

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	756	<b>Submitter:</b>	Simon Upton
<b>Point Number</b>	756.1		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> the extent of the proposed extension of Residential Zoning on the south side of Ngaruawahia as detailed on Map 20.7 to provide a clear urban boundary and transition to the rural zone that preserves the integrity of the gully system and stream margins on the south side of the existing town and reflects the landscape, visual, open green space, green linkages and amenity values promoted elsewhere in the PDP.</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Defer</b> the re-issue of any amended version of the residential zoning limits detailed in Map 20.7 until the March 2017 Structure Plan has been revised to reflect the strategic directions, objectives and policies of the PDP and has been subjected to full consideration of alternative zone boundaries as required by s 32 RMA.</p>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The zoning is based on a non-statutory document – the March 2017 Structure Plan – which has not been subject to s32 analysis and does not form part of the Proposed District Plan.</li> <li>• It is based on but departs from non-statutory document-March 2017 Structure Plan, which does not form part of Proposed District Plan and has not been subject to s32 analysis.</li> <li>• Any extension of residential zoning in this area should fully preserve key topographical and landscape features from development and clearly indicated how key amenities are to be provided for.</li> <li>• Map 20.7 should be withdrawn and reconsidered in light of technical reports on pre-existing landscape, visual and amenity effects, relevant sections of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and key sections of PDP.</li> <li>• The March 2017 Structure Plan should be appraised for consistency with the above documents.</li> <li>• The Proposed District Plan does not include a Structure Plan that supports the residential zoning change.</li> <li>• The 2017 Structure Plan provides no indication that any of the landscape and open space concerns have been taken into account.</li> <li>• No regard for residential extension limits proposed in March 2017 Structure Plan.</li> <li>• Boundaries were different from those in PC17, therefore it is inconsistent with new residential limits.</li> <li>• Proposed District Plan differs radically from the Structure Plan in that it extends the Residential Zone to only a small sliver of land to the west of gully intersecting Rangimarie Road, and adds land on the south side of the proposed road linking Saubrey Road and Rangimarie Road.</li> <li>• Extension to east of Rangimarie Road is problematic in that it cuts across the gully system and proposes a road through the middle of the wetland and also encompasses hills of high local landscape values and marked as being less suitable for development.</li> <li>• No rationale provided for not continuing the zone all the way to the Ngaruawahia-Te Kowhai Road.</li> <li>• No proper consideration of landscape and open space issues.</li> <li>• Blanket extension of Residential Zoning between Rangimarie and Saubrey roads cuts through gently rolling hills and a stream, a critical point in local landscape.</li> <li>• Elevated ground particularly significant part of larger area of rolling country and thus part of a distinctive significant local landscape that is the backdrop to Ngaruawahia, Horotiu and parts of Te Kowhai.</li> <li>• No clear town boundary and transition to rural zone.</li> <li>• Extending residential zone to Saubrey Road places at risk the continued separation of Ngaruawahia and Horotiu, and under this proposal there will be one-farm separating the two built up spaces.</li> <li>• Submitter takes note of 2014 Mansergh Graham report, supporting PC17.</li> <li>• Residential proposed south of railway line is little more than a ribbon of development permanently cut off by key transport arteries.</li> <li>• No consideration of alternative zoning solutions.</li> <li>• Any decision to alter town boundaries by rezoning rural land as residential will have irreversible effects and is not a minor environmental impact.</li> <li>• Permanently obliterates some environmental, amenity and landscape values and replaces them with residential and commercial values.</li> <li>• Major and irreversible changes should only be made after careful consideration of alternatives.</li> <li>• Approach is not consistent with Proposed District Plan objectives and policies.</li> <li>• The approach indicated in Map 20.7 and the Structure Plan on which it is based is not consistent with the Proposed District Plan's objectives and policies, specifically:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ section 1.12 dealing with significant landscape features and availability of public space;</li> <li>◦ section 1.12.6 dealing with the protection and enhancement of open green space and areas of ecological ... and environmental significance;</li> <li>◦ sections 4.7.2 and 4.7.3 promoting subdivision that is sympathetic to the natural &amp; physical qualities and characteristics of the surrounding environment, connectivity, green linkages and a layout that reflects the underlying topography;</li> <li>◦ section 4.7.10 concerning the prominence and accessible by pedestrians.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		