



## Proposed District Plan submission form

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

Feel free to add more pages to your submission to provide a fuller response.

Form 5: Submission on Proposed Far North District Plan

TO: Far North District Council

This is a submission on the Proposed District Plan for the Far North District.

### 1. Submitter details:

Full Name:	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		
Company / Organisation Name: (if applicable)	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		
Contact person (if different):	Annika Dickey (Chairperson/Trustee)		
Full Postal Address:	PO Box 501		
	Kerikeri		
Phone contact:	Mobile: 021 2407720	Home:	Work: 09 4077117 ex 211
Email (please print):	annika@wwc.co.nz		

2. (Please select one of the two options below)

- I **could not** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission  
 I **could** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

*If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission, please complete point 3 below*

3.  I **am** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:  
 (A) Adversely affects the environment; and  
 (B) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition
- I **am not** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:  
 (A) Adversely affects the environment; and  
 (B) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition

*Note: if you are a person who could gain advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991*

**The specific provisions of the Plan that my submission relates to are:**

- How the Plan Works
- Definitions
- Strategic Direction
- Transport
- Subdivision
- Zone chapters

- Maps
- All other chapters of the PDP

Confirm your position:

The submitter opposes, supports or seeks amendment to chapters of the PDP identified in this submission. The reasons are provided below

**My submission is:**

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Proper urban, rural and coastal planning positively contributes towards the environmental, social, cultural and economic wellbeing of the District’s communities.

**Shift from effects-based approach**

Our community has always been concerned about the negative impacts that have arisen from a permissive approach to planning and development to date. We agreed with the Draft DP statements last year that recognised adverse impacts from a permissive approach:

*‘A permissive approach to development has led to adverse impacts on urban character, amenity and infrastructure provision and created incompatible land uses’...<sup>1</sup>*

*‘A permissive planning framework has led, in some areas, to incompatible land uses and significant adverse effects on rural character, amenity and indigenous biodiversity’...<sup>2</sup>*

We strongly support the shift away from a permissive effects-based approach.

A substantial focus of the PDP is on rules for permitted activities. This is a sensible approach in principle, because projects that comply with the rules do not need to apply for resource consent. However, the PDP has several significant weaknesses that make it difficult to achieve the intended overall objectives:

- The rules/standard for permitted activities address limited matters. For example, the rules for subdivision cover the traditional matters of height, water supply, stormwater, telecommunications, etc. The PDP contains insufficient rules/standards relating to environmental values, for example.
- In cases where a proposed development breaches a rule, the PDP frequently defaults to ‘discretionary activity’ status. This means the proposal should be considered by developers and council planners on the basis of PDP objectives and policies. However, many of the policies are written in vague terms that are open to wide interpretation.

We consider that the PDP needs clear criteria for assessing discretionary activities.<sup>3</sup> To reduce the ambiguities in policies, the word ‘avoid’ should be applied more often, and other phrasing should be clarified and strengthened substantially to meet today’s expectations and standards. Additional rules are needed to protect the environment and amenity values, and to address climate change issues relevant to the types of activities covered by district plans (please refer to our submission on climate issues).

We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in a form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value.

S338.001

<sup>1</sup> Draft DP Strategic Direction chapter, Urban sustainability section.

<sup>2</sup> Draft DP Strategic Direction chapter, Rural sustainability section.

<sup>3</sup> The PDP at present sets assessment criteria for specific mapped areas such as sites of Outstanding Natural Character, based on Regional Policy Statement, but rarely sets criteria for assessing discretionary activities in the PDP.

## **CONSIDERATIONS FOR IDENTIFYING APPROPRIATE AREAS FOR GROWTH**

We firmly believe that spatial planning is an essential valuable tool that needs to be used – to the full extent - to provide strategic direction for Council and developers to ensure good integrated outcomes for the wellbeing of our community.

To date, ad hoc development with little strategic direction has resulted in poor urban design outcomes and poor functionality in most of the District's urban centres. This is particularly evident around Kerikeri, Waipapa and Kapiro Road area where development has recently been undertaken, and more has been consented, without taking account of issues such as inadequate infrastructure and poor connectivity.

### **Projected growth in Kerikeri area**

Historically, the population growth of Kerikeri has exceeded forecasts used by Council for planning purposes. The current growth projections for Kerikeri prepared by Infometrix put too much weight on movement of people for employment in Agriculture, Horticulture and Forestry sectors. Some people are no longer tethered to their offices and are working where they want to live, from home. Kerikeri has an airport, fast broad band internet in some areas, good schools, access to the Bay of Islands maritime reserve, and a cosmopolitan population which has attracted people to live and work. The other driver of population growth has been retirement and baby-boomers set to retire across New Zealand over the next 10 to 15 years.

Key considerations for identifying appropriate areas for growth include infrastructure, connectivity, minimising traffic (climate emissions, congestion), and other issues discussed further below.

### **Appropriate locations for future growth**

**Intensification of urban area:** We support intensification of the urban area. However, intensification needs to be carefully planned, with good design principles, appropriate infrastructure and adequate green open spaces for the community. Sub-zones or precincts (or whatever terms are now required by the National Planning Standards) need to be identified to achieve good connectivity, good functionality and protect character and amenity values. Sub-zones are needed to ensure that building height and density are reduced in a graduated manner moving out from the central area to high density residential areas and then lower density residential areas. Policies/rules are also needed to avoid pepper-potting multi-storied buildings in diverse locations in random fashion.

S338.047

Within close distance to Kerikeri township, there are limited opportunities to develop greenfield land for future growth. We consider that the PDP zoning, at present, does not focus on greenfield sites that are more appropriate for future growth, taking into account potential for infrastructure, connectivity, traffic, and other issues.

S338.048

**Land next to the CBD:** Proximity to the CBD is a key issue. The area currently owned by the Bing family should be zoned as a combination of Mixed Use and Residential zones, with a lower height limit than the CBD, such as 7m or two stories. Ideally it should provide several green corridor walkways and cycleways (e.g. on the margins of the intermittent stream) to create links between the CBD, Kerikeri River margin and westwards to Fairway Drive. Adjacent to the river reserve there should include a large green public space with native trees, restful areas, and cafés and restaurant facilities (low impact facilities). This area should be designed in a sensitive manner to be in keeping with the conservation areas around the river, particularly the natural character and high ecological values of the river margins, large areas of native trees/vegetation and wildlife in the vicinity, and the historical and cultural areas downstream.

S338.002

**Land between Waipapa and KK golf course:** The Brownlie property development currently under consideration offers a more appropriate location for future growth than the areas to the north or south of Kerikeri indicated in the PDP zone map. The area between Waipapa and the golf course

has the potential to provide connectivity between SH10 and the CBD, and between SH10 and Waipapa Road, and safe connectivity between the new FNDC Sports Hub on SH10 and local schools. Integrated planning is generally easier on a greenfield site. Importantly, growth in this area would eventually provide a relatively compact footprint for Kerikeri/Waipapa. No other site offers this advantage. The current lack of infrastructure could be addressed by requiring the developer to provide roading, water supply, on-site wastewater system and other needs. Our group supports the rezoning of this area for future development (primarily as a mix of residential, mixed use and natural open space zones)

S338.003

**Land on Kerikeri Road to State Highway 10, with conditions:** We support the zoning changes on Kerikeri Road as this is accessible to some existing infrastructure needs for new dwellings. However, roading infrastructure is not fit for purpose and needs to be upgraded to cope with the increased traffic demands. This may be an upgrade to Kerikeri Road itself, or perhaps a new road to provide alternatives to travel out on to the State Highway. We do not however generally advocate for the construction of unnecessary roads that are created just for congestion/traffic alone, as this general induces demand for vehicle travel.

S338.004

#### **Inappropriate areas for future growth**

**Southern part of Kerikeri Road:** Kerikeri Road is reported (by council) to be the busiest road in the District. Further development in the southern area of Kerikeri Road will only exacerbate the traffic problem, generating the need for more traffic management, such as additional roundabouts and associated costs. This area would not produce a compact urban footprint overall.

**Land to the north of Landing Road and Inlet area southeast of Kerikeri:** We consider that these areas are not suitable as future growth areas. Growth to the north of Landing Road or on the south side of the Inlet would create disjointed patches of urban area spread out over a wide area. Growth along the north and south sides of the Inlet would considerably alter the coastal and natural character of the Inlet. Growth within the traffic catchment area north of Landing Road is unsuitable because it will exacerbate significant traffic issues on Landing Road. The Kerikeri-Waipapa Structure Plan recognised the high ecological values of the land on the north and south sides of the Inlet, and identified these two areas as 'Enhanced environmental habitat and protection area' on the Structure Plan map.

S338.005

#### **NOTES ON ISSUES RELATED TO GROWTH**

##### **Principles of good urban design**

We consider that the PDP should enshrine the principles/design qualities of the Urban Design Protocol, and Good Solution Guide 2007 North Shore City Council,<sup>4</sup> and also take on board more recent improvements/developments in quality urban design –

S338.006

- Context
- Character
- Choice
- Connections
- Creativity
- Custodianship
- Collaboration

<sup>4</sup> <https://environment.govt.nz/publications/urban-design-case-studies-local-government/mixed-use-town-centres-design-guide-north-shore-city-council/>

### **RPS regional form and development objectives**

The Regional Policy Statement for Northland identifies objectives relating to regional form and development, noting that –

*'Under section 7 of the RMA, councils are required to have particular regard to maintaining and enhancing amenity values and maintaining and enhancing the quality of the environment (this includes all natural and physical resources).*

*Good urban and infrastructure design and well planned, coordinated development throughout the region can lead to higher levels of amenity, lower infrastructure costs and greater community wellbeing.'*<sup>5</sup>

The Regional Policy Statement's *Regional urban design guidelines* (RPS Appendix 2, Part B) include guidance. We note, in particular, the following guidance on *Custodianship* –

*'Quality urban design reduces the environmental impacts of our towns and cities through environmentally sustainable and responsive design solutions. Custodianship recognises the lifetime costs of buildings and infrastructure, and aims to hand on places to the next generation in as good or better condition. In this regard, quality urban design:*

- *Maintains landscape values, ecological services and cultural values; and*
- *Considers the ongoing care and maintenance of buildings, spaces, places and networks;*
- *Manages the use of resources carefully, through environmentally responsive and sustainable design solutions; and*
- *Incorporates renewable energy sources and passive solar gain; and*
- *Incorporates the enhancement of the health and safety of communities.'*<sup>6</sup>

### **Visions and goals of communities in the District**

Some communities around the District have identified specific goals and visions for their area in the Community Plans published on FNDC's website. The following goals were developed by *Our Kerikeri's* detailed Kerikeri community consultation process. They indicate the types of community aspirations and goals that the PDP should seek to support and implement –

#### ***Our Kerikeri community goals –***

- Revitalize and preserve our vibrant village feel
- Promote effective, planning infrastructure and growth for a beautiful functional Kerikeri
- Create opportunities for all to thrive and prosper in a sustainable resilient and productive economy
- Embracing diversity and holding an overlying sense of belonging as a society while respecting Tikanga Māori values
- Care for the well-being of our people, supporting healthy resilient and meaningful lives
- Restore and conserve our surroundings, where each generation strives to leave a better Kerikeri to the ones that follow
- Build a culture of innovative sustainable Living. Living lightly and learning from nature

The PDP should include provisions that support urban design principles for quality and innovative developments that cater for mixed use, mixed dwellings and mixed income levels, whilst protecting and preserving the characteristics of respective townships and the things that communities value.

S338.007

<sup>5</sup> NRC, *Regional Policy Statement*, p.44

<sup>6</sup> NRC, *Regional Policy Statement*, p.165, Appendix 2, Part B.

### **Importance of spatial plans, community plans, masterplans etc.**

Spatial planning is an essential tool for achieving good planning outcomes. While we are encouraged to see that integrated development is identified as a strategic direction of the PDP, it is difficult to see how this will be implemented without having the relevant local plans to provide such direction, such as spatial plans, community plans or masterplans. We consider the lack of such documents to be a missed opportunity to rectify the historic pattern of ad-hoc development done in isolation resulting in poor planning outcomes.

The Council should embed good urban design principles into everyday practices, strategies and guidelines and give effect to these in the Proposed District Plan. The necessary supporting documents, strategies, plans and guidelines must be prioritised and completed with urgency to ensure higher density developments and the new mixed-use zones have quality urban design outcomes. For Kerikeri/Waipapa, these critical documents/guidelines would include:

- Spatial Plan
- Downtown masterplan
- Strategy and plan for active transport networks, including green corridors
- Urban Design Protocol incorporating Mixed Use, High/Medium density housing and effective subdivision guidelines for Developers and Council Staff.

We urge Council to continue to develop spatial and strategic planning documents, such as the Kerikeri-Waipapa spatial plan and Kerikeri CBD masterplan, as soon as possible, to help rectify this legacy issue and future-proof our District, noting that we are still early in the statutory review process for the PDP.

As part of this submission, we seek a space holder through all relevant provisions in the plan to enable Council to continue to develop spatial plans, masterplans etc, and provide PDP mechanisms to implement such plans promptly, including through the review process should the plans be completed prior to the Proposed Plan being made Operative.

S338.008

### **Infrastructure**

Having relevant infrastructure in place should be a prerequisite for future development. The provision of necessary infrastructure must be high priority in PDP policies/rules. Given the Council's funding constraints, we consider that developers should normally be required to provide the necessary infrastructure, including items such as on-site community wastewater systems.

S338.009 to  
S338.012

### **Development contributions**

s199 of the Local Government Act notes that development contributions may be required by a local authority if a development will require the territorial authority to expend funds to provide appropriate reserves, network infrastructure or community infrastructure for the development (section 199 of the Local Government Act 2002). The contribution may be in the form of money, land or both.

The Operative DP contains a chapter on development financial contributions (chapter 14). However, some years ago the council eliminated most requirements for development contributions. This has resulted in a large accumulated shortfall in infrastructure and related funding, and ratepayers are unfairly expected to carry this cost burden. It is important that the PDP (or equivalent mechanism) should include provisions for meaningful development contributions to address the need for, and cost of, infrastructure.

S338.013

### **Traffic and connectivity**

A large survey conducted by *Our Kerikeri* found that traffic is the single biggest issue for the Kerikeri community. Each new subdivision outside the urban area generates additional traffic. However, intensification of the urban area would allow many more people to live, work or go to school

withing a walkable or cyclable distance from home. But this ideal can only be achieved if PDP requires new subdivisions and developments to provide connected walkways and cycleways that will contribute to future networks of walkways and cycleways. It also requires a spatial plan for Kerikeri as a matter of urgency.

S338.014  
to S338.16,  
& S338.049

### **Settlement zones**

Settlement zones don't allow for small local shops or facilities at present. However, a combined dairy/café in larger Settlement zones would allow local people to walk to obtain everyday needs instead of driving 4 to 15 kms to the CBD, and could be allowed in case where there are suitable locations, and where it would not create additional traffic problems or other adverse effects on local communities or small roads leading to the Settlements.

S338.017

### **Productive land and irrigation infrastructure**

Land that is regarded as highly productive (LUC Classes 1,2 and 3) is a strictly finite resource, essential for future food production for a growing population here and worldwide, and important for jobs and economic development. The recently issued *National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land* requires councils to protect LUC Class 1-3 land (outside of identified urban areas) and allows councils to protect other types of productive land.

Existing irrigation schemes with large networks of pipes installed underground in the outskirts of Kerikeri are extremely valuable assets. The cost of building a similar irrigation scheme today would be prohibitive, and it makes sense to protect the existing asset where possible providing that the existing residential 'islands' are also recognised (refer to comments on the horticulture zone below).

### **More balanced and equitable development across the District**

Although this submission highlights issues related to Kerikeri/Waipapa area, many of the principles and comments we raise apply to all urban and rural areas in the District.

We recognise that appropriate development and investment is needed in other towns and communities in this District – to ensure more balanced and equitable development across the District, and support local jobs and sustainable economic development. This will help to create diverse great places to live and work around the District, and also help to distribute increases in the population in future decades.

## **AMENITY VALUES AND CHARACTER**

### **General comments on amenity and character**

We consider that the PDP provisions for subdivision, land use and development need to place greater emphasis on character and amenity values, and promote 'placemaking' and other aspects that communities value. Under the RMA (s2) the term *environment* includes *amenity values*:

*'amenity values means those natural or physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people's appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes'*

The RMA (s7) requires the District Council, when managing the use and development of natural/physical resources, to have particular regard to the *maintenance and enhancement of amenity values* –

*'all persons exercising functions and powers under [the RMA], in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall have particular regard to ... the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values' (s7)*

The Operative DP contains several provisions that aim to protect some amenity values for specific parts of Kerikeri Road (e.g. s7.6 Context, Objective 7.6.3.3, Policy 7.6.4.11). Such provisions need to be strengthened and expanded to protect the character and amenity values of additional areas that are valued by the community. In townships, examples could include –

- Master plans or community plans for key areas
- Building setbacks on key roads that contribute to the character of a town (e.g. Kerikeri Road between SH10 roundabout and the town centre)
- Improved restrictions on signage along roads
- Retaining green spaces and open public spaces, requirements for landscaping and tree canopy areas
- Design principles for specific areas, to maintain and enhance specific characteristics

Examples of measures that would help to maintain rural landscapes and amenity values (under s7 of the RMA) –

- Larger setbacks from boundaries
- Improved restrictions on signage along roads
- Requirements for landscaping (tall tree/plant species) to screen new functional structures (such as crop protection structures, warehouses etc.) that are clearly visible from public roads or residential properties.
- Definition of traditional ‘rural character’ to preserve visual amenity and prevent the term being undermined or eroded by new dominant structures.

Overall, PDP policies/rules should pay particular regard to the ‘*maintenance and enhancement of amenity values*’ (as required by s7 of the RMA) and include provisions that will protect the traditional and/or distinctive character of townships and rural areas, and other characteristics that are valued by local communities.

S338.018

#### **Standards for types and qualities of buildings**

The PDP should control the types, qualities and quantity of buildings occurring in towns such as Kerikeri. We need sensible design aesthetic in the new mixed use zone to preserve the character of the town. The PDP or other appropriate mechanism needs to set standards relating to older houses (sometimes in relatively poor condition) moved from elsewhere, low cost housing and rental housing, so that quality standards are maintained for affordable housing.

S338.019 &  
S338.020

#### **Height Restrictions**

The current height restrictions in the proposed DP are 8m in the General Residential zone and 12m in the Mixed Use zone. Our submission is that these height restrictions should be strictly adhered to, and that exceptions to these height limits should not be allowed for multi-unit developments or other purpose.

S338.021 to  
S338.025

Allowing exceptions to the height limits of 8m and 12m would undermine the Council’s objective, specifically the objective GRZ-01:

*“The General Residential zone provides a variety of densities, housing types and lot sizes that respond to: ...  
c. the amenity and character of the receiving residential environment; and  
d. historic heritage.”*

However, we accept that a height limit exception may be made where necessary in the Sport and Active Recreation zone, specifically for competition purposes – refer to our separate submission on that zone.

#### **Multi-unit developments**

We agree that multi-unit developments such as terraced housing and low rise apartment blocks can contribute to the greater vibrancy of Kerikeri, and allow for the construction of a greater variety of housing types and sizes. However, one of our concerns is that the rules around outdoor space are inadequate, and there is a danger that in the drive for higher density, the planning rules will not achieve the overall goal of protecting what is valued by the community. We believe that



intensification in urban zones should be encouraged in the form of well-designed two or three storey buildings (e.g. apartment blocks) with permeable areas including garden/landscaped ground.

#### **Outdoor space for multi-unit developments and residential zones**

GRZ-P3 states *"Enable multi-unit developments within the General Residential zone, including terraced housing and apartments, where there is adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure"*

While we support the need for greater density we are concerned that, if not planned well, it will undermine the key drivers of the overall vision for the Far North outlined in "Far North 2100", especially, "Wellbeing of Communities and People", and Connecting People place and Communities".

In too many multi-unit developments in other districts, the only outdoor space is the concrete used to move and park cars. Especially where these developments take place alongside each other the importance of outdoor space increases. Outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for people to connect, to create a sense of community. When designed well, working within well designed rules, multi-unit developments could enhance the sense of community with Kerikeri and become a real asset.

The PDP provisions for multi-unit developments should:

- include requirements for outdoor space beyond the area needed to move and park vehicles private, including private and shared outdoor space on the north, east or west side of a building
- Where multi-unit developments take place alongside each other, the rules for shared 'green space' reflects the greater density and the need for places for people to share and connect, pedestrian walkways and access to community facilities and amenities.

S338.026 to  
S338.028,  
S338.069 to  
S338.071

As many developments occur by individual developers in silo, we see too many poorly designed, fragmented developments adjacent to each other take place, with no connectivity or potentially greater open spaces for residents to enjoy. This is where policies, guidelines and protocols should be developed to ensure that all developers work toward common design goals and principles that contribute positively and cohesively to the township and immediate area.

#### **Community open spaces, green open spaces, green corridors**

The PDP should wherever possible require or at least promote the creation of community open spaces, green open spaces, green corridors and linkages to support active transport, amenity and community wellbeing.

S338.050 &  
S338.072

#### **Urban design to reduce fear of crime**

CPTED is a crime prevention philosophy based on proper design and effective use of the built environment leading to a reduction in the incidence and fear of crime, as well as an improvement in quality of life. Local authorities have a key role to implement CPTED principles. In most cases, it is anticipated that the local authority will initiate, lead, and facilitate the partnership with the police and other groups. It's a key aspect to planning improved infrastructure to enhance community safety, health, and wellbeing, particularly with females feeling safe in these environments.

S338.006

#### **Crop protection structures and similar structures**

We recognise that windbreaks such as shelterbelt trees and manmade crop protection structures perform a necessary function in orchard areas. However, crop protection structures (CPS) that are visible from roads and residential properties have destroyed visual amenity and rural character in the areas where they are located. Examples can be seen along Kapiro Road and next to SH10 in

Pakaraka. These structures are industrial-style scars on the face of traditional vegetated rural landscapes. Over time, they attract graffiti and the cloth rips and becomes even more unsightly. The proliferation of crop protection structures is expected to continue. It is essential that PDP provisions on crop protection structures and other orchard/agricultural structures are strengthened promptly, to prevent further destruction of visual amenity and rural character.

S338.029,  
S338.051 to  
S338.067

**Setbacks and landscaping/screening:** We support PDP rules/standards that specify CPS and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries (eg. RLZ-S3).

However, the PDP needs additional specific rules/standards, as follows –

- In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property:
  - Those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour.
- Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a ‘non-complying’ activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. (If a breach is merely discretionary, the local communities who pass by these ugly structures on a daily basis will not have any opportunity to comment or object.)

PDP provisions need to be strengthened as above, but in the meantime, we encourage socially responsible orchardists to voluntarily plant landscaping screens to hide their orchard structures from roads and nearby houses, as a common courtesy to the local community.

#### **EFFECTS OF TRAFFIC ON PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES**

Our separate submission provides comments relating to active modes of transport.

This submission provides comments on issues associated with vehicular traffic. The proposed PDP rules (TRAN-R5, TRAN-Table 11 – Trip generation) appear to allow a relatively large amount of ‘trip generation’ or ‘car movements’ associated with new development in any zone, and the chapter requires further consideration.

Many new subdivisions in Kerikeri and the surrounding rural area have greatly increased the volume of traffic using the central shopping/service area and roads leading to/from the CBD (e.g. Kerikeri Road, Waipapa Road, Landing Road, Kapiro Road, Purerua Road). When new developments are approved, insufficient account is taken of the total/cumulative impact of multiple developments on traffic. Other negative impacts on the community are not taken into account – such as such additional levels of noise, disruption and other changes that can affect people, amenity values and the character of the area -

The RMA’s definition of *environment* specifically includes “people and communities” and “amenity values” (RMA s2).

RMA Schedule 4, Clause 7(1)(a) requires that all assessments of environmental effects “must address... any effect on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community”

PDP policies/rules should therefore include policies/rules to address the adverse effects of traffic on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community. These may include -

S338.033 &  
S338.034

- **Cumulative effects:** When considering the effects of a proposed activity, s3 of the RMA states that ‘*the term ‘effect’ includes ... any cumulative effect which arises over time or in combination with other effects ...*’

- **Noise:** s31 of the RMA specifies that council functions include “the control of the emission of noise and the mitigation of the effects of noise’
- **Amenity values and character of an area:** as provided for in the RMA.

PDP policies/rules need to take full account of the impacts of motorised traffic from existing and planned subdivision and development when assessing proposals for new developments. It should require full consideration of cumulative/combined traffic effects, congestion, emissions, noise etc. in townships and roads, especially roads leading to/from a CBD or service centres. PDP policies/rules should allow development proposals to be rejected on the grounds of significant adverse effects from traffic.

### **HORTICULTURE ZONE**

We support PDP provisions that will prevent further land fragmentation, sprawling development, and loss of productive agricultural/horticultural land. We support the creation of Horticulture zones to protect the productive land and irrigation infrastructure assets in the district.

As noted in the draft DP, the council has a responsibility under the RMA and Regional Policy Statement to protect highly versatile soils and prevent land fragmentation and sterilisation, including from reverse sensitivity.<sup>7</sup> We consider that further residential development on productive land should be avoided.

#### **Existing residential clusters in Horticulture zone**

We consider that clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone could be zoned as Rural Lifestyle. In effect this would create several islands of Rural Lifestyle zone within the Horticulture zone.

The PDP policies/rules relating to Rural Living zone should retain the potential for some of this land to be returned to agricultural production at a future date, if owners wish, so further residential development on productive land in existing residential areas of the Horticulture zone is undesirable. Satellite property maps can be used to identify clusters of existing residential lifestyle properties in the Horticulture zone. The following roads have existing residential lifestyle properties that do not have commercial-scale orchards or visible agricultural production, clustered around a road or access lane - these could be zoned as Rural Living islands within the Horticulture zone:

- Blue Gum Lane
- Conifer Lane
- Equestrian Drive, east side & northern area
- Ironbark Road, west & northern area
- McCaughan Road, southern area
- Ness Road, several clusters
- River Drive, northern area
- Riverstream Drive
- Tanekaha Lane
- Waipapa West Road, several clusters

Clusters of existing small residential lifestyle properties lying within the area proposed as Horticulture zone could be classed as Rural Lifestyle zone in cases where they meet criteria such as the following:

- Existing small residential lifestyle property less than 2.5 ha, and
- Without commercial agricultural/horticultural production, and
- Part of an existing cluster of at least 8 or so residential lifestyle properties clustered around a road or access lane.

S338.035

S338.036

<sup>7</sup> Draft DP Horticulture zone chapter, Overview text.

A secondary dwelling on existing larger residential lifestyle properties could be allowed in the Horticulture zone as a discretionary activity, but not within productive horticultural areas.

## **MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES**

### **Sprawl and sporadic patterns of development**

We support policies/rules that seek to avoid urban/residential sprawl in rural and coastal areas. Sprawling development and residential growth in rural areas brings negative effects – it generates longer driving distances for basic services, climate emissions, fragments rural land, reduces the area of productive land and undermines the character and amenity values of rural and coastal areas.

We support Coastal environment policy CE-P4 which states ‘avoiding sprawl or sporadic patterns of development’. However, the PDP should add similar provisions/rules in other zones/chapters.

### **Ribbon development**

Ribbon development in rural areas is an undesirable form of development that needs to be strictly controlled by PDP zoning rules. Examples are seen along SH10 and several other major routes. If left unchecked, ribbon development produces sprawling areas of development that may be kilometers long, multiple single accessways of roads, and problems such as traffic blocking major highways while vehicles wait to turn into those accessways.

### **Light industrial zone**

The following Light Industrial zone Overview sentence should be deleted: ‘the Light Industrial zone is not required to focus on pedestrian access or amenity or provide public spaces’. We disagree with this sentence, especially since the Light Industrial zone may be located next to residential or mixed use zones. Connectivity and amenity should be considered in all zones, while public spaces should be considered for the majority of zones where people live or work.

As an example, we note that Mill Lane (Kerikeri) in the Light Industrial zone is very close to schools, kohanga reos, childcare centres, and links to Hall Road. It is important that the PDP allows such locations to be used for safe pedestrian and cycling access.

### **Resource consenting procedures**

Currently the resource consenting process can take six months and is very frustrating for many applicants. We consider the process should be made clearer and simpler, while at the same time containing appropriate rules and policies that will protect and enhance our urban and natural environments and other things that our communities value.

We believe the council should consider introducing a two-queue system, comprising one queue for applications for small simple minor works by the general public, and a separate queue for other larger or more complex applications. We believe that two separate queues for processing applications could prevent simple minor works being held up by larger or more complex applications.

### **Specific zoning and overlays proposed in PDP maps**

Some of the proposed zoning is inappropriate. Several examples are provided below.

- **Coastal areas:** Many of the coastal areas that were zoned in coastal zones in the ODP are proposed as rural zones in the PDP, and the Coastal Environment area now covers a rather narrow coastal fringe. These changes have a negative effect, removing many of the protections that exist for coastal areas under the RMA and NZCPS. The PDP should add coastal overlays, or

S338.037 &  
S338.038

S338.039

S338.040

S338.041

S338.042

similar mechanism, to all coastal areas visible from marine areas, so that coastal landscapes, coastal character and coastal environments will be protected appropriately.

- **Areas already protected as a result of the consenting process:** Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years. However, the PDP map does not identify these sites and has applied entirely inappropriate zoning in some cases. This problem needs to be rectified promptly, so that existing protected sites are indicated on maps, protected by appropriate zoning and/or overlay, and are promptly included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.
- **Waipapa Landing:** The area around Waipapa Landing and Cherry Park house grounds should be recognised and preserved as a public recreational reserve.

S338.043 &  
S338.044

S338.045 &  
S338.046

**We seek the following decision from the Council:**

Please refer to the text above for areas where our group opposes, supports or seeks amendment to the PDP

I wish to be heard in support of my submission  
I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission  
(Please tick relevant box)

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing

Yes     No

Do you wish to present your submission via Microsoft Teams?

Yes     No

**Signature of submitter:** Annika Dickey, on behalf of Our Kerikeri



**Date:** 20 October 2022

**SUBMISSION NUMBER**

338