

EVIDENCE 69

TOPIC PC85A-D, 86A-B, 87, 102, 114

SUB# Rural Plan changes

DATE 28-07-2017.

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE BY KIM NATHAN IN RESPECT TO  
SUBMISSION 379 ON TOPIC – PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 86A BY THE WHANGAREI  
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

1. My name is Kim Nathan. I have the qualifications and experience as set out in my statement of primary evidence dated 22 June 2017. In my primary evidence, I addressed Submission 379 which seeks that the land as shown in the plan included as Attachment A of my primary evidence, be re-zoned Urban Transition Environment (UTE).
2. It is understood that a UTE zoning is potentially out of scope of these plan changes, however Submission 379 also sought that if a UTE zoning is not considered appropriate, the land should be re-zoned Rural Urban Expansion Environment (RUEE) to allow the logical progression of living development on the fringes of the Waipu township. Therefore, my evidence will focus on re-zoning the land RUEE in this summary statement of evidence.
3. The current proposed zoning of Rural Production Environment (RPE) does not reflect the existing pattern of development in the immediate surrounding area along South Road and will not enable the efficient use and development of the land. The potential for land in this area to be used for rural production activities has already been somewhat compromised by historical subdivision and land development for rural-lifestyle purposes.
4. The purpose of the RUEE is to recognise areas of existing rural-residential land located between the rural area and urban environment, providing capacity for future expansion and urban development, resulting in lot sizes of at least 1ha. The land consists of a cluster of smaller rural-lifestyle allotments located on the outskirts of the Waipu village, no longer in rural production use, with the lots sizes already being approximately 4ha or less in area.
5. I consider that by regularising the existing development and even allowing a slight increase in rural lifestyle development to occur within this area would be more in keeping with the character of the existing surrounding environment and an appropriate use of land in this location. Further, it would reduce demand pressures for the creation of smaller allotments from other larger more productive and commercial viable land holdings further from the village.

6. The sought rezoning is not “spot zoning”, on the contrary, the sought RUEE zoning immediately adjoins and is contiguous with land proposed to be re-zoned Rural Village Residential Environment (as supported by Council) and larger rural land holdings further south along South Road and will effectively act as a graduation rural-residential amenity buffer between the existing and proposed urban and rural environments.
7. The RUEE zoning is only currently proposed on the fringes of Whangarei city and not around other rural towns in the district which are also under pressure to expand, including Waipu which has been identified as one of three growth nodes in the Whangarei District Growth Strategy.
8. The population of Waipu has been and is expected to grow steadily with a conservative estimated population of 5000 by 2061; and a projected residential household demand of 940 and a projected rural-residential household demand of 505, by 2041 (Whangarei District Growth Strategy). This is in part, due to the state of housing affordability in Auckland, the proximity of Waipu to the greater Auckland region and the lifestyle opportunities in the surrounding area. The Council’s 42A report considers that there is still a substantial amount of vacant and undeveloped land zoned as Living 1 Environment (and proposed as RVRE) which would accommodate approximately up to 200 – 266 more residential sections prior to the next District Plan review (approx. 2027), however there is no provision at all for rural-residential growth in Waipu through the proposed plan changes.
9. The objectives for the RUEE seek to provide for future reticulated urban expansion of rural residential land located between rural and urban environments, where subdivision and development is appropriately designed to avoid hazard areas, heritage and natural features. The land sought to re-zoned does not contain any heritage or natural features worthy of protection. The land has been identified by the Council as being susceptible to flooding, however a flood assessment has been undertaken (as included in my original evidence) which confirmed that flooding of this area in a 100-year flood event is only possible if downstream culverts are not upgraded, the culverts have since been replaced and therefore flooding is no longer an issue.
10. There is currently limited capacity within the wastewater network, however I understand that an upgrade to the treatment plant has been set for 2021/2022 which will provide for the future reticulation of this rural-residential land.

11. Some of the proposed re-zoning throughout Waipu i.e. along the northern side of the Braigh and the northern end of the Waipu village appears to be little more than 'reactive planning' and I note that this land is located at a greater distance from the commercial centre and employment opportunities than the land sought to be re-zoned as part of this submission. Further, a large portion are also identified as being susceptible to flooding.
12. The Council does not support the sought re-zoning as the land is not contiguous with the proposed Rural Village Residential Environment (RVRE), however I note that the Council's 42A report supports the re-zoning of the land located immediately north of the land on South Road to RVRE.
13. Council also does not support the sought re-zoning as the land has been identified as being flood susceptible, however as discussed previously, following detailed analysis of the flood hazard, recommended works have been undertaken to mitigate the flood hazard for this land.
14. Two further submissions were made in support of Submission 379 and two submissions are in opposition. Diane and Ken Daron (X-240) who own Lot 3 DP 197716 and Graham Watson (X-069) who owns Lot 5 DP 197716 both made opposing further submissions, stating that they are opposed to intensive residential development within South Road and that the re-zoning sought to RUEE would not be acceptable, however noting that re-zoning the land UTE would be acceptable. I note that the RUEE subdivision provisions provide for development to a density of 1ha, which is larger than both Lot 3 DP 197716 (4289m<sup>2</sup>) and Lot 5 DP 197716 (4127m<sup>2</sup>), which are located further south of the land sought to be re-zoned as part of Submission 379.
15. Overall, my evidence demonstrates that the land should be re-zoned RUEE as the existing development pattern has characteristics that are more allied to ('lifestyle') rural-residential development than the larger rural production land-holdings further south along South Road. Further, the land is within walking distance of the Waipu village and it is my opinion that the proposed re-zoning by the Council is not sufficient to cater for the estimated rural-residential growth of Waipu.

**Kim Nathan**

**14 July 2017**