

# **NOTICE OF MEETING**

## **TASMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN**

### **HEARING 70**

**Date: 5 July 2016**

**Time: 9.30 am – 5.00 pm**

**Venue: Council Chambers  
189 Queen Street  
RICHMOND**

Notice is given that a Tasman Resource Management Plan (TRMP) hearing will be held on:

**Date:** Tuesday, 5 July 2016  
**Time:** 9.30 am  
**Meeting Room:** Tasman Council Chamber  
**Venue:** 189 Queen Street, Richmond

---

**Environment and Planning Committee  
Tasman Resource Management Plan  
Hearing 70  
AGENDA**

---

**MEMBERSHIP**

<b>Chairperson</b>	Cr S G Bryant	
<b>Deputy Chairperson</b>	Cr B W Ensor	
<b>Members</b>	Mayor R G Kempthorne	Cr M L Bouillir
	Cr J L Edgar	Cr T E Norriss
	Cr Z S Mirfin	Cr M J Higgins
	Cr B F Dowler	Cr M J Greening
	Cr P L Canton	Cr J L Inglis
	Cr P F Sangster	Cr T B King

**TIMETABLE**

9.30 am	<b>Opening, Apologies, Welcome Confirmation of Order and Submission Timetable Decision on any Late Submissions</b>
9.45 am	<b>Hearing of Submissions / Presentation of Reports</b>
12.30 pm	<b>Luncheon Adjournment</b>
1:15 pm	<b>Hearing of Submissions / Presentation of Reports (cont'd)</b>

Contact Telephone: 03 543 8581  
Email: [pam.meadows@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:pam.meadows@tasman.govt.nz)  
Website: [www.tasman.govt.nz](http://www.tasman.govt.nz)

# CONTENTS

	Pages
Submitter Consideration Index	1 - 2
RMA Section 42A Report - Executive Summary	3 - 4

SAR No.	Staff Assessment Report Title	Author	Page No.
610	Residential Growth – Rezoning	Shelagh Noble	5
611	Indicative Roads	Shelagh Noble	9
612	Indicative Walkways	Shelagh Noble	13
613	Stormwater	Shelagh Noble	17
614	Business Growth	Shelagh Noble	19
615	Flood Hazard Risk	Shelagh Noble	22
616	Cross Boundary and Amenity Effects	Shelagh Noble	26
617	Miscellaneous	Shelagh Noble	30

# Submitter Consideration Index

Staff Assessment Report Name And Number	Submission	Rec. No
<b>Hearing 70</b>		
<b>601 Stuart, R W &amp; S F</b>		
610 Change 58: Residential Growth - Rezoning	C58.601.1	610.1
<b>806 NZ Transport Agency</b>		
611 Change 58: Indicative Roads	C58.806.3	611.1
	C58.806.4	611.1
	C58.806.5	611.1
613 Change 58: Stormwater	C58.806.1	613.1
	C58.806.2	613.1
<b>1440 Vincent, S M</b>		
612 Change 58: Indicative Walkways	C58.1440.1	612.1
	C58.1440.2	612.1
<b>3960 Brookside Industries Ltd</b>		
615 Change 58: Flood Hazard Risk	C58.3960.1	615.1
	C58.3960.4	615.1
616 Change 58: Cross Boundary and Amenity Effects - Contamination, Noise	C58.3960.2	616.1
	C58.3960.3	616.1
<b>3961 Curtis, Nigel</b>		
616 Change 58: Cross Boundary and Amenity Effects - Contamination, Noise	C58.3961.1	616.1
<b>3962 Buckendahl, Fritz</b>		
611 Change 58: Indicative Roads	C58.3962.1	611.1
<b>3963 Eden, Dr Gaye</b>		
610 Change 58: Residential Growth - Rezoning	C58.3963.1	610.1
<b>3964 Focus Wakefield</b>		
612 Change 58: Indicative Walkways	C58.3964.1	612.1
	C58.3964.2	612.1
	C58.3964.4	612.1
	C58.3964.5	612.1
	C58.3964.6	612.1
	C58.3964.7	612.1
	C58.3964.9	612.1
	C58.3964.10	612.1
<b>3965 Hodgkinson, Michael &amp; Brown, Tyrone</b>		
610 Change 58: Residential Growth - Rezoning	C58.3965.1	610.1
	C58.3965.3	610.1
614 Change 58: Business Growth	C58.3965.2	614.1
<b>3966 Larsen, Silke</b>		
610 Change 58: Residential Growth - Rezoning	C58.3966.6	610.1
	C58.3966.14	610.1
	C58.3966.17	610.1
	C58.3966.18	610.1
611 Change 58: Indicative Roads	C58.3966.2	611.1
	C58.3966.5	611.1
612 Change 58: Indicative Walkways	C58.3966.1	612.1
	C58.3966.4	612.1
614 Change 58: Business Growth	C58.3966.3	614.1
615 Change 58: Flood Hazard Risk	C58.3966.7	615.1
616 Change 58: Cross Boundary and Amenity Effects - Contamination, Noise	C58.3966.12	616.1
	C58.3966.13	616.1
	C58.3966.15	616.1
	C58.3966.16	616.1
<b>3967 Lloyd, Simon</b>		
612 Change 58: Indicative Walkways	C58.3967.1	612.1
	C58.3967.2	612.1
<b>3968 Mullens, Lorna &amp; Jones, Andrew</b>		
610 Change 58: Residential Growth - Rezoning	C58.3968.1	610.1
	C58.3968.2	610.1
	C58.3968.3	610.1
<b>3969 Parkes, Claire</b>		
610 Change 58: Residential Growth - Rezoning	C58.3969.1	610.1
612 Change 58: Indicative Walkways	C58.3969.2	612.1
<b>3970 Steer, Ted &amp; Carol</b>		
610 Change 58: Residential Growth - Rezoning	C58.3970.1	610.1



# Submitter Consideration Index

Staff Assessment Report Name And Number	Submission	Rec. No
612 Change 58: Indicative Walkways	C58.3970.2	612.1
<b>3971 South, Doug</b>		
614 Change 58: Business Growth	C58.3971.1	614.1
<b>3972 Phillips, Mark &amp; Kim</b>		
611 Change 58: Indicative Roads	C58.3972.1	611.1
616 Change 58: Cross Boundary and Amenity Effects - Contamination, Noise	C58.3972.2	616.1
<b>3985 J E Malcolm Family Trust</b>		
615 Change 58: Flood Hazard Risk	C58.3985.1	615.1
	C58.3985.2	615.1
	C58.3985.3	615.1
	C58.3985.4	615.1
	C58.3985.5	615.1
	C58.3985.6	615.1
	C58.3985.7	615.1

# PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 58

## WAKEFIELD

### Section 42A Report

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Purpose of the Report

This report is prepared under Section 42A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) to advise on matters raised in submissions following the public notification of Proposed Plan Change (PPC) 58 on 28 November 2015.

In addition, Section 32AA of the RMA requires a further evaluation if any changes are to be made to the proposal since notification. Council is also required to give reasons for its decisions and this report assists in this regard.

### Reporting Officer

My name is Shelagh Noble, a planner engaged by the Tasman District Council to respond to submissions and prepare this report for Council. I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute (NZPI). I was involved in the early growth model analysis for Wakefield, community engagement with Focus Wakefield (a sub-committee of the Wakefield Village Council) and other agencies, and I prepared Proposed Plan Change 58 (PPC 58) and the accompanying Section 32 Evaluation Report.

### Background Information

The reader is directed to the Explanatory Statement accompanying PPC 58 at notification, and the Section 32 Evaluation Report. In summary, the proposed changes in PPC 58 are as follows:

- A new Section 16.7 for Wakefield, describing issues, policies, and a rationale for the zoning and rule changes proposed.
- New zoning and area maps 58 and 91 (showing indicative roads and walkways).
- Proposed new Residential zones north and northeast of Lord Auckland Road, east of Pitfure Road, and on Edward Street.
- A proposed new Rural Residential zone where the Tasman Great Taste Trail enters Wakefield.
- Some larger lot sizes and increased dwelling setbacks adjoining the Light Industrial zone on Bird Lane.
- Some changes to the noise rule to allow existing industrial noise levels to continue as of right at the Residential zone boundary, but these levels would decrease to residential noise levels 20 metres within the boundary of the Residential zone.
- Proposed closed zones (no further subdivision) for the two Heavy Industrial zones that are subject to medium to high flood hazard risk. Heavy industrial activities on these sites would not be affected.
- Two specified residential locations close to the heart of Wakefield where housing choice is encouraged through a non-notification process.

## The Process

The process for assessing the merit of a proposed plan change is described in Schedule 1 of the RMA. The following dates give an outline of sequential steps in the process:

2013 – 2014	Conduct of the Brightwater-Wakefield Flood Modelling Study
November 2014	Strategic Review Workshop with Wakefield Community
12 March 2015	Council approved Draft Plan Change for consultation
14 May 2015	Community Meeting at the Fire Station, Wakefield
27 August 2015	Council approved Proposed Plan Change 58 for consultation
28 November 2015	Statutory consultation on PPC 58 (17 submissions received)
19 March 2016	Original submissions notified
May 2016	Further submissions collated (4 further submissions received)
July 2016	Proposed date for hearing (to be advised)

## Officer's Section 42A Report

The report comprises eight separate Staff Assessment Reports (numbered 610 to 617) responding to submissions on Proposed Plan Change 58 as follows:

1. 610 – Residential Growth – Rezoning
2. 611 – Indicative Roads
3. 612 – Indicative Walkways
4. 613 – Stormwater
5. 614 – Business Growth
6. 615 – Flood Hazard Risk
7. 616 – Cross Boundary and Amenity Effects – Contamination, Noise
8. 617 – Miscellaneous

Submissions are summarised by Council and grouped around matters raised in reference to the particular provisions proposed to be changed in the Tasman Resource Management Plan. This is a legal process. If a submission requests an action that is beyond the matters within PPC 58 and so subject to formal notification it may be 'out of scope'. Or it may be an action more appropriately addressed through Council's Long Term Plan or by another agency.

Details of the Proposed Plan Change are on Council's website (search for 'Plan Change 58') and are available on disk if required. A number of changes were made to the Draft Plan Change following non-statutory consultation during March – May 2016.

## Recommendations and Reasons

The overall recommendation is that Proposed Plan Change 58 be approved as notified, subject to any modifications decided by Council following the hearing. The discussion in the separate reports that follow explains the reasons for this recommendation. The rationale is also included in the Proposed Plan Change in section 6.17.30.

In summary, with the rezoning proposed in this Plan Change, there will be adequate flood-free land and infrastructure capacity for close to 300 dwellings in Wakefield over the next 20 years. With encouragement for infill development, smaller more affordable lots, and variety in housing design, this trend can be sustained for a further 20 years.

**Reporting Officer:** Shelagh Noble, Planner MNZPI

**Peer Reviewed:** Steve Markham, Environmental Policy Manager

# Staff Assessment Report No. 610

## CHANGE 58: WAKEFIELD: RESIDENTIAL GROWTH – REZONING

### A. ASSESSMENT

#### 1.0 Introduction

This topic relates to the proposed rezoning of land from rural or rural residential to residential in **three locations** in Wakefield. These areas are shown on the notified zone maps 58 and 91. Issues related to each location are discussed below.

Of the 66 submission points on the Plan Change overall, 13 relate to the residential rezoning. Two submission points are assessed as 'out of scope' and are recommended to be disallowed for this reason. One wants a limit on site cover in all residential proposals for the purpose of stormwater management. This protection is already contained in the permitted activity conditions for dwellings in the TRMP. The second wants a removal of the Rural Residential Zone covering the Brooks Valley Farm (southern end of the large Rural Residential Zone location). This location was not part of the notified Plan Change. A private plan change would be required.

Two further submitters provide additional input. NZTA is concerned about stormwater management as a result of subdivision north-east of Lord Auckland Road. This is discussed in a later report. A Brightwater resident has discussed in depth the flooding of the Pitfure Stream, and the potential negative impacts of rezoning land east of Pitfure Road. This submission was directed to Council's hydrology engineers who confirm that the land proposed for rezoning is safe from flood risk as identified in the Brightwater-Wakefield Flood Modelling report, completed in 2014. In any future subdivision of this area, hydrological neutrality in site runoff would be required which will ensure the current flood risk will not be exacerbated. There will also be opportunities for improving current overland flows in future subdivision. In addition, the extent of the urbanised catchment area in Wakefield under proposed Plan Change 58 is very small in relation to the rural extent of this catchment, which is not dealt with by PPC 58.

#### 2.0 Issues

##### **Land north and north-east of Lord Auckland Road:**

The rezoning is generally supported by the community, the neighbours and the affected landowners, some of whom are submitters. Indicative walkways and roads are discussed separately.

##### **Land east of Pitfure Road:**

This rezoning is also generally supported, as above. One submitter opposes the rezoning and rule provisions, on the grounds that it might negatively affect neighbours. The land owner has also suggested the new residential zone could be extended closer to the Pitfure Stream at Edward Street. This can be looked at more closely at subdivision stage. However, the current rezoning extent reflects land safe from flood risk as determined in the flood modelling report.

##### **Land on Edward Street:**

This rezoning is also generally supported, as above. One submitter is a neighbour who opposes the rezoning and rule provisions on the grounds of increasing traffic, loss of rural outlook, and noise. This submitter and one other also oppose the non-notification provisions proposed in two specified sites on Edward Street. These provisions are necessary to encourage housing choice, and are consistent with the Housing Accord that Tasman District Council has signed with central government. Furthermore, the provisions were canvassed extensively at the strategic review workshop (November 2014), the community meeting (May 2015), and the draft consultation period (April – June 2015) which received 33 written feedback forms.

### **3.0 Affected Plan Provisions**

The plan change affects zone maps 58 and 91. It also affects rule 16.3.3.4 (Discretionary Subdivision) by introducing a non-notification clause for two specified areas; and new rule (Discretionary Activity – Building Construction or Alteration – Wakefield Specified Location).

### **4.0 Options**

The options are to proceed with the rezoning and related provisions, or not proceed.

## **B. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

I recommend the rezoning proceed in accordance with the maps and Plan provisions publicly notified.

*Refer to attachment listing:*

- (a) submissions dealt with in this report*
- (b) submission recommendations*
- (c) proposed Plan amendments (if applicable)*
- (d) reasons for the recommendation*

610 **Change 58: Residential Growth - Rezoning**

■ **SUBMISSIONS DEALT WITH IN THIS REPORT**

Consideration Order :

C58.601.1	Stuart, R W & S F	ZM 91	Retain expanded residential area north of State Highway 6.
C58.3963.1	Eden, Dr Gaye	ZM 91	Retain rezoning of Rural 1 land to Residential alongside Whitby Road.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC58.806.5		
C58.3965.1	Hodgkinson, Michael & Brown, Tyrone	ZM 91	Retain new residential zoning on DA13 (located between Pitfure Road and Pitfure Stream).
<i>Oppose</i>	FC58.3653.1		
C58.3965.3	Hodgkinson, Michael & Brown, Tyrone	ZM 91	Consider residential use of land close to Edward Street, by cycleway (Tasman Great Taste Trail), after further flood modelling is done by Council.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC58.3653.3		
C58.3966.6	Larsen, Silke	17.1.3.4A	Delete non-notification provisions for residential development.
C58.3966.14	Larsen, Silke	17.1.3.1	Ensure there are coverage restrictions for houses and decks in new residential areas to manage stormwater.
C58.3966.17	Larsen, Silke	ZM 91	Delete the rezoning of area east of Pitfure Road to Residential.
C58.3966.18	Larsen, Silke	ZM 91	Delete the rezoning of area behind the (Anglican) church to Residential.
C58.3968.1	Mullens, Lorna & Jones, Andrew	ZM 91	Delete rezoning of land from Rural to Residential on Edward Street from rear of Treeton Place properties to Fellbridge Place.
C58.3968.2	Mullens, Lorna & Jones, Andrew	16.3.3.4	Delete the non-notification provisions for two specified residential locations on Edward Street.
C58.3968.3	Mullens, Lorna & Jones, Andrew	17.1.3.4A	Delete discretionary activity provisions for specified residential location with smaller houses on smaller lots in Edward Street and land behind Treeton Place.
C58.3969.1	Parkes, Claire	ZM 58	Delete Rural Residential Zone from Brooks Valley Farm (map provided) and rezone back to Rural.
C58.3970.1	Steer, Ted & Carol	ZM 91	Retain new residential zoning on two areas accessed from Lord Auckland Road.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC58.806.6		

■ **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS**

**Recommendation 610.1**

C58.601.1	Stuart, R W & S F	Allow
C58.3963.1	Eden, Dr Gaye	Allow
<i>Disallow</i>	FC58.806.5	
C58.3965.1	Hodgkinson, Michael & Brown, Tyrone	Allow

Staff Assessment Report : 610 - Change 58: Residential Growth - Rezoning

<i>Disallow</i>	FC58.3653.1	
C58.3965.3	Hodgkinson, Michael & Brown, Tyrone	Disallow
<i>Allow</i>	FC58.3653.3	
C58.3966.6	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3966.14	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3966.17	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3966.18	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3968.1	Mullens, Lorna & Jones, Andrew	Disallow
C58.3968.2	Mullens, Lorna & Jones, Andrew	Disallow
C58.3968.3	Mullens, Lorna & Jones, Andrew	Disallow
C58.3969.1	Parkes, Claire	Disallow
C58.3970.1	Steer, Ted & Carol	Allow
<i>Disallow</i>	FC58.806.6	

**Plan Amendments**

*Topic : 16.3.3.4*

No Plan amendments.

*Topic : 17.1.3.4A*

No Plan amendments.

*Topic : ZM 58*

No Plan amendments.

*Topic : ZM 91*

No Plan amendments.

**Reasons**

1. Rezoning is a logical extension of the existing residential zones in suitable locations to provide additional residential capacity as aimed for in the Tasman Housing Accord.
2. The rezoning is a direct result of Council's growth model project, which considered network and community infrastructure.
3. The Plan changes are consistent with existing objectives and policies, as well as new provisions introduced under Chapter 6.17 to enable additional residential capacity in Wakefield.
4. Insufficient argument is provided to warrant alteration to the notified Plan change.



# Staff Assessment Report No. 611

## CHANGE 58: WAKEFIELD: INDICATIVE ROADS

### A. ASSESSMENT

#### 1.0 Introduction

This topic relates to the delineation of new indicative roads on both the Zone and Area maps 58 and 91 for Wakefield. Currently, there is only one indicative road in the TRMP for Wakefield. This indicative road would join the western end of Lord Auckland Road to Whitby Road (State Highway 6). This indicative road is realigned in the Plan Change, as it currently sits over an existing dwelling. Additional indicative roads are proposed in new and existing Residential and Rural Residential zone locations. There is also an indicative road connection through to Bird Lane across land zoned Rural 1, should any further subdivision proceed in this locality. Indicative walkways are also proposed, and these are discussed separately.

Four submitters comment on the indicative roads in seven submission points. They are all associated with existing and indicative connections from the north-west residential area through to Whitby Road (SH6). Two further submitters provide additional comment.

#### 2.0 Issues

There is one main issue – that of connectivity, and related safety concerns. There is currently only one road access (Martins Road) serving more than 120 dwellings west of the State Highway. This is of concern to Wakefield's Chief Fire Officer who supports the indicative roads shown. A landowner on Bird Lane also supports an indicative road connection through to Bird Lane should residential subdivision of that rural-zoned land occur in the future. One submitter opposes all the indicative road links to Lord Auckland Road and SH6, urging traffic calming measures on Martins Road instead. The NZTA raises a number of concerns and requests a traffic impact assessment of the existing access points at Martins Road and Bird Lane.

During the consultation period, a couple of meetings were held with Andrew James from NZTA, although these did focus more on how to improve pedestrian safety rather than the traffic design and capacity of vehicle intersections. NZTA may have also misread the Plan Change; they are now aware that there is no increase to industrial zoned land and no commensurate immediate impact on the Bird Lane intersection. They are also advised that there is only one additional access point proposed to the State Highway by way of an indicative road; the indicative road closer to the centre of Wakefield is already in the TRMP, and it is just a re-alignment that is indicated. Council's traffic engineers participated in the growth model analysis of future residential areas. Issues of road capacity and safety are considered under network infrastructure. No constraints were identified.

#### 3.0 Affected Plan Provisions

The additional (and re-aligned) indicative roads are shown on both Zone and Area maps 58 and 91.

#### 4.0 Options

The options are to proceed with the Plan Change as notified or delete the indicative roads north-west of Whitby Road, pending a traffic impact assessment. I am advised that a traffic impact assessment, given the small-scale effect of one additional access point to SH6, would be more appropriate at subdivision stage.



## **B. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

I recommend proceeding with the indicative roads as notified in the Plan Change.

*Refer to attachment listing:*

- (a) submissions dealt with in this report*
- (b) submission recommendations*
- (c) proposed Plan amendments (if applicable)*
- (d) reasons for the recommendation*

611 **Change 58: Indicative Roads**■ **SUBMISSIONS DEALT WITH IN THIS REPORT**

Consideration Order :

C58.806.3	NZ Transport Agency	AM 91	Explain rationale for two new indicative roads on north side of State Highway 6.
C58.806.4	NZ Transport Agency	AM 91	Remove new indicative roads on to SH6 until safety audit provided.
C58.806.5	NZ Transport Agency	ZM 91	Undertake safety audit of Martins Ave and Bird Lane intersections with State Highway 6.
C58.3962.1	Buckendahl, Fritz	AM 91	Retain alternative access points other than Martin Ave for 120+ residences if Martin Avenue/SH6 intersection is blocked by accident or fire.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC58.601.1		
C58.3966.2	Larsen, Silke	AM 91	Delete indicative road linking Lord Auckland to other roads and instead add traffic calming on Martin Avenue.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC58.806.1		
C58.3966.5	Larsen, Silke	AM 91	Delete indicative road from Lord Auckland Road to State Highway 6 by service station.
C58.3972.1	Phillips, Mark & Kim	AM 91	Retain indicative road link to Bird Lane subject to some repositioning.

■ **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS****Recommendation 611.1**

C58.806.3	NZ Transport Agency	Disallow
C58.806.4	NZ Transport Agency	Disallow
C58.806.5	NZ Transport Agency	Disallow
C58.3962.1	Buckendahl, Fritz	Allow
<i>Disallow</i>	FC58.601.1	
C58.3966.2	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
<i>Allow</i>	FC58.806.1	
C58.3966.5	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3972.1	Phillips, Mark & Kim	Allow

**Plan Amendments***Topic : AM 58*

No Plan amendments.

*Topic : AM 91*

No Plan amendments.

*Topic : ZM 58*

No Plan amendments.

*Topic : ZM 91*

No Plan amendments.

**Reasons**

1. The indicative roads are a direct result of Council's growth model project, which considered network and community infrastructure capacity.
  2. The Plan changes are consistent with existing objectives and policies, particularly those in Chapter 6.11 of the TRMP to enable adequate connectivity for additional residential capacity as referenced in the Section 32 Evaluation Report.
  3. Insufficient argument is provided to warrant alteration to the notified Plan Change.
-

# Staff Assessment Report No. 612

## CHANGE 58: WAKEFIELD: INDICATIVE WALKWAYS

### A. ASSESSMENT

#### 1.0 Introduction

This topic relates to the introduction of indicative walkways on Zone and Area maps 58 and 91.

Six submitters raise 16 submission points related to indicative walkways. These are discussed further below.

#### 2.0 Issues

The main issues are whether specific requests for additional indicative walkways are relevant for inclusion on the planning maps, ie whether the request is within scope or not (ie whether the request can be considered part of the notified plan change or not); and whether some requests for deletion are valid.

It is important to understand that an indicative walkway is only shown on private land where there is a desired access route that may be secured as part of a future subdivision consent. Therefore, any existing walkways that have already been implemented are not shown. Existing walkways are generally on public land owned by Council or DOC, and may be illustrated in any recreation plans prepared by Council, not on planning maps in the TRMP.

Furthermore, any desired walkways that are on public land and not yet implemented, may be suggested as part of the Long Term Plan (LTP) submissions, eg footpath extensions. It is also important to note that an indicative walkway does not empower Council to take private land. Nor does it create any rights to trespass on private land. It does indicate a future aspiration to create walking access through a future subdivision.

Given that there is a cost to Council in acquiring land to establish walkways, it will be up to the discretion of Council at subdivision stage to decide if the indicative walkway is still needed at that time. It may be that an alternative cost-effective route has already been established. It is possible that there may be more indicative walkways than may ever be realised as the implementation depends on private landowners changing their ownership arrangements through subdivision.

With all the above points in mind, the submitter requests can be summarised as follows:

- Five submitter requests support proposed indicative walkways along the Wai-iti River, from Totara View Road through to Church Valley Road (Wantwood Farm), from the cycle trail over the Pitfure Stream to Pitfure Road, from Lord Auckland Road through to the Wai-iti River, and from 88 Valley Road through to Church Valley Road.
- Four submission points request deletion of indicative walkways through the 88 Valley Rural Residential Zone.
- Three submitters request deletion of indicative walkways adjacent to the Wai-iti River.
- Four submitter points are technically 'out of scope', as they either request indicative walkways that are already implemented (owned by Council); on public land (in which case they are an LTP consideration); or were not part of the notified plan change.

#### 3.0 Affected Plan Provisions

The proposed change affects the indicative walkways shown on zoning and area maps 58 and 91.

## 4.0 Options

One possible criterion for considering the submission requests to delete some of the indicative walkways is whether or not subdivision is likely to occur, given that subdivision is the primary tool for implementing indicative walkways. For example, the properties abutting the Wai-iti River are within the identified flood risk area. Subdivision may be unlikely for some, but others straddle both Rural and Residential zones and acquisition of riparian land is achievable. In the southern parts of the 88 Valley Road Rural Residential area the time frame for development is very long-term, or may never come to fruition should some of the land remain in productive farming. Nonetheless, the routes shown on the planning maps represent a community aspiration that evolved through a lengthy consultation process, with input from Council's engineering and community services teams.

## B. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that the Plan Change proceed as notified, however Council may wish to review some of the indicative walkways following presentations at the hearing.

*Refer to attachment listing:*

- (a) submissions dealt with in this report*
- (b) submission recommendations*
- (c) proposed Plan amendments (if applicable)*
- (d) reasons for the recommendation*

612 **Change 58: Indicative Walkways**

■ **SUBMISSIONS DEALT WITH IN THIS REPORT**

Consideration Order :

C58.1440.1	Vincent, S M	AM 58	Remove proposed walkways on or adjacent to Brooks Valley Farm.
C58.1440.2	Vincent, S M	AM 91	Remove proposed walkways on or adjacent to Brooks Valley Farm.
C58.3964.1	Focus Wakefield	AM 91	Retain proposed walkway along Wai-iti River from Bird Lane to Pigeon Valley Road – and include picnic and dog walking facilities, planting and access to river.
C58.3964.2	Focus Wakefield	AM 91	Establish official walkway along Wai-iti River from Pigeon Valley Rd south to Jimmy Lee Bridge.
C58.3964.4	Focus Wakefield	AM 58	Retain walkway linking Totara View Road with future residential development adjacent to Wantwood Farm.
C58.3964.5	Focus Wakefield	AM 91	Add walkway along 88 Valley Road south from Genia Drive to Totara View Road.
C58.3964.6	Focus Wakefield	AM 91	Add walkway up gully from lower Totara View Road to near Kilkenny Place/Totara View Road intersection and also link it across 88 Valley Rd to the edge of 88 Valley Stream and continue it north along stream to rejoin 88 Valley Road near Fitzsimmons Way.
C58.3964.7	Focus Wakefield	AM 91	Add walkway from Cycle Trail westwards to Catholic Church property and through that property to Pitfure Road.
C58.3964.9	Focus Wakefield	AM 91	Add walkway with enhancements from Lord Auckland Road to Bird Lane and retain walkway link to Wai-iti River.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC58.601.2		
C58.3964.10	Focus Wakefield	AM 58	Retain walkway route between 88 Valley Road and Church Valley Road and upgrade to cycleway standard.
C58.3966.1	Larsen, Silke	AM 91	Delete walkways along the Wai-iti River.
C58.3966.4	Larsen, Silke	AM 91	Delete two walkways parallel to Pigeon Valley Rd (leading to Wai-iti River) and make walkway on other side of river.
C58.3967.1	Lloyd, Simon	AM 91	Delete indicative walkway on SW boundary of Lloyd property.
C58.3967.2	Lloyd, Simon	AM 91	Add existing walkway on Lloyd property to Area Map 91 and sign post it.
C58.3969.2	Parkes, Claire	AM 58	Delete indicative walkways shown on Brooks Valley Farm.
C58.3970.2	Steer, Ted & Carol	AM 58	Delete walkway along Wai-iti River adjoining 9C Angus Place if privacy/security affects are not satisfactorily mitigated.

■ **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS**

**Recommendation 612.1**

C58.1440.1	Vincent, S M	Disallow
------------	--------------	----------

Staff Assessment Report : 612 - Change 58: Indicative Walkways

C58.1440.2	Vincent, S M	Disallow
C58.3964.1	Focus Wakefield	Allow
C58.3964.2	Focus Wakefield	Disallow
C58.3964.4	Focus Wakefield	Allow
C58.3964.5	Focus Wakefield	Disallow
C58.3964.6	Focus Wakefield	Disallow
C58.3964.7	Focus Wakefield	Allow
C58.3964.9	Focus Wakefield	Allow
<i>Disallow</i>	FC58.601.2	
C58.3964.10	Focus Wakefield	Allow
C58.3966.1	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3966.4	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3967.1	Lloyd, Simon	Disallow
C58.3967.2	Lloyd, Simon	Disallow
C58.3969.2	Parkes, Claire	Disallow
C58.3970.2	Steer, Ted & Carol	Disallow

**Plan Amendments**

*Topic : AM 58*

No Plan amendments.

*Topic : AM 91*

No Plan amendments.

*Topic : ZM 58*

No Plan amendments.

*Topic : ZM 91*

No Plan amendments.

**Reasons**

1. The indicative walkways are a direct result of Council's growth model project, which considered network and community infrastructure.
2. The indicative walkways are consistent with existing objectives and policies, in particular Policy 14.1.3.4 which is 'To provide for new open space areas that are convenient and accessible for users, including the provision of walking and cycling linkages in and around townships, between townships and between reserves'.
3. A number of the submitter requests did not appreciate the manner in which indicative walkways are implemented, or not as the case may be.

# Staff Evaluation Report No. 613

## CHANGE 58: WAKEFIELD: STORMWATER

### A. ASSESSMENT

#### 1.0 Introduction

This topic addresses two submission points raised by NZTA. The first relates to how stormwater runoff from the proposed new residential zone north of State Highway 6 is to be mitigated; the second relates to the capacity of Council's existing drainage network along this part of State Highway 6.

#### 2.0 Issues

The recent Flood Modelling study undertaken of the Wai-iti and Wairoa catchments in 2013/14 acknowledges that there is significant surface flow during large rain events, in addition to the river flooding that is the subject of that study. There is also anecdotal evidence that stormwater from the Lord Auckland subdivision ponds in the direction of State Highway 6 rather than towards the Wai-iti River. Council is aware of this and has undertaken and scheduled stormwater improvements in its Long Term Plan and through conditions on resource consents. Council's development engineer will be present at the hearing to speak more about stormwater issues.

Future subdivision is an opportunity to ameliorate any of the existing problems. In addition, any large-scale subdivision of land north-west of Lord Auckland Road will be required to demonstrate hydrological neutrality. Consultation with NZTA would be part of the subdivision processing as a matter of course. In fact, early meetings were held with Andrew James of NZTA, and the draft consultation booklet sent to NZTA, so the recent comments as a result of the formal process are somewhat unexpected.

The submission points have been discussed with NZTA and Council's Development Engineer and will continue prior to the hearing. NZTA intimated that they may withdraw their submission on the basis of information provided.

#### 3.0 Affected Plan Provisions

The submission points relate to the residential rezoning on Zone maps 58 and 91.

#### 4.0 Options

The options are to proceed with the Plan Change as notified, or not proceed on account of limited information on future stormwater management and current infrastructure capacity.

### B. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend proceeding with the Plan Change for the reasons listed below.

*Refer to attachment listing:*

- (a) submissions dealt with in this report*
- (b) submission recommendations*
- (c) proposed Plan amendments (if applicable)*
- (d) reasons for the recommendation*



613 **Change 58: Stormwater**

■ **SUBMISSIONS DEALT WITH IN THIS REPORT**

Consideration Order :

C58.806.1	NZ Transport Agency	ZM 91	Provide for mitigation of stormwater effects from proposed Residential Zone near SH6.
C58.806.2	NZ Transport Agency	ZM 91	Provide an assessment of effects of new Residential Zone on drainage systems nearby.

■ **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS**

**Recommendation 613.1**

C58.806.1	NZ Transport Agency	Disallow
C58.806.2	NZ Transport Agency	Disallow

**Plan Amendments**

Topic : ZM 58

No Plan amendments.

Topic : ZM 91

No Plan amendments.

**Reasons**

1. The rezoning is a direct result of Council's growth model project, which considered the capacity of the stormwater network in a general sense. It was not considered a constraint.
2. The Plan changes are consistent with existing objectives and policies, as well as new provisions introduced under Chapter 6.17.
3. Consultation already occurred with NZTA and further discussions are underway to alleviate their submission concerns.
4. Insufficient argument is provided to warrant alteration to the notified Plan Change.
5. Stormwater is a matter to be addressed at subdivision stage, and through continuing infrastructure investment through the Long Term Plan.

# **Staff Evaluation Report No. 614**

## **CHANGE 58: WAKEFIELD BUSINESS GROWTH**

### **A. ASSESSMENT**

#### **1.0 Introduction**

This topic relates to a small parcel of land on the eastern side of the Pitfure Stream on the Great Taste Cycle Trail, proposed to be rezoned Rural Residential. The area of land is just over 5 hectares. The original area in the draft Plan Change was almost double this. It was reduced in size following community consultation because of a risk of failure from the detention dams located uphill to the east of the site. The minimum lot size is 8000 square metres, which would enable in the order of five to six new allotments. The subject land is flat land on the west side of the cycle trail and does not extend up the hillside.

Three submission points are relevant. The first is from the landowners who request an extension of the proposed zone location further to the north, as in the draft Plan Change maps. The second opposes any development away from the centre of the village and up the hillsides. And the third questions the economic rationale and loss of farming land.

One further submission is opposed to the northern extension of the proposed Rural Residential zone location for reasons of flood hazard risk from detention dams above the land. This matter has subsequently been addressed.

#### **2.0 Issues**

It is clear that this proposed zone location is not an extension of the residential areas. The lots, at a minimum of 8000 square metres, would be larger than the minimum lot size in the 88 Valley Rural Residential area (which is 5000 square metres), would not require network infrastructure, and are on flat land so would not be visible against the hilly backdrop to the village. Therefore, rural character would not be compromised.

The loss of productive land is raised as an issue, but this is questionable, as the minimum lot size would still allow for some specialised productive land-based activity. The main issue is whether the opportunity for additional business (visitor accommodation) activity that is ancillary to the rural residential development would benefit the local economy or detract from it. The growth model does not currently have robust measures of economic demand, however as with supermarkets, trade competition is not a matter that can be considered under the RMA. Visitor numbers are likely to increase as the Cycle Trail extends and the full circular route is completed. Rural lodging would be a complementary offering to the existing accommodation market, alongside bed and breakfast in the village and backpacker (and other choices) at the hotel.

Should the rezoning proceed, there is also an opportunity to secure the indicative walkway across the Pitfure Stream, enhancing the walkability of the village overall.

#### **3.0 Affected Plan Provisions**

The Plan provisions affected are Zone maps 58 and 91.

#### **4.0 Options**

The options are to support the proposed Rural Residential zone or retain the current rural zoning.

## **B. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

I recommend the Rural Residential zoning proceed.

*Refer to attachment listing:*

- (a) submissions dealt with in this report*
- (b) submission recommendations*
- (c) proposed Plan amendments (if applicable)*
- (d) reasons for the recommendation*

614 **Change 58: Business Growth**

■ **SUBMISSIONS DEALT WITH IN THIS REPORT**

Consideration Order :

C58.3965.2	Hodgkinson, Michael & Brown, Tyrone	ZM 91	Extend new Rural Residential Zone east of Pitfure Stream along Higgins Road as in draft Plan change.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC58.3653.2		
C58.3966.3	Larsen, Silke	ZM 91	Delete provisions for extra housing along Great Taste Trail and on hills and ridgelines.
C58.3971.1	South, Doug	ZM 91	Delete new Rural Residential Zone between Pitfure Stream and Higgins Road.

■ **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS**

**Recommendation 614.1**

C58.3965.2	Hodgkinson, Michael & Brown, Tyrone	Disallow
<i>Allow</i>	FC58.3653.2	
C58.3966.3	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3971.1	South, Doug	Disallow

**Plan Amendments**

*Topic : ZM 58*

No Plan amendments.

*Topic : ZM 91*

No Plan amendments.

**Reasons**

1. The Plan Change is consistent with existing objectives and policies, as well as new provisions introduced under Chapter 6.17.
2. Insufficient argument is provided to warrant alteration to the notified Plan Change.
3. The proposal was canvassed extensively with the community during consultation on the draft plan Change and received general support.

# Staff Evaluation Report No. 615

## CHANGE 58: WAKEFIELD: FLOOD HAZARD RISK

### A. ASSESSMENT

#### 1.0 Introduction

This topic relates to the introduction of a closed zone status over two existing Heavy Industrial zone locations, which are within an area identified as being at significant risk of flooding. The existing activities and any new activities appropriate to the zone are able to continue or commence, however subdivision would become a prohibited activity, limiting intensification and expansion of the level of activity anticipated.

Three submitters raised 10 submission points relating to this matter. Two of the submitters have a direct interest in the land affected and oppose the introduction of closed zones for subdivision (and the associated provisions). A third submitter seeks the complete removal of the Pigeon Valley Heavy Industrial zone. This request is out of scope. That is not the intention of the zone closure and it was not publicly notified as such. The zone remains; subdivision would become a prohibited activity through the Plan Change. Two submission points support the continuation of existing or new activities on the sites. This is a correct interpretation as expressed in 6.17.30: "Closed zone status enables the activities to continue on the land but prevents further subdivision of the sites".

A further submission from NZTA is opposed to removing the closed zone provisions on the Bird Lane site, however it appears that the NZTA may have thought there was a whole new zone proposed in this locality. Discussions with NZTA have clarified this potential misunderstanding.

#### 2.0 Issues

The Brightwater–Wakefield Flood Modelling Study, completed in 2014, clarified those areas in proximity to the Wai-iti River at medium to high risk from inundation in varying flood events. While it is technically feasible to raise the level of the land to mitigate the risk, this may not be desirable as it displaces the flood effect onto other properties, and may create design complications. This issue is discussed further in the Section 32 Evaluation Report.

The Heavy Industrial zone on Pigeon Valley Road has a subdivision consent for 6 allotments, but the subdivision has not commenced (consent conditions have not been completed and the titles not issued). An extension of time was granted recently. Subdivision planners advise that there were concerns about the flood risk and the solution proposed, but the TRMP provisions did not provide any grounds for refusing or discouraging the application in the first instance (before the flood modelling study), nor subsequently for refusing the application for extension.

While these two Heavy Industrial zones are historic, it is expected with climate change that the severity of flood events will increase, and it is advisable to take action to limit further risk from intensification on these sites, while acknowledging the investment in current activities on site that are able to continue. The rules for Building Construction and Alteration remain unchanged, and the construction details (floor levels) can be satisfactorily controlled under the Building Act.

The adjacent Light Industrial zone on Bird Lane is not affected by the proposed Plan Change.

#### 3.0 Affected Plan Provisions

The Plan provisions are Zone maps 58 and 91, the explanation in 6.17.30, and associated subdivision provisions in 16.3.4 (16.3.4.1, 16.3.4.5A, and 16.3.4.8).

## 4.0 Options

The options are to retain the closed zone status as notified, or continue with the status quo.

### B. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend the closed zone status be retained, which would preclude any further subdivision applications within the two Heavy Industrial zones in Wakefield.

*Refer to attachment listing:*

- (a) submissions dealt with in this report*
- (b) submission recommendations*
- (c) proposed Plan amendments (if applicable)*
- (d) reasons for the recommendation*

615 **Change 58: Flood Hazard Risk**

■ **SUBMISSIONS DEALT WITH IN THIS REPORT**

Consideration Order :

C58.3960.1	Brookside Industries Ltd	ZM 91	Bird Lane Industrial Zone not to be Closed.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC58.806.2		
C58.3960.4	Brookside Industries Ltd	16.3.4	Remove closed zone subdivision provisions from Bird Lane industrial land.
C58.3966.7	Larsen, Silke	ZM 91	Delete industrial zoning on Pigeon Valley Road.
C58.3985.1	J E Malcolm Family Trust	ZM 58	Delete Closed Zone provision on Rural Industrial Zone at 68 Pigeon Valley Road or clarify in the Closed zoning that current resource consents can be exercised.
C58.3985.2	J E Malcolm Family Trust	ZM 91	Delete Closed Zone provision on Rural Industrial Zone at 68 Pigeon Valley Road or clarify in the Closed zoning that current resource consents can be exercised.
C58.3985.3	J E Malcolm Family Trust	6.17.30	Clarify that the Heavy Industrial Closed Zone at Pigeon Valley permits buildings to be erected without further resource consents.
C58.3985.4	J E Malcolm Family Trust	16.3.4.1	Delete Closed Zone provision on Rural Industrial Zone at 68 Pigeon Valley Road or clarify in the Closed zoning that current resource consents can be exercised.
C58.3985.5	J E Malcolm Family Trust	16.3.4.5A	Delete Closed Zone provision on Rural Industrial Zone at 68 Pigeon Valley Road or clarify in the Closed zoning that current resource consents can be exercised.
C58.3985.6	J E Malcolm Family Trust	16.3.4.8	Delete Closed Zone provision on Rural Industrial Zone at 68 Pigeon Valley Road or clarify in the Closed zoning that current resource consents can be exercised.
C58.3985.7	J E Malcolm Family Trust	17.4.3	Ensure that further resource consents will not be required to erect buildings at 68 Pigeon Valley Road by scheduling or other means.

■ **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS**

**Recommendation 615.1**

C58.3960.1	Brookside Industries Ltd	Disallow
<i>Allow</i>	FC58.806.2	
C58.3960.4	Brookside Industries Ltd	Disallow
C58.3966.7	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3985.1	J E Malcolm Family Trust	Disallow
C58.3985.2	J E Malcolm Family Trust	Disallow
C58.3985.3	J E Malcolm Family Trust	Allow
C58.3985.4	J E Malcolm Family Trust	Disallow
C58.3985.5	J E Malcolm Family Trust	Disallow
C58.3985.6	J E Malcolm Family Trust	Disallow

**Plan Amendments**

*Topic : 6.17.30*

No Plan amendments.

*Topic : 16.3.4*

No Plan amendments to rules 16.3.4.1, 16.3.4.5A and 16.3.4.8.

*Topic : ZM 58*

No Plan amendments.

*Topic : ZM 91*

No Plan amendments.

**Reasons**

1. The introduction of closed zoning is a direct result of Council's Brightwater-Wakefield Flood Modelling Study and the growth model project, which both identified the land as unsuitable for further development (while allowing existing/new activities to remain at the same scale).
2. The Plan Change is consistent with existing objectives and policies, as well as new provisions introduced under Chapter 6.17.
3. Insufficient argument is provided to warrant alteration to the notified Plan Change.



# Staff Evaluation Report No. 616

## CHANGE 58: WAKEFIELD: CROSS BOUNDARY AND AMENITY EFFECTS – CONTAMINATION AND NOISE

### A. ASSESSMENT

#### 1.0 Introduction

This topic includes a range of amenity issues – contamination, noise and boundary setbacks. Each of these is discussed separately in the next section.

Four submitters raised eight submission points on these matters. NZTA lodged two further submission points in relation to Bird Lane, and another further submitter supported a submission on the noise rule.

#### 2.0 Issues

##### Contamination on and adjacent to the former Brookside Sawmill site

The owner of the former Brookside Sawmill site supports the proposed issue and policy in Section 6, seeking resolution of potential remaining contamination as a result prior activities on and adjacent to the site. The site itself still has a 'Chemical Hazard Overlay' shown on area maps 58 and 91. This was addressed in the Section 32 Evaluation Report. No further information has come to hand, and no changes to this overlay are currently proposed, nor specifically requested, although the land owner is seeking clarification. It is the land owner's responsibility to pursue this through further site testing and remediation. Current activities of an industrial nature are not compromised.

Adjacent land directly south-east of the former sawmill site was not proposed for residential rezoning as no evidence of the contamination status was available. The owner of 19 Bird Lane has commissioned a detailed site investigation report of the largest internal parcels (17 Bird Lane, 19 Bird Lane and 171 Whitby Road). The report has identified elevated arsenic levels in parts of the land and prior to any subdivision a remedial action plan would be required. The western-most parcel (171 Whitby Road) is confirmed in the report as being 'suitable for residential land use', however Council's soil contamination expert advises a precautionary approach in regard to the northern portion of all three land parcels.

The three parcels of land are surrounded by some 20 mainly residential properties that have not been formally consulted in relation to a proposed plan change from Rural 1 to Residential. Subsequent discussion has occurred with the owner of 17 Bird Lane and options for considering the requests to rezone parts of two of the three properties (17 and 19 Bird Lane) are discussed below.

##### Noise

A submitter and further submitter request the inclusion of an  $L_{max}$  standard for daytime as part of the noise rule for the Light Industrial zone. Council's noise expert has explained that this is not the purpose of the  $L_{max}$  provision. It is a provision in the Noise Standard (NZS 6802) to ensure night-time sleep is not interrupted by loud noises. It is not an appropriate tool for daytime application.

##### Boundary Setbacks

A submitter supports the 30 metre setback for a dwelling in a Residential zone adjoining the Light Industrial zone at Bird Lane. This is combined with a larger lot size to manage cross boundary effects (see 16.3.3.1 Figure 16.3A – no direct submissions received on this).

## General Amenity

Two submission points are out of scope and disallowed accordingly. These request consideration of group housing rather than bigger lots; and locating houses below ridgelines and using recessive colours. These matters are not part of the Plan Change, however the first outcome sought may well be achieved within the two 'specified locations on Edward Street'.

## 3.0 Affected Plan Provisions

The Plan provisions are Area and Zone maps 58 and 91; 6.17.1.9 (Issues); 6.17.1.10 (Policy – contamination); 17.1.3.1 (setbacks); and 17.4.2.1 (noise).

## 4.0 Options

As indicated above, the decisions on noise, setbacks and general amenity are straightforward (no change to notified provisions) and no change is proposed to the Chemical Hazard Overlay on the area maps at this stage.

With regard to the rezoning request for parts of 17 and 19 Bird Lane, there are a number of options and Council may wish to compliment the owner of 17 Bird Lane for efforts undertaken so far to resolve the somewhat anomalous Rural 1 zoning with residential-style ribbon development around the perimeter.

- Option 1:** Retain the status quo (Rural 1 zoning) as this is what was shown for public notification. The interested parties could proceed with a discretionary subdivision application for residential development, but it would be subject to Rural 1 zone rules, and possible notification and appeals.
- Option 2:** Rezone parts of 17 and 19 Bird Lane as requested – however, apart from 171 Whitby Road (no submission received), adjoining property owners have not been consulted. A further Schedule 1 plan variation process would be required.
- Option 3:** Undertake a private plan change – not practicable as the whole locality should be first remediated, then rezoned, and the interested parties only have control over their own parcels.
- Option 4:** Council could consider a subsequent plan change or variation, provisional on the owners undertaking the soil remediation. This would be complementary to Option 1 above.

## B. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend no change to the notified Plan change provisions in relation to all the above matters. In relation to the Bird Lane subdivision, Council may wish to give some thought to Option 4 in its deliberations following the hearing.

*Refer to attachment listing:*

- (a) submissions dealt with in this report*
- (b) submission recommendations*
- (c) proposed Plan amendments (if applicable)*
- (d) reasons for the recommendation*

616 **Change 58: Cross Boundary and Amenity Effects - Contamination, Noise**

■ **SUBMISSIONS DEALT WITH IN THIS REPORT**

Consideration Order :

C58.3960.2	Brookside Industries Ltd	6.17.1.9	Clarify the contamination status of Bird Lane industrial land.
C58.3960.3	Brookside Industries Ltd	6.17.3.10	Clarify the contamination status of Bird Lane industrial land.
C58.3961.1	Curtis, Nigel	ZM 91	Rezone Rural zoned land from corner of Bird Lane/Whitby Rd to the Light Industrial area on Bird Lane to Residential.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC58.806.3		
C58.3966.12	Larsen, Silke	17.4.2.1	Add a maximum noise level for daytime in Light Industrial Zone (rule condition 17.4.2.1(n)(iv)).
<i>Support</i>	FC58.4103.1		
C58.3966.13	Larsen, Silke	C58 GEN	Group houses by attaching units together with very small plots for private garden and bigger shared area instead of small separate lots.
C58.3966.15	Larsen, Silke	C58 GEN	Ensure all houses are located below the ridgeline and are in recessive colours.
C58.3966.16	Larsen, Silke	17.1.3.1	Mitigate effects of new residential development north of Lord Auckland Road on neighbours (rule condition 17.1.3.1(u)).
C58.3972.2	Phillips, Mark & Kim	ZM 91	Retain Rural 1 Zone on existing Phillips dwelling and rezone balance of property at 19 Bird Lane to Residential.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC58.806.4		

■ **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS**

**Recommendation 616.1**

C58.3960.2	Brookside Industries Ltd	Allow
C58.3960.3	Brookside Industries Ltd	Allow
C58.3961.1	Curtis, Nigel	Disallow
<i>Allow</i>	FC58.806.3	
C58.3966.12	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
<i>Disallow</i>	FC58.4103.1	
C58.3966.13	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3966.15	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3966.16	Larsen, Silke	Allow
C58.3972.2	Phillips, Mark & Kim	Disallow
<i>Allow</i>	FC58.806.4	

**Plan Amendments**

Topic : 6.17.1.9

No Plan amendments.

Topic : 6.17.3.10

No Plan amendments.

Topic : 17.1.3.1

No Plan amendments.

Topic : 17.4.2.1

No Plan amendments.

Topic : AM 58

No Plan amendments.

Topic : AM 91

No Plan amendments.

Topic : ZM 58

No Plan amendments.

Topic : ZM 91

No Plan amendments.

### **Reasons**

1. The Noise Standard is not designed to control intermittent loud noises at night time.
2. The Plan changes are consistent with existing objectives and policies, as well as new provisions introduced under Chapter 6.17.
3. Insufficient argument is provided to warrant alteration to the notified Plan Change, in relation to both the Chemical Hazard Overlay, and the contamination status of land adjacent to this.
4. Additional residential rezoning would require a further Schedule 1 plan change or variation process as the requests are somewhat beyond scope and have not been through a public process.

# Staff Evaluation Report No. 617

## CHANGE 58: WAKEFIELD: MISCELLANEOUS

### A. ASSESSMENT

#### 1.0 Introduction

A number of submission points (8), raised by three submitters are out of scope of the Plan Change and, as such, are disallowed.

#### 2.0 Issues

There are a range of out-of-scope issues not covered in any other reports and, for completion, are listed here:

- Consider a riparian reserve along the true right bank of the Wai-iti River from 88 Valley Stream confluence to Bird Lane.
- Add planting, lighting, signage to the railway reserve from Martin Avenue to Whitby Road and Belfit Lane.
- Ensure fibre in all new developments.
- Replace or upgrade the Wakefield Hall.
- Assist maintenance of historic Old Post Office building.
- Ensure Focus Wakefield is supported.
- Make transport infrastructure improvements.
- Confirm consultation with landowners of specified housing areas (this is confirmed).

#### 3.0 Affected Plan Provisions

No proposed Plan provisions are affected.

#### 4.0 Options

These are matters for action by Council through the Long Term Plan or other community agencies. They are not relevant to the TRMP.

### B. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

These submission points are out of scope and, as such, are recommended to be disallowed.

*Refer to attachment listing:*

- (a) submissions dealt with in this report*
- (b) submission recommendations*
- (c) proposed Plan amendments (if applicable)*
- (d) reasons for the recommendation*

617 **Change 58: Miscellaneous**■ **SUBMISSIONS DEALT WITH IN THIS REPORT**

Consideration Order :

C58.3964.3	Focus Wakefield	C58 GEN	Consider a riparian reserve along the Wai-iti right Bank from 88 Valley Stream confluence to Bird Lane.
C58.3964.8	Focus Wakefield	C58 GEN	Add planting, lighting and signage to Railway reserve from Martin Avenue to Whitby Road, including Belfit Lane.
C58.3966.8	Larsen, Silke	C58 GEN	Ensure fibre is required in all new developments.
C58.3966.9	Larsen, Silke	C58 GEN	Replace or upgrade Wakefield Village Hall.
C58.3966.10	Larsen, Silke	C58 GEN	Assist maintenance of historic old post office building.
C58.3966.11	Larsen, Silke	C58 GEN	Ensure Focus Wakefield is supported.
C58.3966.19	Larsen, Silke	C58 GEN	Transport infrastructure improvements including lower speed limits, better crossings and more public transport.
C58.3968.4	Mullens, Lorna & Jones, Andrew	C58 GEN	Confirm consultation with landowners and Engineering Department re specified housing locations.

■ **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS****Recommendation 617.1**

C58.3964.3	Focus Wakefield	Disallow
C58.3964.8	Focus Wakefield	Disallow
C58.3966.8	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3966.9	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3966.10	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3966.11	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3966.19	Larsen, Silke	Disallow
C58.3968.4	Mullens, Lorna & Jones, Andrew	Disallow

**Plan Amendments**

Topic : C58 GEN

No Plan amendments.

**Reasons**

The submissions relate to matters beyond the Tasman Resource Management Plan (TRMP).