



Waikato District Council  
Via Email

28<sup>th</sup> October 2022

**SUBMISSION ON ENABLING HOUSING SUPPLY VARIATION 3 TO THE PROPOSED WAIKATO DISTRICT PLAN: TERESA WINE**

Reference: A. Proposed Waikato District Council Plan

**Introduction**

1. I wish to speak to my submission and request a hearing to be held.
2. I make this submission to the Waikato District Council (WDC) in response to proposed changes to the Waikato District Plan (Reference A). This would potentially enable the owners of properties within 800 metres of Pokeno Town Centre to construct up to three dwellings up to three stories high (3x3) without the need for resource consent. (Variation 3). I am potentially affected by this proposed change as I live withing the 800m radius.
3. I understand that this variation results from a central government initiative, imposed on Local Authorities.
4. I do not intend to address each part of Reference A in this submission. Rather, this submission contains my overall response to the Variation.

**Submission**

5. I oppose the proposed changes enabling housing supply (Variation 3 to Reference A) which would allow medium density housing (3x3) without the need for a resource consent and without the need for public notification and I make the following points in support:
  - a. **Pokeno Character.** Pokeno has evolved to have the character of a village in a rural setting. I am concerned that should the proposed variation proceed, the character of Pokeno will be forever and irreversibly changed. In other words, my fellow residents and I will have lost the ability to determine for themselves, how they want "their" town to develop.
  - b. **Secrecy** Is the council attempting to sneak these changes through under the cover of darkness?
  - c. **Unfairness.** Should the variation proceed, I may be faced with the prospect of having several multi-story dwellings constructed close to my boundary with all the adverse effects - such as being cast in shadow, loss of outlook, claustrophobic conditions - associated with that. Any multi level dwellings built alongside my boundary will be looking directly into my bedroom and will remove all privacy from my backyard and coupled with the intention in

the Pokeno concept plan council is currently also attempting to force upon us, a pedestrian rail overbridge is proposed for placement at the rear of my property thus destroying any privacy at all.

It is likely to result in a decrease in the value of my property or conversely will increase the cv of my property and thereby increasing my rates(which are rapidly becoming unaffordable at \$140 a week currently). I will gain zero benefit from a higher value as I have no intention of selling and leaving a town I've lived in for nearly 25 years.

I will have no warning of such development and will have no recourse. As if that were not enough in terms of unfairness, those who, like me, live within the 800m radius are potentially affected while those outside the 800m radius are not.

- d. Pokeno has already undergone significant housing development in recent times which is ongoing and has caused significant changes to our village.
- e. **Blunt Instrument.** Fixing the housing shortage problem (which is not an issue in Pokeno) by creating another problem is not the answer. Do not accept, let alone create, significant and adverse impacts on current property owners like me by introducing something that has dubious benefit for a small number of as yet unknown future residents.
- f. **No Public Notification.** I have a real concern that many sections of Reference A – especially those in Part 3 – specifically state that no public notification will occur. This is unacceptable and suggests WDC intends to approve elements it knows are likely to be unpopular (or which it feels it may have no choice but to approve) by stealth. This is not the way I want my elected representatives or their staff to act.
- g. **To even contemplate allowing 3 x 3 townhouses to be put onto any available section within the zone without ANY NOTIFICATION to direct neighbour's is disgusting and completely unacceptable.**
- h. **To allow this level of intensive development alongside what has and is currently occurring will place an even bigger burden upon our existing struggling infrastructure and the ratepayer will ultimately end up footing the bill.**
- i. **Pokeno**, as a community, has already helped the national housing supply significantly with the provision of new housing.
- j. **The only support in a meeting of 50 residents was a single developer.**
- k. **100% of community attendees voiced a resounding loud and decisive NO to this variation.**
- l. **Pokeno village is not a city suburb. We chose to leave the city and come to the country. We certainly didn't choose to live in an area where uncontrolled development of cheap , tacky, ugly nasty dog box developments are going to be allowed to spring up all over the place.**
- m. **Shame on you central government for forcing communities to turn into slums and ghettos.**

## Recommendations

6. Acknowledging that the fundamental drivers for the proposed variation come not from the WDC but from central government, the PCC makes the following recommendations:
  - a. Reject the current central government directive that imposes these changes on existing properties. All local authorities are impacted by this imposition so, assuming most if not all local authorities are not in favour, then use the collective voice to send a clear message to the government. Defy if it comes to that.
  - b. Recognise that Pokeno has a special character and include this character as a Qualifying Matter in Reference A (MRZ2-P6). Put measures in place (such as not allowing MD dwellings

to cause significant loss of light and/or outlook) to protect those properties which may be adjacent to future MD housing and whose current owners are subject to covenants. At the least, these changes should only apply to newly created residential sections that have not yet been sold to a homeowner and where the use of MD housing will not adversely impact the special character of Pokeno.

- c. Actually I recommend you reject this proposal in it's entirety as it makes an absolute farce of all those who have had to spend thousands to get consents. Ask central government to politely remove their nose from our communities and stop destroying the intrinsic nature of New Zealand's small towns.

Teresa Wine  
16 Market Street  
Pokeno 2402