

Attachment A – Auckland Council Submission on the Proposed Waikato District Plan

Topic: Urban Growth and Future Proof Growth Strategy

Plan Section	Support/Oppose	Decision Requested	Reason for Decision Requested
Section 1.5	Support in part: seek amendments	Amend section 1.5 to be titled as follows: <i>1.5 What does this mean for Waikato District strategic objectives and directions?</i>	Proposed amendments will explicitly identify that the matters listed in section 1.5 are the district strategic objectives and directions of the Plan.
Sections 1.5.1(a), 1.5.2(a), 1.5.4(c)	Support	Retain	Overall strategic direction relating to creating a compact urban growth development pattern in line with the outcomes of Future Proof.
Sections 1.5.5(f), 1.5.5(g)	Support	Retain	Services and general Infrastructure provisions and servicing deliver growth patterns identified in Future Proof.
Sections 1.5.7.3(b)	Support	Retain	Provision of water supply to growth areas and links to the Subregional Three Waters Strategy (part of the Future Proof partnership).
Planning maps - Application of 'live' urban residential zones in and around Pokeno and Tuakau. This submission point includes but is not limited to the provisions in Chapter 4, Chapter 16 Residential Zone, and Planning Maps.	Oppose	Amend Chapter 4, Chapter 16, the Planning Maps and any other provisions that are proposed for unserviced urban residential areas in and around Pokeno and Tuakau where there is uncertainty about the funding, staging and timing for infrastructure provision.	<p>The provisions of Section 4.1 <i>Strategic Direction</i> do not adequately address how subdivision and development activities will be managed where a 'live' residential zoning is proposed for un-serviced land in and around Pokeno and Tuakau. The planning framework proposed for these areas is not promoting an integrated, staged approach to infrastructure and development. It is likely to enable development that undermines the ability to coordinate the adequate provision of network and community infrastructure to support growth.</p> <p>An alternative method to 'live' zoning of these areas should be considered, to more appropriately manage land where a live zone has been applied, but where there is no existing or planned supporting infrastructure.</p>

Section 1.5	Support in part	AMEND provisions and maps to provide for outcomes identified in the Auckland-Hamilton Spatial Plan and Future Proof Strategy Phase 2 review.	There is work underway producing the Auckland-Hamilton Spatial Plan, and also carrying out the Phase 2 review of the Future Proof Growth Strategy. These processes will generate a vision for managing urban growth and development in significant parts of the Waikato District that may differ in some respects from that in the Proposed Plan as currently written.
-------------	-----------------	--	--

Topic: Providing for Future Growth in Tuakau and Pokeno

Plan Section	Support/Oppose	Decision Requested	Reason for Decision Requested
Residential Zone 16.1.3 (RD1) <i>The requirements for multi-unit development within the residential zone.</i>	Support in part; seek amendments	Amend 16.1.3 (RD1) as it relates to Pokeno and Tuakau as follows: <i>A Multi-Unit development that meets all of the following conditions:</i> <i>(a)The Land Use – Effects rules in Rule 16.2;</i> <i>(b)The Land Use – Building rules in Rule 16.3, except the following rules do not apply:</i> <i>(i)Rule 16.3.1, Dwelling;</i> <i>(ii)Rule 16.3.8 Building coverage;</i> <i>(iii)Rule 16.3.9 Living court;</i> <i>(iv)Rule 16.3.10 Service court;</i> <i>(c)The minimum net site area per residential unit is 300m²;</i> <i>(d)The Multi-Unit development is connected to public wastewater and water reticulation.....</i> Alternatively, introduce an alternative residential zone for	Growth can be accommodated within Pokeno and Tuakau through expanding the urban areas or through enabling greater densities within existing urban areas. The proposed plan seeks to accommodate growth within Tuakau and Pokeno through increasing the urban footprints of these towns. Within the proposed Residential zone there is provisions for multiunit development however, each unit must have a minimum net site area of 300m ² . The minimum site area for vacant lot subdivision is 450m ² . The proposed rules within the residential zone will not provide for intensification of the existing urban area nor will they result in a range of housing typologies that facilitate housing choice. The proposed rezoning of rural land for urban development and the zone rules will generate further urban sprawl on land and will result in a loss of prime soil. Furthermore, the lack of variety in housing typologies facilitated within the Residential and Village zones will result in a lack of housing choice to cater for a variety of incomes in and around Tuakau and Pokeno. Higher minimum densities than those proposed are more appropriate for established residential areas immediately adjacent to the Business Town Centre zones. Higher residential densities around this zone would better support public transport and other infrastructure, the commercial vitality of the town centre and promote people living, working and playing in their local town centres.

		Pokeno and Tuakau which provides for terrace housing.	<p>The provision of other bulk and location requirements, site coverage and the assessment criteria included for this type of activity are sufficient enough to address the likely impacts on amenity and residential character, whilst encouraging alternative types of housing design and delivering on the typology enabled by these provisions.</p> <p>An alternative to the above is to enable a new zone to be included within established residential areas, such as within walking distance from existing Business Town Centre zoned areas. This could be a more dense residential zone, or one that enables slightly increased building envelopes to enable in-fill and additional residential development to occur close to town centres.</p>
--	--	---	---

Topic: Pressure on productive capacity of rural land

Plan Section	Support/Oppose	Decision Requested	Reason for Decision Requested
Protection of the productive capacity of high class soils			
Section 1.5	Support in part: seek additions	Amend: Insert a new section in Section 1.5 for <i>High class soils</i> as a matter of strategic direction.	Identify the protection of high class soils is a significant issue with its own strategic direction and objective in section 1.5.1.
Section 1.5.1	Support	Retain	Identifying compact urban development as one of the strategic directions of the plan to ensure growth occurs around existing established centres.
Objective 5.1.1 Objective 5.2.2 22.4.1.1 Prohibited Subdivision	Support	Retain	Provisions that protect and retain high class soils.
Maintenance of rural character and amenity			
Rule 22.4.1.5 Rural Hamlet Subdivision	Oppose	Delete	Rural Hamlets and the growth of new residential areas should be limited and focused around existing towns and villages. Strategic directions in the plan encourage growth around existing towns and centres, therefore enabling rural hamlets do not align with this. Rural hamlet developments have the potential to create small enclaves of residential activity, with potential effects on reverse sensitivity.

			<u>transport management and on rural character. Manage impacts of ribbon or hamlet development.</u>
Policy 5.3.8(d)	<u>Support</u> in part <u>Oppose</u>	<u>Delete</u> Amend Policy 5.3.8 (remove strikethrough and insert <u>underline</u>): (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects	The Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part does not provide for rural hamlets. Instead it seeks to encourage the development of existing towns and villages. The provisions enabling rural hamlet development do not cascade appropriately from the higher order strategic objectives of the plan and as the provisions enabling rural hamlets are sought for deletion, the associated policy is also sought for deletion. Rural Hamlets may have the potential however, to grow across regional boundaries into Auckland. The proposed amendments to the policies for rural hamlets will ensure these are precluded where such development has the potential to grow across regional boundaries.
Conservation lots			
22.4.1.6 Conservation lot subdivision	Support in part; <u>seek further analysis</u>	Further Section 32 analysis required.	Support further section 32 analysis to consider the potential costs and benefits of conservation lots in the rural area, in particular the impacts of potential yields on rural character where these provisions are utilised to create additional lots. Analysis to consider the potential impact on growth in the rural area would be beneficial.
Transferable Title (TTR) mechanism			
22.4.1.1 Prohibited subdivision Rule PR4	Support in part; <u>seek amendments</u>	22.4.1.1 Prohibited subdivision Rule PR4 with changes as follows (remove strikethrough and insert <u>underline</u>): <i>(a) Any subdivision where a <u>lot</u> has been created for the purpose of a transferable rural <u>lot</u> subdivision under the provisions of the previous Operative Waikato</i>	WDP approach to rural subdivision does not include TTR mechanism which enables additional subdivision rights to be transferred to other sites where certain criteria are met. Suggest amendments to the provisions to make it more absolute that no additional lots are able to be subdivided where a transferable rural lot subdivision has occurred in the past.

		<i>District Plan – Franklin Section. by either: (i) Amalgamation; or (ii) Re-survey</i>	
--	--	---	--

Topic: Cross Boundary issues

Plan Section	Support/Oppose	Decision Requested	Reason for Decision Requested
General cross-boundary matters			
Section 1.5.3	Support	Retain Section 1.5.3 Cross-boundary issues	Support the strategic recognition of the significance of cross boundary issues for integrated decision making.
Section 1.5.5(e)	Support	Retain Section 1.5.5(e) regarding consultation between the organisations responsible for the infrastructure, developers, adjoining landowners, and iwi and adjoining consent authorities.	Support the directive for consultation between the organisations responsible for the infrastructure, developers, adjoining landowners, and iwi and adjoining consent authorities.
Cross boundary natural environment protection matters			
Section 1.5.3 use of term “natural character”	Support	Retain	Land-water interface and natural character have cross boundary implications are not confined to one geographical area.
Section 1.5.3 Cross boundary issues	Support in part	Amend section 1.5.3 to seek that the Council liaise with Auckland Council and Waikato Regional Council and the relevant district councils on air quality issues as appropriate where there could be adverse effects across territorial boundaries.	There are activities, which may have the potential to adversely affect air quality beyond the district boundary such as odour or dust. Support the recognition that although Councils may under s31 (b) of the Resource Management Act "control ... any actual or potential effects of the use, development or protection of land ...", the primary control of air contaminants remains the role of the regional councils through their regional plans. Seek that the Council liaise with Auckland Council and Waikato Regional Council and the relevant district councils on air quality issues as appropriate where there could be adverse effects across territorial boundaries.
Section 1.5.3	Support	Retain	Recognition that the west coast is a wild and scenic coastline with limited road access which has restricted development in the past.

Section 1.5.3	Support	Retain	The Miranda coast has a low-lying more sheltered character, is important to Tangata whenua and is an internationally significant habitat for migratory birds.
Objective 3.2.1	Support	Retain <i>(a) Indigenous biodiversity in Significant Natural Areas is protected and enhanced.</i>	Supports the identification and protection of Significant Natural Areas.
Policy 3.2.2	Support in part; seek amendments	Amend Policy 3.2.2 as follows (remove strike through and insert <u>underline</u>): <i>Identify significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna in accordance with the Waikato Regional Policy Statement <u>and include identified significant ecological areas in the Auckland Unitary Plan which cross the Waikato-Auckland territorial boundary as Significant Natural Areas.</u></i>	Seek alignment with the Auckland Unitary Plan – Operative on Part in relation to the identification and protection of Significant Natural Areas in close proximity to the common territorial authority boundary. Ensure areas identified in the Unitary Plan follow through into the Waikato District.
Road network activities			
Chapter 13: Definitions <i>Road network activities</i> Rule 14.12.1(a) P5 for permitted activity standards for road network activities	Support	Retain	General alignment of the definition of 'road network activities' will make it more efficient for Auckland Transport to manage roading within Waikato District and across the common boundary.

Topic: Reverse sensitivity and management of adjoining land uses

Plan Section	Support/Oppose	Decision Requested	Reason for Decision Requested
Section 1.5.4(b)	Support	Retain	Strategic recognition that reverse sensitivity.
Policy 5.3.7	Support	Retain	Policy that recognises types of rural environment activities and avoids and or mitigates the effects of these activities on other sensitive land uses.
22.3.7.2 Building setback sensitive land use	Support	Retain	Building setbacks create separation for sensitive activities based on zone and site size. Specific rules for sensitive activities are included.
22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries	Support	Retain	Building setbacks create separation for sensitive activities based on zone and site size. Specific rules for sensitive activities are included.