

Submitter Number 272

Mark Smith

Waikato District Plan Review

Hearing 25 – Rest of District – Hamilton Fringe Report

Requesting rezoning of the Summerfield Lane Precinct
from Rural to Country Living.

Speaker's Notes

- The Summerfield Duck.

Thank you for the opportunity to present to you today.

In the summary section of the evidence I submitted on 11 February 2021 I referred to the old adage that if something looks like a duck, quacks like a duck and walks like a duck then the evidence all points to it being a duck.

- Evidence Provided

The Summerfield Lane precinct I refer to in my submission and in my evidence has all the characteristics of a Country Living Zone except the zoning. All the evidence and appearance and servicing and assorted property sizes and soil qualities point to it being Country Living Zone but the zoning in the District Plan does not.

As you have this evidence to hand in my original submission and my evidence paper, I shall not take the time to repeat this information at this point. I will address the pertinent information when addressing the matters raised in the s42A reports.

- Section 42A Reports

- Dr Mark Davey Report – Supplementary Evidence

Dr Davey's report provides detailed data analysis regarding land supply in the Waikato District that would result should the panel accept the zoning decisions recommended by the Council s42 authors.

As the Council report did not recommend the re-zoning of the Summerfield Lane Precinct, I have little to say about the Davey report. What I would say is that it is quite properly a macro view of the whole District and the added data from Summerfield Lane, should you accept my submission, is too small to skew any conclusions made by Dr Davey

○ Hearing 25: Zone Extents. Rest of District – Hamilton Fringe. Susannah Tait.

I found Ms Tait's s42 Report disappointing with her decision (para24) to lump all Tamahere zoning requests together for consideration without, it would seem, separate consideration of the different physical, planning and soil considerations of the different submissions. Submitters have invested time and effort on their submissions since 2018 and I think a little more individual attention was warranted in the s42 report.

(para 24 s42 Report. For Tamahere, I have assessed all the requests for a Country Living Zone and a Village Zone together (being requests for a rural residential outcome).)

● Rebuttal

" The National Policy Statement defines an urban environment as: "any area of land (regardless of size, and irrespective of local authority or statistical boundaries) that: (a) is, or is intended to be, predominantly urban in character; and (b) is, or is intended to be, part of a housing and labour market of at least 10,000 people".

The Summerfield proposal does not meet this definition and cannot be considered as creating an urban environment.

Ms Tait states (at para 30) that Future Proof 2017 states that the Hamilton urban area includes the, Tamahere-Tauwhare Census Area Unit and that this to be a sufficient directive that Tamahere and Matangi can be considered to be covered by future proof considerations.

The mapping provided in Fig 11 of Ms Tait's report and the information in her paras 55 and 56 show that the Summerfield Lane proposal is outside both the proposed urban limit for Tamahere and outside the expansion area considered for Hamilton City. Any small changes within the Summerfield lane Precinct will not therefore interfere with these Future Proof proposals in the future.

High class soils are defined in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement as: "those soils in Land Use Capability Classes I and II (excluding peat soils) and soils in Land Use Capability Class IIIe1 and IIIe5, classified as Allophonic Soils."

The DSIR report I provided with my proposal states that the soils in the Oosterbahn subdivision portion of the Summerfield precinct are made up of Class IIs3, Class IIw3, Class IIIe3, Class IVe2 and Class VIe2 soils. The class IIw3 soils are said to be poorly drained with wetness. Overall there are no useful areas of good soils and these are already developed for country living uses.

The Soil and Land evaluation Ltd report I supplied for the Mc Neill subdivision portion of the Summerfield precinct showed the soils to be a mix of Class IVe2 and Class IIIw3.

Therefore only small parts of the Summerfield precinct have soils that reach the High Class definition of the Waikato Regional Policy statement. The portions that do meet the high

standard are generally already developed with housing and grounds and are not used productively.

46. Policy 6.1713 (Rural residential development in Future Proof area) acknowledges that careful management of rural residential development is required that recognises the pressures from and the adverse effects of rural residential development particularly within close proximity to Hamilton City, as well as the potential for adverse effects; conflicts between activities; servicing demands; and cross-territorial boundary effects.

Any development within the Summerfield Precinct would be governed by the Country Living Rules and these would avoid any adverse effects or cause conflicts between activities as they would be within an area that already has the characteristics of a Country Living Zone. As laid out in my evidence the increase in demand on council services would be less than minor but would add to the rating income.

Lastly the policy states that rural residential development should have regard to the principles in section 6A, this includes eight principles specific to rural residential development, being:

a) be more strongly controlled where demand is high;

Country Living Zone Rules would control any Summerfield Precinct development.

b) not conflict with foreseeable long-term needs for expansion of existing urban centres;

Summerfield precinct is outside the boundaries signified as being for expansion

c) avoid open landscapes largely free of urban and rural-residential development;

Any development would be within existing rural-residential development.

d) avoid ribbon development and, where practicable, the need for additional access points and upgrades, along significant transport corridors and other arterial routes;

Any Summerfield Recinct development would not constitute ribbon development, create only limited individual property access points which would not be on significant transport corridors.

e) recognise the advantages of reducing fuel consumption by locating near employment centres or near current or likely future public transport routes;

The Summerfield precinct is only 10km from both Hamilton and Cambridge. While there is a surfeit of school buses passing the precinct, there is no public bus service. However this is a fault of the Regional Council bus route which could be solved by a minor reroute of the Cambridge to Hamilton public bus route to service the Hooker Road, Duncan Road, Pencarrow Road, Summerfield Lane, Tamahere Drive, Oaklea Lane and Strawberry Fields Lane,.

f) minimise visual effects and effects on rural character such as through locating development within appropriate topography and through landscaping;

Any development would fit within the Country Living character of the existing properties. The potential visual effects would be minor and individual developments would be within appropriate topography.

g) be capable of being serviced by onsite water and wastewater services unless services are to be reticulated;

Any development within the precinct would be capable of being serviced by onsite water and wastewater services although trickle feed council water supply is available.

h) be recognised as a potential method for protecting sensitive areas such as small water bodies, gully-systems and areas of indigenous biodiversity.

Prior development of the Summerfield Precinct into farmland many years ago would have destroyed any areas of biodiversity as it was bare farmland. However, since development as a rural residential area it has been well planted with Kauri, Rimu, Kahikatea, Kanuka, and other indigenous and introduced trees and Tui, Korimako, Kotare, Ruru, piwakawka and riroriro, Pukeko, Pipiwharauoa are all resident in the valley and other birds are frequent visitors.

Infill housing sites in this area would not require reshaping of contours or destruction of established vegetation. The McNeill subdivision area includes a covenanted area of Kahikatea.

Summary

The reasons Ms Tait gives for her recommendation that my submission be declined are all addressed above and shown to be not applicable.

The information I have given above is largely a repeat of the information given in my original submission and my evidence paper of February 2021.

I trust that is sufficient to lead the Commissioners to disregard Ms Tait's recommendations and grant the re-zoning of the Summerfield Precinct from Rural to Country Living.

Mark Smith

10 May 2021