

Appendix 3

Variation 4 Iona Residential Rezoning

Issues and Recommendations Report

This Appendix provides an assessment of the submissions and the Hearing Panel's recommendations in respect of these. It should be read in conjunction with:

- The summary of submissions made (Appendix 2);
- The Recommendations report, which highlights the major issues raised in submissions and the Hearing Panel's consideration and recommendations in relation to them; and
- The recommended amendments to the provisions as a result of submissions (Appendix 1)

Please note that the submission points have been grouped into key topic areas, with recommendations made across submissions on the same (or similar) topic. Submission points made by an individual submitter may therefore occur in several topic areas, depending on the nature and extent of their submission.

1. ISSUE 1 - GENERAL SUPPORT FOR IONA REZONING PROPOSAL

1.1 RECOMMENDATION

a) That the submissions of

#04 Stuart Rattray

#06 David MacCallum

#34 G Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

In demonstrating support for the rezoning of the Iona Urban Growth Area *be accepted* insofar as they support Variation 4 to rezone this area of land for residential purposes, supporting the Section 32A analysis.

1.2 REASONS

1. The submissions support the rezoning of the Iona Urban Growth Area for residential use, demonstrating overall there is support for the rezoning to occur.

2. ISSUE 2 - GENERAL OPPOSITION TO IONA REZONING PROPOSAL AND NEED FOR HOUSING

2.1 RECOMMENDATION

a) That the submissions of:

#03 Edward Hamilton

#07 Pete Wynne-Lewis

In demonstrating opposition to the residential rezoning of the Iona Urban Development Area *be rejected*.

2.2 REASONS

1. The potential environmental effects resulting from Variation 4 have been subject to detailed environmental assessments as evidenced in the Section 32 Evaluation Report and the supporting technical documentation (Appendices A-Q). This Variation as notified is on the basis that extensive planning and comprehensive environmental assessment has taken place and ensures that any adverse effects of such a development will be avoided, remedied or mitigated.
2. That the Ministry of Education has been consulted on the proposed Variation as evidenced in the Consultation Log, Appendix F of the Section 32 Report. Independent of Variation 4, the Ministry of Education have commenced an Area Strategy for Havelock North and the surrounding area which will provide a long term view of the future needs within the school network and Council and the Ministry will continue to liaise in implementing its regional growth strategy.
3. Residential development in this area is consistent with the HPUDS and Hawkes Bay RPS and is required to meet Council's obligations under the NPS UDC.

3. ISSUE 3 – WIDER IMPLICATIONS OF INCREASED POPULATION IN HAVELOCK NORTH

3.1 RECOMMENDATION

a) That the submission of

#02 Vicki Gold

In demonstrating support for the rezoning of the Iona Urban Development Area be accepted in part insofar as the submitter supports ongoing growth and development of Havelock North and that it needs to be done in a controlled and considered manner.

b) That the submission of

#09 Robert and Nicky Gardner

Be rejected as the submission with regard to the need for more schools and a supermarket is beyond the scope of the proposed rezoning.

3.2 REASONS

1. The submission supports the rezoning of the Iona Urban Growth Area for residential use.
2. That the requests for more schools, supermarkets and medical services cannot be accepted through this variation process as those matters are for the individual organisations and businesses to decide on how to conduct their businesses.
4. That consultation with the MoE, HBDHB and the wider community including supermarkets is done via statutory and non-statutory processes. It is ultimately up to the organisations and businesses to decide on their own future planning and business management and to respond to the changes that Variation 4 may bring to the community.
5. That the Council monitors and manages parking capacity in the village centre to ensure that the total overall volume of parking is sufficient to meet present demands.

4. ISSUE 4 – OFF-ROAD CYCLE LINKAGES THROUGH IONA RESERVES

4.1 RECOMMENDATION

a) That the submission of

**#20 Hawke's Bay Mountain Bike Club
C/- Roger Wiffin, Stradegy**

In demonstrating support for the open spaces and public linkages between Lane Road and Middle and the adjacent Iona Bull and Terraces Neighbourhoods and Endsleigh Road and seeking amendments to the Structure Plan and Policy ITP5 to facilitate recreational linkages be accepted in part in so far as Policy ITP5 and the Legend Reference on the Structure Plan have been amended to remove any suggestion of preference for walkways only, and there will be full consultation on the use of the reserve at the time of the vesting of the reserve and the development of the Reserve Management Plan.

4.2 REASONS

1. The zoning of the land is not the appropriate time for decisions on the public use and detailed layout of the reserve. Upon the vesting of the reserve, the management plan will be formulated and consultation on the uses will be undertaken.

5. ISSUE 5 – POWERCO – SECURING GAS SUPPLY TO IONA IN AN APPROPRIATE AND TIMELY MANNER

5.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#33 Powerco

Seeking amendments to Appx 11-25A, Objective HNSMAO5, Rule 30.1.5 (SLD2) and Anticipated Outcomes BHAO1 and BHAO8 and the inclusion of a definition of non-residential activity *be rejected*.

5.2 REASONS

1. That it would be ineffective to add provisions to the above mentioned sections as they are overruled by the Permissive Network Utilities DWA provisions.
2. That the Network Utilities DWA provisions provide for the protection of Network Utilities from land use activities which may adversely affect them.

6. ISSUE 6 – NON-RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITIES IN THE RURAL RESIDENTIAL ZONE

6.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#18 Brian Rickard

Be rejected as the submission is out of scope.

6.2 REASONS

1. Policy HRRP1, HRR8 and 9, Rules HRR 16, 17 and 19 and assessment criteria 8.3.8.3 and 8.3.8.5 are not subject to Variation 4.
2. Only consequential numbering changes as a result of the insertion of the new 'Iona Special Character Zone' occur to the Rural Residential Zone.

7. ISSUE 7 –TRAFFIC AND ROADING

7.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submissions of

#03 Edward Hamilton
#12 Phillip Appleford

Opposing the rezoning on the basis of the increase in traffic *be rejected* given that there is a significant need to provide for housing in Havelock North, the effects on the majority of roundabouts within the Village centre would be manageable and that a review of the Karanema roundabout is being planned by the road asset department.

- b) That the submissions of

#05 David and Colleen Youngquest
#09 Robert and Nicky Gardner

In demonstrating support for the Variation but seeking mitigation measures to deal with the effects of traffic on the road network *be accepted in part* given that there is a significant need to provide for housing in Havelock North, the effects on the majority of roundabouts within the Village centre would be manageable and that a review of the Karanema roundabout is being planned by the road asset department.

7.2 REASONS

1. That the effects of the proposed development on the road network will be mitigated by ensuring that the roads within the development are appropriately designed to ensure that it is a safe and efficient network and by providing for long term improvements to the wider network through the Council's Long Term Plan.
2. That traffic numbers along Gilpin Road will continue to be monitored to determine whether minor safety improvements may be required.
3. The consideration of a traffic management plan at the time of subdivision will enable conditions to be included on the subdivision consent to ensure any adverse traffic effects during development of these areas can be managed.

8. ISSUE 8 – STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

8.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#03 Edward Hamilton

Be rejected on the basis that this area is identified in the HPUDS and Hawkes Bay RPS and is required to give effect to the NPS urban Development Capacity, and potential stormwater related adverse effects will be appropriately mitigated.

#05 David and Colleen Youngquest

Be accepted as there is a need to ensure that the concept of, and requirements for, stormwater neutrality are clear defined in the Structure Plan and subdivision provisions to ensure adverse effects are appropriately managed and mitigated.

#08 Thomas and Karen Dear

#09 Robert and Nicky Gardner

Be rejected as the requirement to pipe drains on private land outside the development area is beyond the scope of Variation 4. However, it is noted that amendments have been made to the stormwater management requirements to ensure that post development flows are no more, and in some rainfall events less, than pre-development flows.

#27 William Davidson

Be accepted in part in so far as amendments have been made to the stormwater management requirements to ensure that post development flows are no more, and in some rainfall events less, than pre-development. It is also noted that the Structure Plan map (Appendix 13A, Figure 2) includes a stormwater management area in the vicinity of Outlet D to ensure that increased flows from development of this sub-catchment are appropriately managed and mitigated.

#28 Hawkes Bay Regional Council

Be accepted in that amendments have been made to the stormwater management requirements to ensure that post development flows are no more, and in some rainfall events less, than pre-development and that the Structure Plan map (Appendix 13A, Figure 2) includes a stormwater management area in the vicinity of Outlet D to ensure that increased flows from development of this sub-catchment are appropriately managed and mitigated.

#34 Graeme Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings

Be accepted in part, in so far as provisions have been amended to ensure that the land required for stormwater management facilities will be determined during detailed design and lodgement of an application for subdivision. Only land required for stormwater management purposes will be set aside and vested in Council and remaining land in the identified stormwater management areas can revert to its underlying zoning.

Be rejected to the extent that a stormwater management detention facility is likely to be required to mitigate flows from the lower catchment at Outlet D, and this has been provided for in the Structure Plan. It is noted however, that the location and sizing of the facility will be determined during detailed stormwater design and land not requirement for stormwater management purposes will be available for development in accordance with its underlying zoning.

8.2 REASONS

1. The development of urban areas and associated impervious surfaces creates additional stormwater runoff which, if unmitigated, can create new or exacerbate existing flooding and erosion effects. The Iona Structure Plan promoted the concept of 'stormwater neutrality', however this was not defined. Providing clear performance requirements to achieve stormwater neutrality will ensure that the stormwater network and associated detention facilities will be designed to appropriately mitigate adverse effects in accordance with Council's design guidelines.

2. A requirement to pipe drains on private property outside of the development area is outside of the scope of the Hearing Panel's jurisdiction. However, it is noted that both the Hastings District and Hawkes Bay Regional Councils acknowledged this issue and indicate that they will assess requirements in the future.
3. It is considered that stormwater detention is required in the vicinity of Outlet D to address increased stormwater flows in the relevant sub-catchments and that this mitigation cannot be provided by 'over-compensation' of flood flows in the upper catchment (other than for the 100 year ARI event). This has been provided for in recommended amendments to the subdivision provisions.

9. ISSUE 9 - COMPREHENSIVE STRUCTURE PLAN FOR THE LAND BETWEEN TE AUTE AND MIDDLE ROAD

9.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#08 Thomas Allen & Karen Dear

In requesting a comprehensive structure plan be undertaken for the land between Middle Rd and Te Aute Road *be rejected*.

9.2 REASONS

1. The land has not previously been identified within HPUDS as an area for residential development;
2. A structure plan over this land would earmark it for residential rezoning. This land is currently Zoned Plains Production which is identified for productive land uses; and
3. No assessments have been done on this land as to whether it is appropriate for residential development.

10. ISSUE 10 – GENERAL PROVISIONS IONA SPECIAL CHARACTER ZONE

10.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submissions of

#05 David and Colleen Youngquest

#24 Josephine and Simon Beamish

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Be accepted insofar as these support the general standards of the Iona Special Character Zone, and/or the amendments recommended to 30.1.7U(2) and the land to be zoned open space identified on the Appendix 13A, Figure 2 Structure Plan reflect the intentions of the submitter.

- b) That the submission of

#30 Hastings District Council

Be accepted insofar as the specific development standards 8.3.4E Stormwater, 8.3.6G Supplementary Residential Buildings, and subdivision standards 30.1.7U and 30.1.7V(10) are amended and new assessment criterion 30.1.8(24)(j) is added to the recommended Variation 4 Iona Residential Rezoning Proposed District Plan in order to assist with the interpretation and administration of these standards and the plan in general.

10.2 REASONS

1. The general standards such as site coverage, building setbacks, offset yards and fence height and the Appendix 13A, Figure 2 general design outcomes are supported by the submitters.
2. The amendment sought to the provision of a cultural effects assessment is appropriate.
3. The amendments proposed by HDC will assist with the interpretation and understanding of the Plan.
4. The timing of the vesting of stormwater detention ponds will ensure that only that land that is a requirement for stormwater management facilities is set aside and vested in Council and that this will occur at the time of subdivision. Further provisions have been included to provide for the circumstance where subdivision and development occurs in advance of these detention areas being established and vested in Council.

11. ISSUE 11 – DENSITY IN THE BULL HILL NEIGHBOURHOOD

11.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#05 David and Colleen Youngquest

Be accepted in that they support the density provisions of larger sections of the edge with more density accommodated internally.

- b) That the submission of

#08 Thomas and Karen Dear

Requesting that the housing density of the area to be lowered to help with stormwater runoff and to keep the present aesthetic qualities of this area intact *be rejected*.

- c) That the submission of

#24 Josephine and Simon Beamish

Be rejected in that the request to reduce density in the Bull Hill area would be inconsistent with the objectives of the Neighbourhood and Zone to allow for a variety of site sizes that suit a range of housing typologies and thereby create a mixed community.

d) That the submission of

#34 G.Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Be accepted in part in that standard 8.3.5A(c) is deleted, amendments are made to the 30.1.6A table, assessment criteria 8.3.9F(a) is reworded and included in 30.1.8.2(24)o, relevant criteria at 8.3.9F are deleted from 8.3 and transferred and included in 30.1.8.2(24)o and 8.3.9F(e) is deleted.

e) That the submission of

#30 Hastings District Council

Be accepted in part in that the requested amendments to the density, minimum site size provisions and assessment criteria be made to 8.3.5A, 30.1.6E, 30.1.8.2(24) and that 8.3.9F is deleted.

11.2 REASONS

1. The density of development within the Bull Hill Neighbourhood is considered appropriate as it achieves a balance between the efficient use of land and the desire to create an attractive and pleasant residential amenity for residents and neighbours.
2. The density provisions will give effect to the Managing the Built Environment section of the Regional Policy Statement including the requirement that greenfield areas seek to achieve a density of 15 dwellings per hectare where appropriate, noting that a lower density is required in the Iona Terraces and Plateau areas to retain the landscape, character and amenity values of these areas.
3. The density provisions will assist the Council in meeting its responsibilities under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.
4. There is support for the concept of larger site sizes on the edge of the Bull Hill Neighbourhood with greater density levels provided for within the site.
5. This concept ties in with the need to retain the minimum 600m² site size along the Havelock North Character Residential Zone boundary to ensure that the density buffer that is provided includes existing residential sections adjoining the new urban development area.
6. The expectations of landowners in the adjoining Havelock North Residential Character Zone will be maintained.
7. There are other options available to ensure the stated development capacity housing yield is achieved across the whole Iona Urban Growth Area.
8. The proposed amendment to standard 8.3.5A will simplify the rule and align with standards associated with other new urban development areas in the District without impacting on the overall yield of the Bull Hill Neighbourhood or the need to comply with minimum site sizes.

9. It is appropriate that Comprehensive Residential Developments are exempt from 8.3.5A and that a separate standard is provided to ensure that these developments are subject to appropriate density limits.
10. That a whole block approach to the subdivision of the two larger areas of this neighbourhood will provide benefits in terms of achieving the urban design objectives for the neighbourhood as well as a comprehensive approach to servicing and roading layout.
11. The amendments to assessment criteria (formerly 8.3.9F(a) and now transferred to 30.1.8.2(24)) more appropriately convey the rationale behind the edge density standard to create a buffer to surrounding lower density zones;
12. The changes to the density provisions in 8.3.5A mean that it is appropriate to transfer the relevant assessment criteria in 8.3.9F to the subdivision section so that these matters can be considered at the time initial applications for subdivision are received for each block.
13. The rezoning of land will change this area from rural residential and lifestyle / grazing land use to an urban residential area and this undoubtedly will result in additional noise. The noise provisions of the plan seek to set noise levels appropriate to residentially zoned areas. The structure plan design which breaks up the new residential areas into neighbourhoods flanked by the reserve areas will help to reduce the impact of this additional noise on the existing surrounding environment. This separation provides a buffer which assists in the mitigation and management of noise.

12. ISSUE 12 – COMPREHENSIVE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS (CRD) AND RETIREMENT VILLAGES

12.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties and Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Be accepted in part insofar as the rule structure has been amended to provide a graduated approach in both section 8.3 and 30.1, and the amendments requested to standard 30.1.7V.11 and assessment criteria 8.3.9J and provision for retirement villages are made as set out in the recommended Variation 4 Iona Residential Rezoning Proposed District Plan.

- b) That the submission of

#30 Hastings District Council

Be accepted insofar as the requested amendments to rules in 8.3.3 and 30.1.5, standards in 8.3.6, standard 30.1.7V and assessment criteria 8.3.9A, K, J and 30.1.8.2(24) plan are made as set out in the recommended Variation 4 Iona Residential Rezoning Proposed District Plan.

12.2 REASONS

1. The submissions support a graduated approach to the rule structure for Comprehensive Residential Development.
2. The amendments proposed to the applicable rules, standards and assessment criteria encourage comprehensive residential developments and ensure that these types of developments will achieve good design outcomes;
3. The cross reference to comprehensive residential development assessment criteria within Section 8.2 is appropriate and provides guidance for the assessment of relevant matters such as architectural style, design and external appearance, bulk, scale, mass and proportions as well as the site layout of buildings in relation to the parent site.
4. The inclusion of retirement villages into Policy BHP6 and the definition of Comprehensive Residential Development will confirm that retirement village development is considered under the comprehensive residential development provisions within the District Plan.

13. ISSUE 13 – REALIGNMENT OF IONA ROAD

13.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#12 Phillip Michael Appleford

Requesting that Iona Road retains its current alignment and the remaining Iona triangle land be retained for a reserve area be rejected.

13.2 REASONS

1. It would result in the removal of 1 hectare of land which could be used for residential development.
2. It would restrict the ability to achieve the 390 – 400 dwellings as required by the SPP direction.
3. It is considered that the proposed planting and cycle corridor and the restriction of access along Middle Road will create an attractive entrance to the Havelock North Suburban area.
4. That the proposed realignment Iona Road will have beneficial urban design outcomes in terms of the layout of subdivision in this area and will also allow for the more efficient development of sections within this part of the Bull Hill Neighbourhood.

14. ISSUE 14 – ROAD LAYOUT

14.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submissions of

#05 David and Colleen Youngquest

#30 HDC

#32 Michelle and Malcolm Hart

Be accepted insofar as an additional standard 30.1.7V(12) is proposed to ensure no more than intersections with Iona Road are created in the future in the area of concern.

b) That the submission of

#17 Noel Martin-Smith

Be rejected in that the extension of Reynolds Road is fundamental to the urban design of the new urban development area and ensures connectivity between the existing and proposed new residential areas and that the concerns of increased traffic on Reynolds and Breadalbane Road will not have a significant impact on their operation.

14.2 REASONS

1. The concerns of local residents regarding the number of new roads that connect between Middle Road and Iona Road are addressed through District Plan provisions.
2. The additional standard proposed will give effect to the design criteria outlined in the Structure Plan in respect of Iona Road.
3. The extension of Reynolds Road is fundamental to the urban design of the new urban development area and ensures connectivity between the existing and proposed new residential areas.
4. The traffic analysis from Stantec confirms that the existing roading network surrounding the new urban development can operate in an efficient manner.

15. ISSUE 15 – EXTENT OF THE BULL HILL NEIGHBOURHOOD OVERLAY

15.1 RECOMMENDATION

a) That the submission of

#06 David MacCallum

Be accepted insofar as an extension to the Bull Hill neighbourhood is supported but with an amended alignment as shown in the recommended Iona Structure Plan map.

b) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Be rejected in part insofar as the requested removal of the stormwater detention area over the Bull Hill neighbourhood near Outlet D is not recommended as some land in this location is likely to be required for stormwater management purposes.

However, assessment criteria 30.1.7U provides for identified stormwater management areas deemed to be no longer required for stormwater management to revert to their underlying zoning.

15.2 REASONS

1. The extension to the Bull Hill neighbourhood as depicted in the recommended Iona Structure Plan map meets the intention of the submitters request and enables a more efficient use of land in this area.
2. The abovementioned extension will assist in the achievement of the development capacity housing yield of 390-400 over the whole Iona Urban Growth Area.
3. The abovementioned extension will also ensure better urban design outcomes in that development either side of the main spine road will be of a similar scale and nature.
4. The inclusions to the Bull Hill Neighbourhood requested by the Lowe submission in the vicinity of Outlet D are not recommended as these areas will likely be required for stormwater management purposes.

16. ISSUE 16 – COMMERCIAL NODE

16.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#03 David and Colleen Youngquest

Be rejected as the rationale behind the provision of specific commercial nodes is to provide for an activity and space that creates a community meeting place or hub for local community interaction. A café and or café/dairy in close proximity to the centrally located Bull Hill Reserve area is considered an ideal activity to provide for such a facility.

- b) That the submissions of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Holdings Ltd

Be rejected in part insofar as requests for a more generic provision for commercial activity and amendments to standards so that the operation of a café is not restricted in terms of maximum floor space and hours of operation.

Be accepted in part insofar as requests for alternative locations for the commercial node within the Bull Hill Reserve area be provided for.

- c) That the submissions of

#30 Hastings District Council

Be accepted in part insofar as the amendments to standard 8.3.6H(b) with regard to the sale of liquor for consumption on-site is an appropriate activity in this location.

16.2 REASONS

1. Allowing more generic commercial activities such as hairdressers or takeaway food premises would not meet the purpose of the commercial node to provide a community meeting place or hub to encourage interaction and a sense of place.
2. The proposed alternative location for a commercial node has been considered appropriate as it will add amenity to the adjacent Bull Hill Reserve area.
3. The amendments proposed by the Lowe submission to the specific standards for café /dairy activities within the commercial node are not considered to ensure the amenity and character of the ISC Zone will be upheld.
4. An amendment proposed by HDC in respect of 8.3.6H(b) will ensure a clear understanding that premises used for the sale of liquor for consumption off site are not provided for within the commercial node.

17. ISSUE 17 – RESERVES AND SPECIMEN TREE RETENTION

17.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#06 David MacCallum

Be accepted insofar as they support the open space reserves, playground and retention of the avenue of trees.

- b) That the submission of

#05 David and Colleen Youngquest

Be accepted in part insofar as they support the open space reserve, playground, retention of trees, walkway / cycleway provision but that no further tree retention provisions are recommended nor changes to the structure plan in respect of the provision of parking and toilet facilities for reserve areas.

- c) That the submissions of

#32 Malcolm and Michelle Hart

Be rejected insofar as no amendments to the structure plan are made to provide for additional landscape strips or reserves in the eastern Bull Hill Neighbourhood and no additional specimen trees are identified on the structure plan.

17.2 REASONS

1. The open space reserves, playground, specifically identified avenue of trees and walkway / cycleway connections are supported by the submitters.
2. The reserve provision in the Bull Hill Neighbourhood meets Council's requirements for land area and accessibility.

3. The request for a landscape strip along the edge of the Havelock North Character Residential Zone could be considered at the time of the whole block application for subdivision to ensure that there is sufficient space and any such provision does not impact on development yield.
4. The request for the identification of specimen trees within the Bull Hill neighbourhood on the structure plan to ensure their retention does not include sufficient analysis to support and justify such a request.
5. That provision of parking and toilet facilities for reserve areas will be considered as part of the parks planning process and the formulation of a reserve management plan for these areas.
6. That the structure plan as notified seeks to protect a grouping of trees in an avenue through the placement of a road and any further provision for general tree protection could impact on development layout and yield, given the Streamlined Planning Process expectation of development capacity for at least 390-400 dwellings.

18. ISSUE 18 – GEOTECHNICAL MATTERS

18.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#32 Malcolm and Michelle Hart

Be accepted insofar as the existing assessment criterion 30.1.8.2(24)(c) is included in the District Plan and will be applicable to the assessment of subdivision applications within the Bull Hill neighbourhood.

18.2 REASONS

1. The concerns to which the submission relates are addressed by existing assessment criterion within 30.1.8.2(24)(c) of the District Plan which are applicable to subdivision applications within the Bull Hill neighbourhood.

19. ISSUE 19 – REVERSE SENSITIVITY

19.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#32 Malcolm and Michelle Hart

Be rejected insofar as more detail in respect of the specific minimum housing design standards required would need to be provided in order to support this submission request.

19.2 REASONS

1. Reverse Sensitivity effects of noise are controlled through the existing noise standards in the Plan and through the separation of the new residential area from the Plains Production Zone and required setbacks from the Rural Residential Zone.
2. Further details in respect of the specific minimum housing design standards required would need to be provided in order to support this submission request.

20. ISSUE 20 – SINGLE STORY DWELLINGS AND TREES/HEDGING SURROUNDING STAPLEFORD PARK

20.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submissions of

#10 Brian & Jackie Mills
#19 Barry & Tanja Huxford

Requesting that buildings surrounding the existing Stapleford Park development be restricted to one storey *be rejected*.

- b) That the submission of

#25 David & Elizabeth Ashby

Requesting a limit of building heights within the Bull Hill neighbourhood *be rejected*.

- c) That the submission of

#24 Josephine and Simon Beamish

Supporting building heights in general for Variation 4 *be accepted*.

- d) That the submission of

#10 Brian & Jackie Mills

Requesting that existing trees around Stapleford Park be retained *be rejected*.

- e) That the submission of

#19 Barry & Tanja Huxford

Requesting that hedging around Stapleford Park be removed *be rejected*.

20.2 REASONS

1. An 8 metre height limit which allows for two storey dwellings will allow for greater flexibility on how sites can be developed, and will give opportunity for greater areas of plantings and landscaping.

2. The 8 metre height limit is consistent with other residential zones within the District, including the adjacent Havelock North Character Residential Zone and General Residential Zone (which will apply to Stapleford Park), this will ensure a uniformity in bulk and location across the zones.
3. The proposed standards around building setbacks and recession planes will ensure that excessive shading is avoided on existing properties and visual amenity is consistent with other residential Zones.
4. The land surrounding Stapleford Park has been previously zoned residential since the late 1980s, or has been marked for residential development through HPUDS for a number of years (including when Stapleford Park was developed). It is considered that there has been a general expectation that residential development would occur within this area.
5. It is not considered that development should be restricted by existing trees other than those that have historic reasoning to ensure protection. Nor should existing vegetation be removed if they were permitted through existing provisions, and the rezoning does not change any effects created by the existing plantings.
6. That the Ashby property is a considerable distance from the Bull Hill neighbourhood, and of similar height, and on this basis it is not considered that two storey dwellings within this neighbourhood would impinge on their privacy.

21. ISSUE 21 – MIDDLE RIDGE OPEN SPACE ZONE (IONA RECREATION RESERVE) ISSUES

21.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#25 David and Elizabeth Ashby

Supporting the open space area but seeking assurances that the walking tracks not be located on or near the ridgeline *be accepted in part* in so far as there will be full consultation on the use and planting of the reserve at the time of the vesting of the reserve and the development of the Reserve Management Plan.

- b) That the submission of

#24 Josephine & Simon Beamish

Supporting the retention of the wetlands and plantings and seeking to have involvement in any future discussions *be accepted in part* in so far as there will be full consultation on the use and planting of the reserve at the time of the vesting of the reserve and the development of the Reserve Management Plan.

21.2 REASONS

1. The zoning of the land is not the appropriate time for decisions on the detailed layout and planting of the reserve. Upon the vesting of the reserve, the management plan will be formulated and consultation on the uses will be undertaken.

22. ISSUE 22 – 50 LANE ROAD

22.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#16 Peter and Lois Rutter

Supporting the structure plan but seeking amendment to the plan provisions that accompany it with regard to attaching covenants, increasing the side yard standard 8.3.5D (c) and road construction and landscaping changes *be rejected*.

22.2 REASONS

1. Adherence with the Structure Plan is appropriately provided for under performance standard 8.3.4A which will apply to current and future landowners and/or developers.
2. The 7.5m yard setback for sites adjoining the rural residential zone provides an appropriate balance between maintaining amenity and allowing sites to be developed in an efficient manner.
3. That deciduous trees are recommended for the road because such trees are part of Havelock North's 'sense of place', and to provide scale to anchor the built development. The spine road will be constructed 6 metres below the Rutter property with earthworks a minimum 5m distance from the boundary, which in conjunction with the trees will provide privacy and screening. Refer Appendix 13A, Figure 4.
4. That the construction design of the road has not been undertaken and until that time it is not possible to commit to the planting of the land adjacent to the boundary.
5. That the spine road will be constructed to an appropriate width and alignment to not encourage inappropriate driver behavior and the road surface will be appropriate to the design of the road.
6. That the proposed amendments are not the most efficient and effective method of meeting the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991.

23. ISSUE 23 - AMENDMENTS TO MIDDLE RIDGE OPEN SPACE ZONE (IONA RECREATION RESERVE) AND ENVIRONS

23.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#34 Graham Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings

To relocate the boundary of the Open Space Zone along the main ridge to enable additional land here in the zone footprint and exclude an area of land at the southern end of the middle ridge from the open space and Iona Special Character zone and retain as Havelock North Rural Residential *be rejected in part*.

- b) That the submission of

#11 Peter Maidens

Be accepted in part insofar as part of the site at 78 Lane Road will retain its current Havelock North Rural Residential Zoning with the remaining portion being rezoned partially Iona Special Character Zone, sitting within the Iona Terraces neighbourhood – Area D and partially Open Space Zone, sitting within the Iona Recreation Reserve.

23.2 REASONS

1. The central ridge of the Iona Recreation Reserve is a fundamental element of the Iona development that will ensure that the characteristics of the Havelock Hills are maintained. It functions as a buffer between the existing rural residential development on its eastern and southern boundaries and the proposed new development. The southern portion is important in separating the more dense development in the Iona Terraces and the Iona Plateau in maintaining connectivity to Lane Road, although the boundary along the south east end of the central ridge has been readjusted slightly to better fit the landform. Retaining the area of open space as notified, with a minor boundary adjustment at the upper end of the central ridge, will allow for a greater range of uses in the proposed reserve.
2. The submission supports the proposed recommendations of the Section 32 report for the land to be used for residential purposes. The proposed zoning is an efficient use of the land that has a physical orientation to the west and does not impinge on the amenity of the special character of Lane Road and assists in meeting the yield target set by the Minister for the Environment.
3. That the current zoning achieves the purpose of the Act and the relevant objectives of the plan as demonstrated in the section 32 Evaluation notified with Variation 4.

24. ISSUE 24 – EXTENSION OF THE IONA SPECIAL CHARACTER ZONE

24.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#21 M and R Dixon

Supporting the variation with amendments to show a structure road from Iona Road through to 50 Lane Road, to realign the Rural Residential boundary to follow the ridgeline, and to Amend Policy ISCP7, be accepted in part in that the boundary be accepted to follow the ridgeline but not in its entirety and not including the property at 8 Lane Road.

- b) That the submission of

#22 David Oliver

Seeking inclusion of the property at 151 Iona Road in the Iona Special Character zone be rejected.

- c) That the submission of

#31 Robin Wilkins

Seeking inclusion in the Iona Special Character Zone based on the three building platforms identified in his submission be accepted in part in so far as the land will be rezoned as far as the ridgeline contour and that the identified platforms will be included on the structure plan along with a requirement for access to be from other than Lane Road for retention of the existing vegetation on the Lane Road frontage adjacent to the southernmost platform and that the dwelling be single storey.

24.2 REASONS

1. The submissions support the proposed recommendations of the Section 32 report for the land to be used for residential purposes and assists in meeting the yield target set by the Minister for the Environment. The amendment to the boundary of the Iona Special Character Zone is an efficient use of the land that has a physical orientation to the west and which can be accessed from the Iona Special Character Zone or Iona Road.
2. Rezoning property on the eastern side of the ridgeline will adversely affect the amenity of the special character of Lane Road.

25. ISSUE 25 – REQUESTED AMENDMENTS TO OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

25.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#21 M and R Dixon

To include additional wording on the rural residential boundary into Policy ISCP7 be rejected.

- b) That the submission of

#34 Graeme Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings

Seeking amendments to objectives ITO1, ITO3 and Policies ITP6, ITP8, and ITP9 be accepted in part in so far as the amendments to objectives ITO1, and Policies ITP4, ITP8 and ITP9 are accepted, and the amendments to ITO3 and ITP6 are rejected, and replaced by alternative wording.

25.2 REASONS

1. The suggested amendments to ISCP7 will affect the clarity of the policy and will result in a less effective policy.
2. The remaining amendments will result in more precise objectives and policies that will better achieve the outcomes sought for the development.

3. That the amendments will ensure that the objectives and policies meet the requirements of the Resource Management Act in the most efficient and effective manner.

26. ISSUE 26 – IONA TERRACES DENSITY PROVISIONS

26.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#24 Josephine and Simon Beamish

Be accepted in part in so far as the density will provide for a variety of site sizes which assists with achieving a good standard of amenity.

- b) That the submission of

#34 Graeme Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings

Be accepted.

- c) That the submission of

#30 HDC

Be accepted.

- d) That the submission of

#34 Graeme Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings

Seeking the inclusion of assessment criteria related to density in the Iona Terraces neighbourhood *be rejected.*

- e) That the submission of

#34 Graeme Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings

Seeking to amend the subdivision assessment criteria relating to the Iona Terraces Neighbourhood be *accepted in part.*

26.2 REASONS

1. That the amendments will result in achieving proposed recommendations of the Section 32 report for the land to be used for residential purposes in the most efficient manner while achieving good urban design through the variety of lot sizes.
2. That the amendments will assist in achieving the household yields set down by the Minister for the Environment in his direction.
3. That the resolution of the relationship between density and stormwater effects will result in the sustainable management of resources under Part 2 of the RMA.

4. The rezoning of land will change this area from rural residential and lifestyle / grazing land use to an urban residential area and this undoubtedly will result in additional noise. The noise provisions of the plan seek to set noise levels appropriate to residential zoned areas. The structure plan design breaks up the new residential areas into neighbourhoods flanked by the reserve areas will help to reduce the impact of this additional noise on the existing surrounding environment. This separation provides a buffer which assists in the mitigation and management of noise.
5. The inclusion of additional density criteria relating to the need to achieve an overall housing yield of 390—400 lots in 8.3.9G is not considered appropriate. The Bull Hill Neighbourhood is considered more suitable for intensive development than the Iona Terraces and changes have been made to the both minimum lot sizes and minimum housing density within that neighbourhood to achieve the desired housing yield over the Iona and Breadalbane areas.

Notwithstanding this, a reduction in average lot sizes on the Iona Terraces A to C has been made which may lead to a slightly greater housing yield in this area than that of the notified plan. It is noted that Section 8.3.9G criteria have been moved to Section 30.1 Subdivision.

6. Assessment criteria have been added to ensure a range of lot sizes and minimum percentages within the Iona Terraces (A to C) and the average lot size had been reduced from 800 m² to 700 m². This provides for a greater density of development, while ensuring landscape, character and amenity values are retained.

27. ISSUE 27 – ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES IONA TERRACES NEIGHBOURHOOD

27.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#34 Graeme Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings

Be accepted in part in so far as the suggested amendments to ITAO1 and ITAO2 are made but that alternative wording to ITAO3 be provided as follows;

“A terraced residential neighbourhood to integrate with the central ridge landform with varied lot sizes and layout to create a greater sense of individuality and a distinctive Iona Terraces character.”

27.2 REASONS

1. That the amended wording provides greater clarity in the outcomes sought for the Iona Terraces and the Variation as whole and supports the proposed recommendations of the Section 32 report for the land to be used for residential purposes with a high standard of amenity.

28. ISSUE 28 – HEIGHT CONTROLS FOR IONA TERRACES

28.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#25 David and Elizabeth Ashby

Seeking development on the Iona Terraces areas A, B, and C out of the sight-line of the central ridge be rejected.

28.2 REASONS

1. Acceptance of the submission would result in an inefficient use of the land by reducing the number of sites able to be achieved in the Terraces neighbourhood. Such an outcome would compromise the ability of the development to achieve the housing yield target for the development area set down by the Minister for the Environment in the Direction.
2. The effects on the amenity of the properties to the west of the development will be mitigated by means of the provisions relating to building platform location and building heights.

29. ISSUE 29 –ACCESS ISSUES IONA TERRACES NEIGHBOURHOOD

29.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#06 David MacCallum

Seeking the inclusion on the structure plan of a new point of access off the main spine road to the southern end of his property at 155 Lane Road be accepted.

29.2 REASONS

1. The new point of access will result in a more efficient use of the land by maximising yield for residential purposes.
2. The alternative access will better distribute the traffic effects of the proposed development.

30. ISSUE 30 – GENERAL TRAFFIC ISSUES

30.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submissions of

#15 Dale Prebble

#24 Josephine and Simon Beamish

Supporting the Variation but seeking mitigation measures to deal with the effects of traffic on the road network be accepted in part in so far as the traffic impacts of the

proposed development have been further considered and that the need for further work on the Karanema roundabout has been identified.

30.2 REASONS

1. That the effects of the proposed development on the road network will be mitigated by ensuring that the roads within the development are appropriately designed to ensure that it is a safe and efficient network.
2. That longer term improvements to the wider road network will be provided for through the Council's Long Term Plan.

31. ISSUE 31 - CUL-DE-SAC POSITIONING IN THE UPPER REACHES OF THE IONA TERRACES NEIGHBOURHOOD

31.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) That the submission of

#15 Dale Prebble

Seeking the relocation of the cul-de-sac within the upper reaches of the Bull Hill Neighbourhood *be rejected*.

- b) That the submission of

#11 Peter Maidens

Be accepted insofar as the cul-de-sac is in the best location factoring in access and topographical considerations. Minor amendments to it might be able to be made once bulk earthworks and lot layout are designed.

31.2 REASONS

1. That the cul-de-sac road as proposed means all road access arrangements are internalised within the proposed rezoning area itself and that the character of Lane Road is maintained;
2. The proposed road alignment follows existing topography and shifting it west will place it on the side of a spur;
3. To ensure no other development occurs within this area, which prevents access from occurring, there is a requirement that all activities are carried out in a manner that ensures that all aspects of the Iona Structure Plan can be met including roading infrastructure and that they are not restricted in anyway; and
4. Through the identification of this road, it was intended that all properties within this part of the rezoning area have access to a new internal road, allowing properties to efficiently use their identified rezoning areas.

32. ISSUE 32 - REQUESTED STRUCTURE PLAN AMENDMENTS TO THE IONA PLATEAU NEIGHBOURHOOD

32.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Seeking extensions of the residential edges within the lower reaches of the Iona Plateau neighbourhood *be rejected in part*, insofar as the extension to Proposed Lot 1 is accepted whereas the additional lot (Proposed Lot 21) is rejected.

32.2 REASONS

1. In the case of the extension to Lot 1 (as depicted) this will align better with the contours along the boundary of the reserve, will not affect the utility purpose and function of the reserve and will remain landscaped irrespective of how it is held.
2. In the case of the additional lot (referred to as Proposed Lot 21 in submission 34):
 - a. It will reduce the amenity of the reserve because the site is at a lower elevation than the rest of the plateau (the house would appear within the valley rather than on the plateau);
 - b. will undermine the effectiveness of the vegetated scarp separating the plateau from the reserve;
 - c. the design approach taken in the Plateau was to squeeze the lots up slightly so as to retain the valley and ridge as a strong landscape feature and amenity for the wider Iona area;
 - d. the sensitive placement or location of building platforms, provided the basis for density in this area. The extensive land area set aside for reserve, has offset the increase in density within the plateau area. It is the purposeful intent that limited development occur in this area;
 - e. The 20 lots as identified on the Masterplan are considered the best means of achieving the policy framework for the zone as demonstrated in the section 32 Evaluation notified with Variation 4; and
 - f. The above reasons demonstrate that the creation of the additional lot is not consistent with the Purpose and Principles of the Resource Management Act 1991.

33. ISSUE 33 - RELOCATION OF THE IDENTIFIED BUILDING PLATFORM ON LOT 13, THE REMOVAL OF THE NO BUILD/EARTHWORKS AREA WITHIN PROPOSED LOTS 12 AND 13 AND THE IMPOSITION OF HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS

33.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) That the submissions of

#23 Jeremy Cranswick

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Seeking the relocation of the Identified Building Platform on Lot 13 and the removal of the No Build/Earthworks Area within Proposed Lots 12 and 13 be rejected in that the location of the platform on Lot 13 remain in the position as notified.

b) That the submission of

#23 Jeremy Cranswick

Seeking the imposition of a height restriction on house site with reference to current typography be rejected in part insofar as a height restriction is imposed to Lot 13 taking into account existing ground levels.

c) That the submission of

#24 Josephine and Simon Beamish

Seeking retention and adherence to the set building platforms and earthworks restriction provisions be accepted.

33.2 REASONS

1. The existing house at 140 Lane Road is positioned approximately 70 metres from the boundary with Proposed Lot 13 and 90 metres from the centre of the identified building platform.
2. Given the separation distances outlined in 1. above there is no potential effect that would warrant a restriction on vegetation height.
3. The ridge provides a natural means of assisting ensure buildings blend into the landscape and shifting the building site west will place it on the ridge.
4. Under the current Rural Residential zoning there are limited bulk and location controls. Residential buildings within the HPUDS Future Residential Area (for which the rezoning area is), can be positioned in the case of this boundary 5 metres away and have a maximum height of 10 metres for all buildings and structures. These provisions effectively act as an amenity baseline for this property.
5. The bulk and location controls are much greater than could be experienced under the existing zoning rules and as such provide greater protection in terms of privacy than exists currently.
6. The centre of the building platform is similar (slightly lower) to ground level at the submitter's house and the 4 metre height restriction is taken from natural ground level.
7. While it is possible that a specific design could achieve what the submitter requests by excavating into the ridge, it would be design- dependent, and is better assessed as part of a consent application.

8. The provisions as notified are considered the most efficient means of achieving Policy IPAO3 “Key landscape features will be retained and not visually compromised as a result of inappropriate building development, earthworks and planting”.

34. ISSUE 34 - OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES OF THE IONA PLATEAU NEIGHBOURHOOD

34.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

- A. Seeking an amendment to the wording of Objective IPO1 *be accepted* and the wording be amended to read: “To promote a high standard of residential amenity within the Iona Plateau Neighbourhood”.
- B. Seeking an amendment to the wording of Policy IPP1 *be accepted in part* insofar as the number of lots within the plateau area is not changed from 20, clarification of the ‘no build, no earthworks and restricted planting’ areas and the word very is removed from the explanation. It is therefore recommended that the explanation to this policy be amended to read:

Explanation:

A masterplan has been prepared for the Iona Plateau neighbourhood which takes into account the topography and shape of the landform and allows for building platform placement that is complementary to the surrounding environment. The plan results in a fixed lot layout and building platforms with a maximum of twenty residential properties, single storey building restrictions for some lots; development placement which results in reduced volumes of earthworks, extensive planting at subdivision (ideally prior) and the inclusion of no build, no earthworks and restricted planting areas. This ensures the creation of a high amenity area with low density housing so effects are appropriately managed.

- C. Seeking an amendment to the wording of Policy IPP2 *is rejected* and that the explanation to this policy remain as notified with reference to 20 lots.
- D. Seeking an amendment to the wording of Policy IPP3 *is accepted* and that the wording of this policy and explanation be amended to read:

POLICY IPP3

Restrict the floor area of residential dwelling units and accessory buildings provided for as of right in the Iona Plateau Neighbourhood and manage their placement with nominated building areas within each lot.

Explanation:

Development within the Iona Plateau Neighbourhood is to be managed to ensure any buildings are sympathetic to the underlying landform and surrounding visual and landscape patterns. Building placement is constrained to that area identified on the masterplan with a restricted ability to construct buildings beyond the nominated platform for each site. Only one principal dwelling plus accessory building, a supplementary residential building and visitor accommodation building is permitted on each site. A gross floor area limitation along with other amenity based standards, including a continuous building length rule exist to reduce the visual

impact of buildings on the landscape. Note:

- E. Seeking an amendment to Objective IPO2 is accepted and that the wording of this objective be amended as follows:
That development within the Iona Plateau Neighbourhood avoids or mitigates adverse effects on the existing landscape character and amenity values of the adjoining Rural Residential Zone.

34.2 REASONS

1. That the amendments improve clarity, assist with interpretation and better reflect intent; and
2. The creation of the additional lot as previously assessed is rejected and any consequential amendments not needed as a result.

35. ISSUE 35 - IONA PLATEAU NEIGHBOURHOOD RULE TABLES (LANDUSE AND SUBDIVISION)

35.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Seeking a change in activity status for Rule IPN8 from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary and for Rule IPN10 from Non Complying to Discretionary be accepted.

35.2 REASONS

1. The objectives, policies and assessment criteria for the Iona Plateau Neighbourhood have been shaped to ensure that the policy framework sets a very clear direction of the types of activities that will be acceptable in this area.

36. ISSUE 36 - PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR THE IONA PLATEAU NEIGHBOURHOOD (LANDUSE AND EARTHWORKS)

36.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) That the submissions of

#30 Hastings District Council

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Seeking changes to 8.3.7C 'Fencing' be accepted.

Seeking changes to 8.3.7D 'Density' be rejected.

Seeking changes to 8.3.7E 'Nominated Building Area' be accepted in part.

Seeking changes to 8.3.7H 'Vegetation Control Area' be accepted in part.

Seeking changes 27.1.6A 'Extent of Earthworks' be rejected.

- b) That the submission of

#24 Josephine and Simon Beamish

Seeking retention of the fencing standard for the Iona Plateau neighbourhood be accepted in part insofar as the standard is amended to ensure clarity and ease of interpretation.

36.2 REASONS

1. That the amendments improve clarity, assist with interpretation and better reflect intent.
2. The creation of the additional lot as previously assessed is rejected and the consequential amendments not needed as a result.
3. The amendments sought by Submitter #30 HDC and #34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings Ltd to the rule improve clarity and interpretation of fencing standard 8.3.7C and do not alter the intent in any material way.
4. The vegetation control area on Lots 14 and 15 has been amended as it is now proposed that limited planting occur within the no build/earthworks/planting area on Lots 14 and 15. This is reflected in the Appendix 13A, Figure 2 map.

37. ISSUE 37 – SUBDIVISION PROVISIONS FOR THE IONA PLATEAU NEIGHBOURHOOD

37.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) That the Submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings

Seeking changes SLD17 and SLD27 and the inclusion of a new rule SLD17A be rejected, insofar as the higher activity statuses reflect that the plateau is the most visual and sensitive part of the rezoning area.

- b) That the submission of

#30 Hastings District Council

Seeking changes to SLD17 to make administration clearer and fix a referencing error be accepted.

- c) That the submission of

34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings

Seeking changes to 30.1.7W(a), (b), (c) and (d) be rejected, insofar as an assessment found it is not considered appropriate to have an additional lot and it was intended that development within the plateau occur in a prescriptive way.

- d) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings

Seeking changes to 30.1.7W(g) *be accepted* so the standard can be simplified by referring to a standard rather than unnecessarily repeating text.

- e) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd and Lowe Family Holdings

Seeking the deletion of reference to Lot 13 and the addition of assessment criteria in relation to the same lot *be rejected*, insofar as it is not considered appropriate to remove the no build/earthworks area as it relates to Lots 12 and 13.

37.2 REASONS

1. For recommendations a), c) and e) the amendments sought will not assist in achieving the objectives, policies and outcomes sought for Iona Plateau neighbourhood; the creation of the additional lot as previously assessed is rejected and the consequential amendments not needed as a result and it is with intent that development within the plateau area occur in a prescriptive way.
2. For recommendations b) and d), the amendments improve clarity, assist with interpretation and better reflect intent.

38. ISSUE 38 – RELOCATION OF IDENTIFIED BUILDING PLATFORMS ON LOTS 9, 10, 12 & 13,

38.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the Submission of

#26 Christopher Miles

Be rejected as the platforms identified on the Structure Plan and Masterplan for Lots 9, 10, 12 and 13 are appropriate and that there are no characteristics that would warrant the imposition of a single-storey height for Lots 9, 10 and 12.

38.2 REASONS

1. For the plateau area, density has been determined based on the sympathetic placement or location of building platforms, in order to reduce the visual effects of buildings on the landscape.
2. The house site on the nearest lot to this property (Lot 13) is on the far side of the ridge, is restricted to a single storey, and the intervening slope is to be replanted.
3. The combination of distance and replanting of the intervening slope is considered sufficient to mitigate the effects from the other lots [9, 10, 12] on the outlook from the

submitter's property.

4. Lots 9, 10 and 12 don't have any particular characteristics that would warrant the imposition of a single-storey height. The 8m height standard is consistent with the standard that applies throughout the surrounding area. The sites are part of the plateau area in general and are not in especially prominent locations. There will be a reasonable separation distance from properties in Endsleigh Road, and a further buffer of a replanted hillside on the opposite side of the intervening valley.

39. ISSUE 39 - 140 LANE ROAD

39.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submission of

#01 Tom Harper

Requesting that the no build zone be extended slightly so that views from deck are maintained; a mutually agreed height restriction for plantings in the no build zone; and height restrictions be imposed on lots 16, 17 and 18 to maintain views (and that lots 15, 16, 17 and 18 are terraced to maintain views) *be accepted in part* insofar as the no build/earthworks/planting area be altered to allow for native grass planting.

39.2 REASONS

1. Under the current Rural Residential zoning there are limited bulk and location controls. Residential buildings within the HPUDS Future Residential Area (for which the rezoning area is), can be positioned in the case of this boundary 5 metres away and have a maximum height of 10 metres for all buildings and structures. These provisions effectively act as an amenity baseline for this property.
2. The bulk and location controls are much greater than could be experienced under the existing zoning rules and as such provide greater protection in terms of privacy and amenity than exists currently.
3. The introduction of low level planting within an amended no planting area will ensure the stark outlook identified by Councils Landscape and Urban Design expert does not result.

40. ISSUE 40 – GENERAL SUPPORT FOR PROPOSED BREADALBANE REZONING (HAVELOCK CHARACTER ZONE WITH SPECIAL CHARACTER OVERLAY).

40.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submissions of

#04 Stuart Rattray

#05 David & Colleen Youngquest

#14 Geoff Gage

#29 Tahimana Private Residences LTD

In demonstrating support for the rezoning of this area of land as a Havelock North Character Residential Zone with Special Character Overlay subject to the Variation be accepted insofar as they support the variation to rezone this area of land for residential purposes, supporting the Section 32A analysis.

40.2 REASONS

1. The submissions support the rezoning of the Breadalbane Avenue Special Character Area for residential use. This is in line with the Section 32 assessment and demonstrates that there is an overall support for the rezoning to occur.
2. The submissions support the specific Objectives, Policies and provisions relating to the protection of existing neighbourhood characteristics and the larger 1000m² density and minimum site size.

41. ISSUE 41 – OPPOSED TO THE PROPOSED HAVELOCK NORTH CHARACTER RESIDENTIAL ZONE WITH SPECIAL CHARACTER OVERLAY

41.1 RECOMMENDATION

- a) That the submissions of Phillip Michael Appleford (Submission 12) and Jamie Wilson (Submission 13)

#12 Phillip Michael Appleford

#13 Jamie Wilson

Opposing the rezoning of Breadalbane Avenue as part of Variation 4 be rejected.

41.2 REASONS

1. That this land was previously identified in HPUDS and considered to be suitable for greenfield residential growth.
2. That a thorough Section 32 analysis was undertaken for Variation 4, which found it to be appropriate for urban residential development.
3. That the Section 32 report also addressed the amenity and urban design issues relating to the intensification of development within Breadalbane Avenue.
4. That development is capable of providing a range of housing opportunities through provision of large lot site sizes. The rezoning of Breadalbane Avenue will ensure a greater provision of land for development within the District.
5. The development will help achieve the direction in the SPP for achieving an additional 390 – 400 dwellings for Variation 4.

42. ISSUE 42 - ZONE PURPOSE

42.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) That the submissions of

#30 Hastings District Council

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

In relation to the wording of 8.1.2.3 'Havelock North Strategic Management Area' Introduction be accepted in part. insofar as the wording is recommended to read as follows:

The Iona Growth Area is considered a special environment because it comprises several unique landscape features - the Bull Hill, the ridge landforms and a set of ponds and wetland areas with associated planting and bird life. ~~The area is also partially covered by the Havelock foothills rural character landscape area (RCL6) which is valued for its cultural patterns of land use rather than its natural landscape values. The rural character landscape areas are not considered unique or significant natural landscapes on a District wide level and there are several other areas in the District that comprise similar qualities primarily centred around rural settlement areas.~~ **The land is located on the south-west outskirts of Havelock North at the toe of the Havelock Hills. The Iona Growth Area is therefore ideally positioned for providing additional land for Havelock North in a manner that avoids the versatile soils of the Heretaunga Plains and retains the special environment features referred to above.**

b) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

In relation to the wording of 8.1.2.3 'The Iona Neighbourhoods Environment' Bull Hill Neighbourhood Introduction be rejected in part insofar as it is considered more appropriate to include reference to development capacity housing yield of 390 – 400 dwellings for the overall rezoning area by introducing a new Objective and Policy to Section 8.1.

c) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Seeking additional wording be included to the Iona Terraces Neighbourhood Introduction be accepted insofar as it reads:

Iona Terraces Neighbourhood (Appendix 13A Figure 1 [Insert Link])

The Iona Terraces Neighbourhood contains the land to the south of Iona Road, encompassing the slopes above the road and the edge of the Bull Hill Neighbourhood. The sloping land within this area will make high density development difficult to attain. As such a lower density of development is provided for which will ensure high levels of landscaping and open character while still achieving an efficient use of residential land. Iona Terraces will be developed to ensure a terraced hillside neighbourhood with expansive views that complements the existing landform which gives this area a feeling of spaciousness and rural character while still achieving an efficient use of residential land.

d) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Seeking amendments to Havelock North Strategic Management Area Objective HNSMAO8 and Policy HNSMAP11 be accepted insofar as they read:

OBJECTIVE HNSMAO8

The Iona Growth Area will provide a place that adds value to Havelock North providing an opportunity to create innovative residential land development responses to this unique environment.

POLICY HNSMAP11

The Iona Growth Area will provide an attractive residential development which will cater for a range of property sizes and building types. Development will efficiently utilise the gently sloping land and will be lower in density as the topography increases in height and prominence.

- e) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Seeking amendments to paragraphs 2 and 3 of Section 8.3.1 Iona Special Character Zone Introduction be accepted insofar as they are amended in the recommended Variation 4 Iona Residential Rezoning Proposed District Plan.

- f) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Seeking amendments to Section 8.3.2 'Iona Special Character Zone Objectives and Policies' being Objective ISCO1, Policy ISCP1, Policy ISCP2 and ISCP5 be rejected in part in that a new objective and policy be introduced to Section 8.1 to reflect the development housing yield capacity of 390 to 400 dwellings.

- g) That the submissions of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Seeking amendments to Section 8.3.2.1C Iona Special Character Zone Objectives and Policies be rejected in part insofar as it is considered more appropriate to include reference to development capacity housing yield of 390 – 400 dwellings for the overall rezoned area by introducing a new Objective and Policy to Section 8.1.

42.2 REASONS

1. That the Rural Landscape Character Area (as it relates to this site) is no longer considered appropriate due to the detailed design work undertaken by the Iona Working Group and introduced via Variation 4;
2. Changes introduced improved interpretation, administration and meet the overall objective of making additional land available for greenfield housing development across the entire rezoning area; and
3. It is considered more appropriate for the development capacity housing yield of at least 390-400 dwellings introduced by the Streamlined Planning Direction to sit in the overarching section of the Plan, being Section 8.1 'Havelock North Strategic

Management Area' so that it applies to the rezoning area as a whole. All objectives and policies that flow from this then need to give effect to this section of the Plan. This allows neighbourhood responsive objectives and policies to be introduced, which cater to specific environmental needs, while meeting the overall objective of using land efficiently.

43 ISSUE 43 – CHANGES TO THE INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STRUCTURE PLAN

43.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Be accepted.

43.2 REASONS

1. The amendments proposed by the submitter recognise the importance of this area in meeting Havelock North's growth needs and will assist with the interpretation and understanding of the Plan.

44 ISSUE 44 –SERVICING

44.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

- a) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Requesting amendments to the structure plan to clarify that it is the Council that will be extending the watermain and wastewater services network within Middle and Iona Roads and amendments to design outcomes for Iona Road *be accepted* in part.

- b) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Requesting amendments to the design outcome for Iona Road *be accepted*.

- c) That the submission of

#34 G. Lowe Properties Ltd & Lowe Family Holdings Ltd

Requesting that the structure plan in Appendix 13A clarify that the reserve areas vested should be those open space areas approved of as part of any subdivision application *be rejected*.

44.2 REASONS

1. The amendments clarify that Council will extend services within existing roads (Middle and Iona Road) in order to service the development area while it is the developer or landowners responsibility to extend and provide for infrastructure services within the proposed new roads of the development area.
2. That the amendments to the design outcomes for Iona Road are appropriate taking into account the nature of the land use on either side of Iona Road.
3. The open space zone is a cornerstone of the structure plan design and has been configured to assist in the establishment of the different neighbourhood characteristics and to retain the significant and valued landscape features of the zone including the Bull Hill, the central valley and ridge landform and the set of ponds and wetland areas.
4. The reserve areas identified as open space zone on the Structure Plan play a significant role in mitigating the impacts of the increased housing density allowed under Variation 4, particularly on the amenity and character of the adjoining rural residential area.
5. The open space zone area has a significant role to play in providing for the overall stormwater conveyance and treatment system for the Zone, to provide linkages within the neighbourhood areas, to create an open feel to the residential area and will also provide functional reverse sensitivity buffers between adjacent rural residential activities and new urban residential activities
6. Indicative stormwater management areas are shown on the Structure Plan map. The exact location and size of the ponds/wetlands constructed within these indicative stormwater management areas will be confirmed during subdivision. Remaining land in these areas that is not required for stormwater management purposes can then be utilised in accordance with its underlying zoning.
7. Any changes to the open space areas depicted on the Structure Plan post the Variation 4 process, undermine the significant amount of consultation (both with the community and landowners within the zone including the working group process) that has occurred to develop and shape the Iona structure plan including the open space reserve areas.