

BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

UNDER

the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

IN THE MATTER

of the Far North Proposed District Plan –

Hearing 3: Special Purpose Zones – Orongo Bay, Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Park and Moturoa Island.

**SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF WAYNE ERIC SMITH
ON BEHALF OF FAR NORTH HOLDINGS LIMITED**

PLANNING

24 June 2024

INTRODUCTION

1. This additional supplementary evidence is in direct response to a request for additional information by the Hearings Panel for the Ngawha Innovation and Enterprise Special Purpose Zone which was held on the 18th June 2024.
2. The request comprised two components which provide additional support to the Statement of Evidence provided at the Hearing. The two components are:
 - Childcare facilities
 - Accommodation
3. For each of these considerations, there is a brief introduction and supporting commentary. In addition, there are plans provided for each component. The plans are indicative and detail a potential development opportunity within the site. Access and onsite servicing is yet to be confirmed but there is sufficient onsite servicing to address the potential activities.

CHILDCARE FACILITIES

4. The Statement of Evidence and submission from FNHL sought to remove the exclusionary references recommended within Objective NIEP-O1 and Policy NIEP-P2 as recommended within the Section 42A report. Instead FNHL seeks to enable and allow this ancillary activity to occur within the NIEP Special Purpose Zone. The reasons for their requested inclusion are noted within the original Statement of Evidence and the reasons remain relevant and compelling.
5. It is important for FNHL that the opportunity exists for these types of ancillary support activities such as childcare to be allowed within the Park. The facility reduces potential barriers for students, trainees, employees, or business owners operating within Park and who require this service. There should be no barriers for any onsite participants.
6. The potential for a childcare facility within the Park is relatively advanced with recent expressions of interest from a local resident to operate the childcare facility and which compliments her existing operations within Northland.
7. The location for the childcare facility is the same as what was verbally advised within the Hearing. A site near to the entrance of the Park and on one of the sites located through the grove of trees before you get to the constructed facilities has been noted as a suitable location.
8. In discussions with FNHL there would not appear to be any immediate requirement for more than one childcare facility because the proposed facility will take some time to reach capacity based on the numbers of children suggested.

9. The suggested scale of the childcare facility sees the facility catering for twenty under 2 year olds and around fifty 2-5 year olds for a total of seventy children. Plans attached to this evidence reflect the potential facility designs in which discussions have been held and preliminary discussions held. There are two designs provided within the attachments although this proposal is still preliminary.
10. With respect to concerns over reverse sensitivity it is important to note that activities within the Park which surround the potential childcare sites are not producers of offensive odours, excessive noise, or undertake rural practices which could involve sprays. Furthermore, as noted within the verbal right of reply from the Council Officers, childcare facilities are highly regulated with perimeter fencing and safety in general, a key part and requirement for these types of facilities. In the event that residential uses are within close proximity to the facility then boundary treatments are possible which would alleviate any potential noise issues.
11. As noted above it is the ability to establish this childcare facility which is seen as more important than the location within the Park. The location of sensitive activities such as childcare facilities would generally only be practically suited to the innovation hub rather than the other development areas.

ACCOMMODATION

12. The second matter required additional supporting information was related to accommodation. The Hearings Panel sought information on the type of accommodation, the numbers of potential units, and the preferred location(s).
13. To enable the range of accommodation sought, FNHL's submission sought the modification of NIEP-P3 to enable the policy to provide for accommodation options for the Park by exempting the accommodation options from the aspects to be avoided. The updated wording sought was as follows:

NIEP-P3 Avoid land use and development that would compromise the function of the NIEP zone or detract from the function and well-being of Kaikohe and Ngawha, including but not limited to avoiding:

- a. ...
 - b. industrial activities (excluding activities which incorporate manufacturing and processes relating to primary production including by-product waste ~~materials~~ streams);
 - c. ...
 - e. residential activities (excluding temporary student, trainee, and visiting staff and/or onsite employee accommodation as provided for in the zone);
14. The policy needs to enable the residential uses for the Park and this should be reflected within the above policy. The preferred location for the

accommodation is within Building Platform 19 which is located to the north of the Innovation Hub and is adjacent to the Matawii Dam. Attached to this supporting brief is a site plan which identifies the location of this platform and also an indicative layout for the accommodation area.

15. The housing is for the purposes of providing accommodation for students, trainees as well as for trainers, employees of businesses within the Park, and for those people visiting the Park for any particular purpose.
16. The preferred accommodation mix is noted as follows:
 - Six 3 bedroom units
 - Six 2 bedroom units
 - Eight 1 bedroom units
 - Thirty 1 bedroom self contained units in a block
 - Thirty 1 bedroom dormitory units with shared kitchen and recreational spaces.
17. The accommodation blocks are likely to be dedicated to student and trainee use. This component would likely include a pastoral care aspect and a range of communal facilities. The stand-alone units are likely to be used for those people providing the training, those persons employed onsite and who require accommodation, and for any visitors or guests of the Park.
18. For the purposes of residential intensity, the scale is considered to be appropriate. If the accommodation blocks are excluded, there are twenty residential units on a 240ha property equating to one dwelling per 12ha. This is considered to be an acceptable residential density for development within this locality. It is further suggested that accommodation be limited to this building platform (19) only to avoid the potential for reverse sensitivity effects within other sites throughout the Park. A rule to this effect would be expected to deliver this desired outcome.
19. The remaining area not required for residential purposes within building platform 19 will be used for an activity which would be suitable for being located adjacent to residential activity.

CONCLUSION

20. The above response addresses the questions surrounding childcare and accommodation within the Park. We thank the Hearing Panel for allowing the opportunity to provide additional supporting information for consideration.
21. The proposed additions as noted will enable a Park to be established which not only meets the expectations noted within its goals and aspirations but which also is competitive on a regional and national level.

Wayne Smith

Dated 24th June 2024