

Proposed District Plan – Hearing Stream 7

Stephanie Blick

Speaking Notes 06/07

Policy P1 and the Growth Strategy

The discussion surrounding the applicability of either clause 1) or 2) is a largely a moot point as Ms Sweetman and I are both in agreement that the rezoning is consistent with clause 2).

However, my final comments regarding applicability of Clause 1 as follows:

- Both New Residential Areas and Potential Growth Areas are identified as ‘medium term’ therefore it appears they are forecast to be advanced at similar times i.e. within the NPS Medium Term 3-10. And therefore the ‘new areas’ are not envisaged to be advanced ahead of the Silverwood site.
- The Implementation plan of the Growth Strategy includes the preparation of 3-Waters catchment plan to give effect to the strategy. The Silverwood site is included in the Cannons Creek and Whitby growth areas of WWL Preliminary 3-Waters Catchment Management Plan. The site is within two areas as the growth areas have been defined by catchments and the site falls within both the Cannons Creek and the Whitby catchments. The Whitby growth area is described as “*the existing suburb of Whitby, including development areas to the south of Whitby near the new link road*”.
- The Growth Strategy was developed to inform, among other things the LTP. On page 143 of the LTP in the ‘Planned Developments 2021-2051 – sequencing plans Whitby East and Silverwood are signalled for development between 2021 and 2051. Judgeford Hills is identified for development until 2046-2051, Pukerua Bay West and East in the NGA is between 2025-2041 and Mt Welcome also within the NGA is between 2030-2041. The LTP therefore signals that development of the Silverwood site will advance ahead of the other growth areas.

FUZ Zoning

- FUZ is defined in the National Planning Standards as –

*Areas suitable for urbanisation in the future **and for activities that are compatible with and do not compromise potential future urban use.***
- There are a number of matters in Appendix 11 that relate to the identification of ‘compatible activities’ in the future structure plan. Related to the Silverwood Draft Structure Plan, these matters include –
 - Integration of green networks with open space and pedestrian and cycle networks, showing how they reflect the underlying natural character values and provide opportunities for environmental restoration and biodiversity
 - Provision of open spaces which are highly visible from streets and of a scale and quality to meet identified community needs

- Paragraph 63 of my evidence - *Section 4.2 – Section 7 of the RMA* of the Section 32 Report for the FUZ chapter states that (my emphasis added) –
*“The FUZ will enable residential areas **and other complimentary land uses such as open space** which typically feature amenity values that are appreciated by the community and contribute to their desirability as places to live.”*
- And –
“FUZ areas feature SNAs and SALs, both of which protect environmental qualities that are valued by the community.”
- For FUZ identification process I do not consider that the final extents of residential areas need to be refined. Such areas aren’t generally refined on other structure plans that have informed FUZ zonings.
- FUZ is the most appropriate zone for the site as set out in my evidence.

Residential Zoning

- Would be determined by the project team as next stage in structure planning process if the FUZ zoning was to be approved.
- Could include a number of options (including bespoke provisions) even in light of MDRS requirements.

Access to Silverwood Block

- Project civil and traffic engineers identified the most suitable and practicable location for an access point.
- Final location was refined based on input and advice from the project ecologist. As a result areas were identified on the site where ecological mitigation for the loss of vegetation to create the access could occur.
- Ecological report identifies ecological enhancement opportunities via the protection of other SNA areas and ecological restoration.

Staging of development

- FUZ provisions do not preclude separate structure plans being advanced for the two sites or a structure plan developed by both landowners, a single landowner, or Council to cover both sites.

Takapuwahia Precinct

- The Takapuwahia Precinct is located in the General Residential Zone of the PDP with an SAL overlay and SNA overlays. Ms Sweetman notes that there are bespoke provisions that respond to the natural features and natural character of the site.
- On review of the draft maps for Variation 1 on Councils website, I note that the site is proposed to be rezoned MDRZ.
- Ms Armstrong outlined that she has recommended to Council that the current bespoke Takapuwahia Precinct provisions in the Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter be retained when the site is rezoned MDRS.
- The Council website for the PDP Variation 1 states that Council are considering *‘Building heights in Special Amenity Landscapes (where there is an underlying residential zone)’* as a qualifying matter.

Assessment Against PDP

- The site evaluation report accompanying the submission included an assessment against the relevant strategic direction objectives, most of which were not assessed by Ms Sweetman.
- As per my evidence, the appropriateness of the FUZ zoning for the other growth areas was not assessed against these strategic direction objectives nor was it assessed against the District Wide matters. Instead the relevant s32 report notes that:

‘future development and re-zoning would be subject to assessment against the District wide chapters of the PDP’.

- While I agree with Ms Sweetman that the identification of FUZ areas has resulted in the culmination of a number of structure plans, growth strategies and development frameworks, having reviewed all of these documents for other projects and for the preparation of the Silverwood submission, it is my opinion that the Silverwood submission provides significantly more detail and assessment. Also, the previous structure plans and growth strategies all pre-date the current RPS, the revised NPS-UD and Enabling Act and the PDP, including the District Wide and Strategic Direction objectives.
- The proposed rezoning gives effect to UFD-01 because:
 - The rezoning is ‘planned’ in the growth strategy, the subsequent 3 waters implementation plan and in the LTP
 - The rezoning will contribute to a ‘compact’ city via the containment of the urban environment within close proximity to city and local centres, existing roading, existing services, amenities and other services.
 - The rezoning is strategic as it aligns will infrastructure provision. The submission also notes that the rezoning and redevelopment of the site could leverage off infrastructure and other works occurring as part of the Porirua East regeneration project.
- The proposed rezoning gives effect to UFD-02 because:
 - It will assist in providing sufficient supply of land to meet the citys medium-term housing needs. This objective does not place a limit on supply and I note that, when the PDP is amended to give effect to the NPS-UD amendments this objective should be amended to state ‘providing, at least, sufficient supply’.
 - I also note that on page 13 of the Growth Strategy, it states that *“the District Plan will aim to zone land and identify services as part of the Resource Management Act process. Where possible, the District Plan will future proof land up to 30 years, based on the identification shown in this strategy”*
- The proposed rezoning gives effect to UFD-03 because:
 - The traffic, engineering and urban design assessments included with the submission confirm that the site can be connected to the adjacent neighbourhood, accessed, and support the existing community of Waitangirua. The site is in close proximity to Warspite Avenue that is a main bus route through Waitangirua and Cannons Creek.