs from the Landscape Plan GA5.0 Revision 01 regarding proposed number of sections on Johnston Street. The submitter believes that this is misleading and confusing – and affects report results.</li> </ul>	The plan change should not be given the go ahead before sufficient services and infrastructure are in place.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 6.3.1 – the submitter is concerned regarding the adverse effects on the character of the area.</li> <li>Section 9.7 – the submitter is concerned regarding reverse sensitivity and the lifestyle blocks and rural activities adjacent.</li> </ul>	
10.02	Section 1.3 – Vision, Section 2.2 – Table 2, Section 1.7.3, Section 9.8 – Traffic ITA Report, Section 1.7.7, Section 6.3.1, Section 9.7.	Oppose in part	The submitters contend that the area in question should keep its rural character and the larger sections sizes along the boundary could help with this, as would the water feature and planting suggested in the proposal.	The plan change should not be given the go ahead before sufficient services and infrastructure are in place.
10.03	Section 1.3 – Vision, Section 2.2 – Table 2, Section 1.7.3, Section 9.8 – Traffic ITA Report, Section 1.7.7, Section 6.3.1, Section 9.7.	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter raises issues with traffic and safety matters in the plan change document including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed zoning change will adversely affect the traffic movements, safety and travel of existing and new residents particularly on Johnston Street, Raleigh Street and SH3 intersection. This is not addressed in the request.</li> <li>The submitter details there is no indication on the Landscape or Structure plans, i.e. through right of way access lanes, or PPC report that sections exit onto Johnston street. This is only mentioned in the ITA Report.</li> <li>The submitter is concerned between the two Landscape Plan’s discrepancy in regard to total rural lots and the size of these lots. This has caused confusion and it will affect the level of traffic volume being created.</li> <li>The submitter highlights, as noted in the ITA report, that to accommodate two-way traffic on Johnston Street, opposing vehicles have to slow and use the berm.</li> <li>The submitter notes that the traffic table from 2015 is outdated, with there now being more properties and vehicle</li> </ul>	The plan change should not be given the go ahead before sufficient services and infrastructure are in place.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
			<p>movement. The submitter is concerned regarding the increased traffic on a narrow secondary road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The effects will flow onto Raleigh Street, given the anticipated vehicle movements from Johnston Street, extra roads and housing. There is no turning bay or slip lane provision for Johnston Street.</li> <li>• The submitter does not agree that there will be no discernible impact on safety or performance of the road or intersection with Raleigh Street.</li> </ul>	
10.04	Section 1.3 – Vision, Section 2.2 – Table 2, Section 1.7.3, Section 9.8 – Traffic ITA Report, Section 1.7.7, Section 6.3.1, Section 9.7.	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter has concerns regarding the potential ecological impact of the proposed development and the loss of rural character and reverse sensitivity. Their concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the report only mentions two native birds on the property, yet the submitter has regularly seen 12+ species of birds on their adjacent property.</li> <li>• The development will have an effect on rural native character which attracts these species. Increased development could mean these species are lost</li> <li>• There is no mitigation of risk of wandering dogs from the proposed subdivision on stock on Johnston Street, other than fencing on the northern end.</li> </ul>	The plan change should not be given the go ahead before sufficient services and infrastructure are in place.
10.05	Section 1.3 – Vision, Section 2.2 – Table 2, Section 1.7.3, Section 9.8 – Traffic ITA Report, Section 1.7.7, Section 6.3.1, Section 9.7.	Oppose in part	The submitters believe that the land in question should remain rural until all infrastructure is in place to handle the additional traffic safety and service requirements.	The plan change should not be given the go ahead before sufficient services and infrastructure are in place.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S11 Ross Alistair Johnston</b>				
11.01	Section 9.7	Oppose in part	The submitter notes that in their experience, to date they have received no complaints about agricultural related activities from their urban neighbours. The submitter believes that mitigating any risk of reverse sensitivity with a 1.2m high wooden fence is inadequate, making reference to Figure 16.	The submitter seeks a change to the proposed fencing provisions to require full (urban) legal height fences be constructed.
11.02	Sections 1.7.3, section 3.6, section 9.6, section 9.8 and Figure 10.	Oppose in part	The submitter believes that the effects of additional traffic on Johnston Street has not been given enough consideration. No mention is made of other vehicle use i.e. daily milk tanker collection, heavy agricultural machinery, etc as they interact with urban vehicles on a narrow road. Concerns are also raised regarding road-edge letterboxes and damage to berms.	The submitter seeks a requirement for Raleigh Street to be widened to allow for safe use by different vehicles at night and the removal of all letterboxes at the road edge.
<b>S12 Powerco Limited</b>				
12.01	General - the Plan Change in its entirety	Neutral	<p>The submitter seeks to ensure that Council and applicant are aware of Powerco's existing assets in the area and the future supply of electricity and gas to the proposed lots. Appendix A and B of their submission details Powerco's existing gas and electrical assets.</p> <p>To ensure adequate supply to the PPC49 area, it is necessary to have some forewarning and plan for any necessary new assets i.e. lines, poles, gas pipes etc and the establishment of locations for utility street furniture/ above-ground assets.</p> <p>Powerco can supply power to this new residential development from their substations in either Bell Block or Waitara West, however approximately 0.9km if overhead lines will need to be upgraded.</p>	<p>The submitter has existing gas and electricity assets within the area and seeks to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are able to continue to operate, maintain, upgrade and access these assets.</li> <li>• The identification of future residential growth areas shows potential future service provision.</li> <li>• To enable a more orderly and timely provision of electricity and gas supply, the submitter should be contacted to facilitate the provision of services in concert with</li> </ul>

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
			<p>Powerco currently has capacity to supply the gas, without any upgrades. There are existing gas pipes in Raleigh Street, as shown in Appendix A . Any removal or relocation of Powerco’s assets needs to be done by a Powerco approved contractor.</p> <p>Existing electricity assets are located in the plan change area and the submitter seeks recognition of these existing assets, to ensure these are considered when undertaking any future works and to avoid adverse effects on these assets. There is a need to manage any work or planting in the immediate vicinity of network utilities that may pose a risk to, now, or in the future on, the operation of the network, in accordance with industry standards.</p>	development and to allow for any necessary upgrades.
<b>S13 Theresa Wilcox</b>				
13.01	Point 1.1- The change of Planning Map B40 (included in Volume 3 – Maps of Operative New Plymouth District Plan) to rezone Lot 3 Deposited Plan 446773 as per the Structure Plan in Appendix A, and Drawing No: GA6.0 Structure Plan.	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the Private Plan Change and rezoning of the land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitters property is opposite the subject site on Raleigh Street. The submitter and her husband purchased their property for its rural amenity, small horticulture business, to escape urban condensed living hassles and to operate a small farming activity.</li> <li>• The proposed rezoning and potential development of urban dwellings straight opposite their property will have adverse lifestyle and cultural well-being effects.</li> <li>• New Plymouth District is not short of urban growth areas and Council is meeting its responsibility to ensure there is an adequate supply of areas within the district to meet urban development demand.</li> <li>• The submitter notes the FUD is only a temporary classification until the next district plan review and under the Draft Digital District Plan it is proposed to remove the FUD on the subject</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
			<p>site and sites north of Borthwick Street. The submitter understands NPDC analysis identified other potential areas within the district and Waitara as being better suited for development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Rural Lifestyle Zone could be an option that is explored by the PPC. The Draft District Plan is looking to introduce minimum 4000m<sup>2</sup> to 1-hectare size lifestyle developments.</li> <li>• The submitter does not believe that the PPC meets Issue 1 and Objective 1 of the District Plan for a variety of reasons including: incompatibility with the rural character of the area, diminished neighbouring amenity, a negligible overlay, it not being a natural fit for urban extension and inconsistency with the Operative District Plan.</li> <li>• The PPC will enable urban – rural activity conflict, including complaints from urban dwellers on rural activities.</li> <li>• The submitter is concerned with the effects of light levels from urban residential areas, on rural amenity and sleep disturbance, and the prolonged construction effects.</li> </ul>	
13.02	Point 1.1- The change of Planning Map B40 (included in Volume 3 – Maps of Operative New Plymouth District Plan) to rezone Lot 3 Deposited Plan 446773 as per the Structure Plan in Appendix A, and	Oppose	<p>The submitter is particularly concerned about the traffic effects. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SH3 Waitara to Bell Block upgrade proposes no right hand turn in or out of Nelson Street. This means residents heading south or returning from the north will exit/entry via Raleigh Street.</li> <li>• Traffic volume along Raleigh Street will increase from the SH3 upgrade and the PPC dwellings. There will be a compound effect in traffic volume, traffic noise and pedestrian safety as a result of the PPC, as well as the existing adverse effects of existing traffic.</li> <li>• Additional traffic will further reduce rural amenity.</li> </ul>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
	Drawing No: GA6.0 Structure Plan.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The roading infrastructure (along Raleigh Street) is not in place to support existing traffic let alone further traffic i.e. no street lighting, footpaths to support pedestrian use, no cycling lanes (also not provided in the development) and no kerbing between Stafford Street and SH3 Intersection onto Raleigh Street, exposing the area to traffic hazards. Reducing the speed is not.</li> <li>It is important to maintain the area surrounding Raleigh Street in an open rural environment.</li> <li>The submitter will be affected by traffic light overspill from Johnston Street and Raleigh Street exiting lots.</li> </ul>	
13.03	Point 1.1- The change of Planning Map B40 (included in Volume 3 – Maps of Operative New Plymouth District Plan) to rezone Lot 3 Deposited Plan 446773 as per the Structure Plan in Appendix A, and Drawing No: GA6.0 Structure Plan.	Oppose	<p>Structure Plan drawing GA6.0 proposes Road Frontage lots adjoining Raleigh Street to be on average 600m<sup>2</sup>, however large lots averaging 1000m<sup>2</sup> are proposed on the site border adjoining rural zoned land, to enable a transitional character. This should be applied to Raleigh Street frontage lots. Multiple drive-way exits onto Raleigh Street will add to traffic and safety concerns.</p> <p>The submitter opposes the reduction in the minimum lot size from 450m<sup>2</sup> to 350m<sup>2</sup>. For environmental well-being and social development, it is important to have space around a dwelling for children play (away from the road), for gardens and pets.</p> <p>The rule change to restrict fencing on sites between the street and front of the dwelling poses a safety risk to residents diminishes the safety of residents. Fencing allows some definition of boundary between private property and the berm.</p> <p>The submitter believes the PPC will have significant adverse effects on the environment (including the quality of the</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.



Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
			<p>environment) including (but not necessarily limited to) significant adverse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• environmental, social and cultural effects;</li> <li>• amenity values, landscape (including visual) and rural character effects;</li> <li>• lighting and light overspill effects;</li> <li>• noise, vibration and privacy effects;</li> <li>• 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);</li> <li>• infrastructure, services and community infrastructure effects;</li> <li>• storm water, sewage, water supply and wastewater effects;</li> <li>• agricultural land (in terms of loss of and fragmentation of agricultural land) and soil conservation effects;</li> <li>• reverse sensitivity effects;</li> <li>• earthworks effects;</li> <li>• construction effects;</li> <li>• cumulative effects.</li> </ul> <p>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 PPC will not be efficient or effective; neither does it properly consider alternatives.</p> <p>Further, there has been a lack of proper or any meaningful consultation, particularly with surrounding neighbouring</p>	

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
			properties. The PPC will not achieve sustainable management and is contrary to the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991.	
<b>S14 Jo Limmer</b>				
14.01	Section 1.3 -Vision, Section 1.7.2 - Geotechnical report, Engineers report and Design plans, Civil Infrastructure Consulting Ltd, Section 1. 7.3 - Integrated Transport Assessment, Section 2.2 -Description of request table, Section 9. 8 -traffic report, Section 6.3.1 and Section 9. 7 - character of area	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter contends that the character of the area should remain rural – the submitter notes that two maps show different lot sizes around existing properties and along Johnston Street. All rural adjacent properties should equal the mentioned larger lots of 1000m<sup>2</sup>. In addition, the submitter notes that there should be no moving onto the sections of older transportable homes or house buses, caravans as single dwellings.</p> <p>The submitter wants to ensure current rural character remains this is listed as a cost in the plan change request.</p>	The plan change should not be given the go ahead before sufficient services and infrastructure are in place.
14.02	Section 1.3 -Vision, Section 1.7.2 - Geotechnical report, Engineers report and Design plans, Civil Infrastructure Consulting Ltd, Section 1. 7.3 - Integrated	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter reiterates that the request notes that all stormwater and waste will be reviewed and will not add any additional problems to the existing currently known issues within the Waitara community. The submitter wishes to ensure no additional development will cause a drop-in water pressure for current residents around the surrounding area.</p> <p>The submitter wants a review of all current storm and sewer pipes within the Waitara area that will possibly be linked to this</p>	The plan change should not be given the go ahead before sufficient services and infrastructure are in place. In particular, sufficient water, stormwater and waste services and infrastructure are in place to provided for both existing

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
	Transport Assessment, Section 2.2 -Description of request table, Section 9. 8 -traffic report, Section 6.3.1 and Section 9. 7 - character of area		subdivision, to review current condition and review if they can take additional capacity, without causing further deterioration before further decisions made. The submitter seeks assurance that current residents are not disadvantaged in any way with current service usage i.e. drop in water pressure.	residents and the proposed dwellings.
14.03	Section 1.3 -Vision, Section 1.7.2 - Geotechnical report, Engineers report and Design plans, Civil Infrastructure Consulting Ltd, Section 1. 7.3 - Integrated Transport Assessment, Section 2.2 -Description of request table, Section 9. 8 -traffic report, Section 6.3.1 and Section 9. 7 - character of area	Oppose in part	<p>In regard to traffic, the submitter agrees with the statement in the request report that the increase in traffic for the Raleigh Street and SH3/Raleigh Street intersection is a cost. The submitter raises that there has been a marked increase in traffic since the 2015 survey, which has been noticed by current residents and the impact of additional traffic caused by this subdivision and other current and possible section sales in the area should be noted and reviewed by council and Land Transport NZ.</p> <p>The submitter seeks a widening of the Johnston Street Road to allow for the increased traffic to pass safely (possibly up to 12 additional cars) without having to use the berm. The submitter raises that Council should be aware of the additional sections which are currently for sale on this road. The submitter also seeks a light to be added on the corner of Raleigh and Johnston to allow for safe turning into and out of Johnston Street at night. The submitter seeks that an additional survey should be conducted on the SH3/ Raleigh Street area and decisions made and timelines agreed, before addition additional traffic flow to a known risk area further endangering road users.</p>	<p>The plan change should not be given the go ahead before sufficient services and infrastructure are in place.</p> <p>In particular, widening of Johnston Street Road, the addition of a light on the corner of Raleigh Street and Johnston Street and that decisions are made and timelines agreed on road treatment for SH3/ Raleigh Street before any additional traffic flow from the development.</p>

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
14.04	Section 1.3 -Vision, Section 1.7.2 - Geotechnical report, Engineers report and Design plans, Civil Infrastructure Consulting Ltd, Section 1. 7.3 - Integrated Transport Assessment, Section 2.2 -Description of request table, Section 9. 8 -traffic report, Section 6.3.1 and Section 9. 7 - character of area	Oppose in part	The submitter details that sufficient lighting should be provided within the subdivision and along Raleigh Street. The submitter seeks to ensure good lighting within the subdivision including the walkway and also extended along Raleigh Street to ensure safety of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists with the increasing population and vehicle flow.	The plan change should not be given the go ahead before sufficient services and infrastructure are in place. In particular, sufficient street lighting provided within the subdivision and along Raleigh Street, including the walkway within the subdivision.
<b>S15 New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)</b>				
15.01	Plan change in its entirety.	Supportive in part	<p>The submitter details that they have a mandate under the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA), the Government Roothing Powers Act 1989 (GRPA), and the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018/19-2027 /28 (GPS) to carry out its functions in a way that delivers the transport outcomes set by the Government.</p> <p>NZTA detail that the CPS promulgates the Government's future strategic transport priorities, and these should be considered in the development and decision processes for PC 49. NZTA is interested in PC 49 because it has implications on how the State Highway network is protected and managed. NZTA furthers that</p>	NZTA seek that Proposed PC 49 be approved subject to ensuring that the potential effects from development do not impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
			PC 49 also has implications on SH3 road users safety and accessibility, as this section of SH 3 is operating above capacity.	
15.02	Plan change in its entirety.	Supportive in part	<p>NZTA detail that the daily and peak hour trip generation rates that have been adopted in the applicant's ITA appear to be low. NZTA note that daily trip generation of 9.0vpd/dwelling and peak hour generation of 0.85vph/dwelling have been assumed. Residential development of this nature would typically generate in the order of 10.4vpd/dwelling and peak hour generation of 1.2vph/dwelling.</p> <p>NZTA detail that the assessment notes that a significant proportion of trips during peak hours would be to and from New Plymouth via the SH3 intersection. However, the assessment does not provide detail on existing constraints in terms of level of service, or an assessment of how this would be exacerbated by development in the structure plan area.</p> <p>NZTA note that the applicant's ITA identifies that there are existing safety shortcomings at the SH3/Raleigh Street intersection through crash analysis. However, the assessment does not outline the extent to which these effects would be exacerbated by the development, nor what mitigation measures required to address this.</p> <p>NZTA furthers that the ITA notes that the planned State Highway changes will significantly improve both the safety and efficiency of the connection points for local traffic onto the key SH3 route.</p>	<p>NZTA seek that Proposed PC 49 be approved subject to the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further justification being provided for the use of lower daily trip generation rates.</li> <li>• Provision of detail on existing constraints in terms of level of service, or an assessment of how this would be exacerbated by development in the structure plan area.</li> <li>• The provision of a more detailed assessment of the effects of the development on the intersection of SH3/Raleigh Street and the intersection of SH3/Tate Road. This assessment should include analysis of safety effects as well as level of service.</li> <li>• The use of SIDRA analysis to determine pre and post development level of service.</li> </ul>

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An assessment outlining the extent to which the effects of the safety shortcomings at the SH3/Raleigh Street intersection would be exacerbated by the development, and what mitigation measures would be required to address this.</li> <li>• Amended plan change provisions to include the upgrade of the SH3/ Tate Road intersection as mitigation.</li> </ul>
15.03	Plan change in its entirety.	Supportive in part	<p>NZTA detail that the Transport Agency broadly supports the Structure Plan as a mechanism for planned urban growth through a private plan change process. This process provides a good opportunity for effective integration of proposed land use with the surrounding services and infrastructure, including the State Highway network.</p>	<p>NZTA seek that Proposed PC 49 be approved subject to pre-mentioned amendments.</p>
15.04	Plan change in its entirety.	Supportive in part	<p>NZTA acknowledges and supports the inclusion of policies which aim to ensure that all new lots have safe and adequate vehicle access from the roading network and require an interconnected transport network that provides a variety of routes for walking, cycling, passenger transport and motor vehicles. These policies align with and support the safe system and multi modal priorities of the GPS, as elaborated on in section 4.1 of this submission.</p> <p>NZTA also welcomes the inclusion of provisions which recognise and provide for the effects of residential growth on existing</p>	<p>NZTA seek that Proposed PC 49 be approved subject to pre-mentioned amendments.</p>

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
			networks as a result of increased traffic. The Transport Agency is supportive of the proposed draft objectives and policies as outlined in 'Appendix C Proposed Additions to NPDP'.	
15.06	Plan change in its entirety.	Supportive in part	NZTA note that the proposed residential zoning is not directly adjacent to SH3. Therefore, noise sensitive activities such as dwellings, which can suffer reverse sensitivity effects from State Highways, would not incur such effects as a result of the proposed rezoning.	NZTA seek that Proposed PC 49 be approved subject to pre-mentioned amendments.
15.07	Plan change in its entirety.	Supportive in part	<p>NZTA does consider there to be challenges affecting the proposed land use change with respect to road user safety and accessibility. Specifically, it is considered that the SH3/Raleigh Street intersection is operating above capacity and is subject to safety risks.</p> <p>NZTA detail that they are in the detailed business case process for the delivery of an upgrade to the intersection of SH3/Tate Road intersection in the form of a roundabout, which would improve both capacity and safety. Under this scenario, the SH3/Raleigh Street intersection would be closed. However, NZTA note that they are not yet in a position to upgrade the intersection and any upgrade would not likely occur until 2022 or later. It is important to note that although this upgrade is likely, delivery cannot be guaranteed with certainty, which is a risk that the applicant and Council will need to take into account.</p> <p>NZTA considers that the additional traffic generation associated with the proposed land use change would exacerbate safety and efficiency issues on the State Highway network.</p>	<p>NZTA seek that Proposed PC 49 be approved subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pre-mentioned amendments and further information provision sought, to enable NZTA to ascertain the full extent of these capacity and safety constraints.</li> <li>• Amending the plan change provisions to address the increased safety and efficiency effects on the State Highway network from the development.</li> <li>• The development within the structure plan area not proceeding until adequate infrastructure is in place at the Tate Road/ SH3 intersection. Any application</li> </ul>

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
				<p>for subdivision or development in the structure plan area should incur non-complying activity status until the roundabout at the SH3/Tate Road intersection is delivered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post-delivery of this upgrade, subdivision should revert to restricted discretionary activity status.</li> <li>• The plan change should also include supporting assessment criteria that prompt consideration of whether the SH3 intersection is at a standard that can safely and efficiently accommodate the additional traffic.</li> </ul>
<b>S16 Manukorihi Hapū</b>				
16.01	Plan change in its entirety.	Oppose	<p>Manukorihi Hapū, a Hapū of Te Atiawa, exercise manawhenua within their rohe, which the PPC is located. Manukorihi Hapū note that they do not have an in-principle objection to growth, it is considered that any significant residential development should be provided for in appropriate locations by way of appropriate methods.</p> <p>Manukorihi Hapū detail that the proposal will have significant adverse effects on the environment (including the quality of the</p>	Reject/decline the Plan Change in its entirety.



Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
			<p>environment) including (but not necessarily limited to) significant adverse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural effects - limited consultation has been undertaken by the applicant to define the cultural values associated with the application site including engaging Manukorihi Hapū to provide expert cultural evidence. The unnamed stream that crosses the application site is a tributary of the Waitara Awa and forms Statutory Acknowledgement to Te Atiawa and Manukorihi Hapū.</li> <li>• Environmental and social effects including ecological effects</li> <li>• Amenity values, landscape (including visual) and rural character effects</li> <li>• Traffic and transport effects including accessibility and connectivity</li> <li>• Infrastructure, services and community infrastructure effects</li> <li>• Stormwater, wastewater and water effects - significant concerns about the proposed disposal of stormwater directly to the unnamed stream</li> <li>• Earthworks and construction effects</li> <li>• Cumulative effects.</li> </ul> <p>The proposal's adverse effects will not be, nor are capable of being, adequately or appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>Manukorihi Hapū further that there has been a lack of proper or any meaningful consultation with tangata whenua; nor engagement of iwi/ hapu to provide expert cultural advice.</p>	

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
<b>S17 Jordan Family Trust</b>				
17.01	Plan change in its entirety.	Support	<p>The submitter believes that there is a shortage of available residential sections for sale and that the proposed change will benefit the community by making more land available for new housing.</p> <p>The submitter believes that New Plymouth District Council should take the opportunity to rezone not only this piece of land but also the land marked in black on the plan attached in the submitter's appendices into residential. The submitter details that this is a great opportunity for the Council to look forward and make available land for residential growth now. The submitter believes that New Plymouth is growing North and it makes real sense to have Waitara grow towards New Plymouth.</p> <p>The submitter sees real benefit in utilising the existing utility services in the area and the submitter also understands that the land is outside of the potential flood zone which many properties in Waitara are subject to.</p> <p>The submitter furthers that this land is already held in smaller blocks and adjoins residential land. The submitter believes the benefit of rezoning at this time is that the land is held by two owners. The submitter notes that whilst it may not be ideal to rezone now, the next revisit of the District Plan is unlikely to be less than 10 years away which will restrict growth south of Waitara for possibly 15- 20 years. The other alternative is growth north which would mean the development of all new infrastructure for utilities - south the infrastructure is already in place.</p>	That the proposed private plan change be approved in its entirety.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
			The submitter details that that part of the land is currently designated Future Urban Development so it would make sense to rezone this land to residential at the same time that the Johnston St land is rezoned.	
<b>S18 Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa</b>				
18.01	Plan change in its entirety.	Oppose	<p>Te Kotahitanga note that whilst Te Kotahitanga does not have an in-principle objection to growth, it is considered that any significant residential development should be provided for in appropriate locations by way of appropriate methods.</p> <p>The proposal is not the most appropriate or suitable way to achieve the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act') or the stated objectives of the proposal or the objectives of the District Plan.</p> <p>The proposal is not designed to accord with and assist the territorial authority to carry out its functions in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.</p> <p>The proposal will not properly give effect to, and is contrary to and inconsistent with, the National Policy Statements for Urban Development Capacity and Freshwater Management and the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity; Regional Policy Statement for Taranaki, the Regional Air Quality, Freshwater and Soil Plans for Taranki; the Land Supply Review 2007-2027 Final Framework for Growth; Waitara Community Board Plan: A Thirty Year Vision; and is not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the New Plymouth District Plan.</p>	That the proposed private plan change be rejected/ declined in its entirety.

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
			<p>Te Kotahitanga further that the proposal would conflict with the objectives of Te Atiawa's iwi, environmental management plan - <i>Tai Whenua, Tai Tangata, Tai Ao</i>.</p> <p>The proposal will have significant adverse effects on the environment (including the quality of the environment) including (but not necessarily limited to) significant adverse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural effects -the applicant has had limited engagement of iwi and hapu to provide expert cultural advice in relation to the proposal. The unnamed stream that crosses the application site is a tributary of the Waitara Awa and forms Statutory Acknowledgement to Te Atiawa.</li> <li>• Environmental and social effects</li> <li>• Amenity values, landscape (including visual) and rural character effects</li> <li>• Lighting and light overspill effects</li> <li>• Noise, vibration and privacy effects</li> <li>• Traffic and transport effects including accessibility and connectivity</li> <li>• Infrastructure, services and community infrastructure effects</li> <li>• Stormwater, wastewater and water effects - significant concerns about the proposed disposal of stormwater directly to the unnamed stream</li> <li>• Agricultural land (in terms of loss of and fragmentation of agricultural land) and soil conservation effects;</li> <li>• Reverse sensitivity effects;</li> <li>• Earthworks and construction effects;</li> <li>• Cumulative effects.</li> </ul>	

Submission Point Number	Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
			<p>The proposal's adverse effects will not be, nor are capable of being, adequately or appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>Te Kotahitanga detail that the proposal is not considered to be a sustainable use of the whenua and will not be efficient or effective; neither does it properly consider alternatives. As mentioned previously, there has been a lack of proper or any meaningful consultation with tangata whenua; nor engagement of iwi/ hapū to provide expert cultural advice.</p> <p>The proposal will not achieve sustainable management and is contrary to the purpose and principles of the Act.</p>	

## Appendix 1: List of Submitters and Contact Details

Submitter No.	Submitter Name	Contact Company	Submitter Address		Submitter Email
1	Aaron Booker	Central House Movers	94 Katere Road	New Plymouth	<a href="mailto:aaron@chmnz.nz">aaron@chmnz.nz</a>
2	Justine Lehmann		1 Silby Street	Waitara	<a href="mailto:justine.lehman@hotmail.com">justine.lehman@hotmail.com</a>
3	Michael Miners		7 Parson Street	Vogeltown, New Plymouth	<a href="mailto:mikeminers@hotmail.com">mikeminers@hotmail.com</a>
4	Gary and Marlene Malcolm		16 Norman Street	Waitara	N/A
5	Julie Anne Weston		14 Borthwick Street	Waitara	<a href="mailto:jaweston@hotmail.com">jaweston@hotmail.com</a>
6	Colin Cameron		25 Record Street	Fitzroy, New Plymouth	<a href="mailto:camecolin@gmail.com">camecolin@gmail.com</a>
7	Kathleen Weston		71 Otaraoa Road	43 RD, Waitara	<a href="mailto:kjweston@xtra.co.nz">kjweston@xtra.co.nz</a>
8	Iain Robertson		186 Heta Road	New Plymouth	<a href="mailto:iainrobertson@outlook.com">iainrobertson@outlook.com</a>
9	Brett and Anne MacDonald		40 Johnson Street	Brixton, Waitara	<a href="mailto:bmex@xtra.co.nz">bmex@xtra.co.nz</a>
10	Marilyn and Pat Cadle		39 Johnson Street	RD 42, Waitara 4382	<a href="mailto:cadlesplace@gmail.com">cadlesplace@gmail.com</a>
11	Ross Alistair Johnston		137A Brown Road	RD 42, Waitara 4382	<a href="mailto:rahmjohnston@xtra.co.nz">rahmjohnston@xtra.co.nz</a>
12	Powerco Limited	Attn: Rebecca Dearden	Private Bag 2065	New Plymouth 4340	<a href="mailto:rebecca.dearden@powerco.co.nz">rebecca.dearden@powerco.co.nz</a>
13	Theresa Wilcox		81 Raleigh Street	RD 42, Waitara 4382	N/A
14	Jo Limmer		44 Johnson Street	RD 42, Waitara	<a href="mailto:lzimmer2@hotmail.com">lzimmer2@hotmail.com</a>
15	NZ Transport Agency	Attn: Kelsey Armstrong	PO Box 1947	Palmerston North 4440	<a href="mailto:kelsey.armstrong@nzta.govt.nz">kelsey.armstrong@nzta.govt.nz</a>
16	Manukorihi Hapū	Attn: Pat Bodger	C/- PO Box 155	Waitara	<a href="mailto:patsy.bodger@tuiora.co.nz">patsy.bodger@tuiora.co.nz</a>
17	Jordan Family Trust	C/- Karen Venables	PO Box 145	New Plymouth 4312	<a href="mailto:karen@legalsolutions.nz">karen@legalsolutions.nz</a>
18	Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa	Attn: Hemi Sundgren	35 Leach Street	New Plymouth	<a href="mailto:sarah@teatiawa.iwi.nz">sarah@teatiawa.iwi.nz</a>