

**BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL  
APPOINTED BY WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**UNDER** the Resource Management Act 1991

**IN THE MATTER** of the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF BERNARD GAVIN WARMINGTON**

*for Rainer Hack and Ursula Hack (Submission Number 201)*

**Supplementary Planning Evidence: Hearing Stream 12C – Large Lot Residential Zone**

Dated: 7 July 2024

---

**Align**

## **EXPERIENCE**

1. My full name is Bernard Gavin Warmington.
2. I have a Bachelor of Agricultural Science (hons) from Lincoln University, and a Master of Science in Resource Management (hons) from Lincoln University. I am a Full Member of the New Zealand Planning Institute and hold the Project Management Professional (PMP) qualification of the Project Management Institute.
3. I am the Area Planning Manager for Wellington at Align Limited, a multi-disciplinary consultancy offering services in planning, property, urban design and landscape architecture. I have held the role for three years, before which I was a Principal Project Lead in the Resource Consents Department of Auckland Council for from 2016 to 2021.
4. I have practiced in policy and planning for approximately 30 years working in central government, local government and consultancy in New Zealand and in consultancy in the United Kingdom and Middle East. I have experience in preparing and processing District and Regional Resource Consents and RMA policy in New Zealand and in Environmental Impact Assessment and environmental policy in other jurisdictions. I was a policy adviser for MAF (now MPI) for five years working on rural environmental and RMA policies and a policy adviser for Bay of Plenty Regional Council for three years working on a range of topics.
5. I have worked on a wide variety of planning projects, either for the applicant or for the Council as regulator. These include subdivisions of all scales up to 1200 lots, land use proposals for residential, commercial, industrial and retirement land uses, city-scale masterplanning projects and infrastructure projects including roading, stormwater and energy networks.
6. This statement of evidence supplements the evidence circulated to the Hearing Panel by Victoria Edmonds. Ms Edmonds is no longer working at Align Limited and I have taken up the role of planner for the Waimakariri District Plan hearings. I am familiar with the evidence prepared by Ms Edmonds.
7. Unless otherwise specified, all statements in this evidence are my own opinion.

## **CODE OF CONDUCT**

8. Although these proceedings are not before the Environment Court, I have read, understood, and will comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023. This evidence has been prepared in accordance with this Practice Note and I agree to comply with it. Except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person, I confirm that this evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in this evidence.

## SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

9. This supplementary evidence addresses the proposed rezoning of part of 110 Parsonage Road (“the site”) to Large Lot Residential Zone (LLRZ), as shown in Appendix B (Outline Development Plan) to Ms Edmonds’ evidence. The proposed Large Lot Residential Zone area occupies about 1.6ha of the 3.7ha site.

10. I have addressed the following principal issues:

- a) Expanding on parts of Ms Edmonds’ evidence which are of particular relevance to the LLRZ rezoning request. I note that Ms Edmonds’ evidence was prepared to support a ‘substantial rezoning’ into more than one proposed zone. In view of the structuring of the hearings into streams for each proposed zone, the current evidence addresses the parts relevant to the current Stream 12C LLRZ. Later evidence will address Stream 12E MRZ.
- b) Providing the cultural values assessment which was summarised in the earlier evidence but the document itself was not attached.
- c) Reference to the traffic engineering evidence of Mr Andy Carr (submitted with this evidence) undertaken for Mr and Mrs Hack.
- d) Responding to statements in the Council’s Section 42A report for Stream 12C and to the author’s subsequent responses to Panel questions;
- e) Providing additional assessment of the rezoning proposal against NPS-UD, Regional Policy Statement and Proposed District Plan objectives and policies;
- f) Further commentary about the appropriateness of the proposed rezoning in relation to section 32 of the Resource Management Act;

11. In preparing this statement of evidence, I have:

- Read the s42A report for Stream 12C and its attachments
- Read the Officer’s response to Panel questions dated 27 June.
- Reviewed the relevant statutory framework, plans, policies, and related materials that are referred to in the above.
- Reviewed the further Waimakariri Residential Capacity and Demand Model Economic Assessment December 2023.
- Read the conditions of the Notice of Requirement for the Woodend Bypass
- Read the submissions received by the Council.
- Read the relevant Hearings Panel memos and minutes.
- Read, referred to and relied on the evidence from the following persons:
  - i. Civil engineering – James Hopkins
  - ii. Geotechnical – Raymond Su
  - iii. Traffic and transportation – Andy Carr.

12. I have attached the following document to my evidence:

- Appendix A – Cultural Values Assessment by Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga

## **INITIAL RESPONSE TO S42A REPORT AND OFFICER'S RESPONSE TO PANEL QUESTIONS**

13. The Stream 12C section 42A report notes:

14. *442. Given that there is no planning or engineering information that is specific to rezoning the site to LLRZ, and the proposal is inconsistent with RPS Policies 6.3.9, in particular the property was not identified in the RRDS (Policy 6.3.9), is not adjacent to existing urban [,] LLRZ of [or?] Settlement Zone (unless No 90 is rezoned to GRZ). (This sentence appears unfinished).*

15. The author concluded by rejecting the proposed rezoning. I consider that relevant engineering information was provide, and accept that the planning information was not sufficient. A further assessment of the planning matters is provided in this evidence.

16. The s42A author's response (27/6/24) to Panel questions further notes:

17. *"I also do not agree that the proposed rezoning provides an integrated residential community, as the site is separated from the existing residential areas by the stormwater management area at 90 Parsonage Road"*

18. I disagree with the officer's conclusion that the separation by a stormwater lot is a disconnection in general terms from the adjacent residential area approximately 100m to the west. A similar situation exists in many urban areas where adjacent residential areas are separated by stormwater areas, geographical features or parks.

19. I note that the stormwater management area at 90 Parsonage Rd does not fit the definition of Rural Lifestyle Zone as zoned in the PDP. It has few characteristics of RLZ and is held as Drainage Reserve.

20. *"No assessment was provided against RPS Policy 6.3.9. The proposed rezoning area is not identified in the RRDS, so is inconsistent with the policy. I do not agree with the assessment against the provisions of the NPS-UD as stated in Appendix A I do not consider LLRZ as being urban"*

21. An assessment against RPS Policy 6.3.9 is provided in this evidence. The Rural Residential Development Strategy (RRDS) was adopted by Council in 2019 and has informed the definition of existing LLRZ areas and proposed future areas (LLRZ Overlay). I note that the NPD-UD was issued in 2020 and is a higher order document than the Canterbury RPS or the District Plan. This enables the intent of Objective 6 and Policy 8 to be considered, despite the current site not being identified in the RRDS. I also note that the Council's s32 report for the Residential Chapter concludes (page 18) that LLRZ should be treated as

'urban environment' for the purpose of the NPS-UD even though in many ways it does not appear as an urban land use. The s32 report note that LLRZ is within the Residential zones of the National Planning Standards.

22. *"No traffic assessment was provided as part of the rezoning request, but the planning assessment stated that it would be part of a broader resource consent process. Deferring it to the resource consent process does not enable an assessment against Policy 6.3.5(5) as part of the rezoning request."*
23. A traffic assessment has been provided by Mr Andy Carr, attached to his evidence. This concludes that there are no transport related reasons to consider the rezoning inappropriate. Please note that his report necessarily included the full anticipated development (using a nominal dwelling number of 35 to be conservative), rather than only the LLRZ lots.
24. *"It is noted in the planning evidence that a cultural advice report was received from Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga. I am unaware whether this report has been provided to Council."*
25. The cultural advice report from Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga was omitted from the previous evidence. It is attached to this evidence as Appendix A. No wāhi tapu or specific cultural sites were noted to be present on the subject site, although this conversation may need to continue. The response mainly noted cultural concerns and expectations in relation to development methodology and water quality, which will be incorporated into future design of the development and the approach to construction.
26. *"There are no significant constraints that relate to natural hazards, geotechnical conditions, or the ability to provide stormwater, wastewater and potable water services to the site that would prevent the proposed GRZ/MDRZ land use."*
27. I note this conclusion, which supports that advice from the submitters' specialist civil engineer and traffic engineer.
28. I note in passing that the civil engineering report and evidence was submitted on 5 March 2024 as required, along with the planning evidence, according to our records (rather than early May as stated in the S42A author response to Panel questions). Our geotechnical report was also submitted on 5 March 2024. The traffic engineering report and evidence is submitted with the current evidence.

## **ADDITIONAL POLICY ASSESSMENT**

29. The s42A report and further response to Panel questions questioned the level of policy assessment provided in evidence for the submitters to support the rezoning to Large Lot Residential Zone.
30. This further policy assessment builds on the evidence submitted by Ms Edmonds.

## NPS URBAN DEVELOPMENT

31. Objective 6 of the NPS-UD requires that: *“Local authority decisions on urban development that affect urban environments are...(c) responsive, particularly in relation to proposals that would supply significant development capacity.”*
32. The LLRZ part of this site would not provide significant capacity in itself but the overall site can provide in the order of 32 lots and possibly more if the final design and capacity of infrastructure permits that. There is an onus on Council to consider such proposals.
33. Policy 8 of the NPS-UD requires that: *“Local authority decisions affecting urban environments are responsive to plan changes that would add significantly to development capacity and contribute to well-functioning urban environments, even if the development capacity is:
  - a) unanticipated by RMA planning documents; or
  - b) out-of-sequence with planned land release.”*
34. In this case, for the wider site, the Council should give due consideration to the proposal even though it is not directly anticipated by the District Development Strategy, the Rural Residential Development Strategy and the Proposed District Plan.
35. The land concerned has already been lost to productive rural use, being a long-established rural residential lot of 3.7ha with mature trees present across the property. The existing lot with cannot be amalgamated into productive rural land to the east due to the presence of the Woodend Bypass designation, which Government has prioritised for construction. Transport and servicing needs can be met, as demonstrated in the evidence presented by Mr Carr and Mr Hopkins for the submitter, without creating unsustainable demands or impacts. Reverse sensitivity effects are unlikely as there are limited agricultural activities adjacent to it.
36. Zoning part of the site as part as LLRZ, as set out in Ms Edmonds evidence, would:
  - Provide a sympathetic setting to the HNZ listed dwelling;
  - Enable the listed dwelling to be set on a manageable lot size, with potential to be restored by a new owner;
  - Enable protection of the scheduled trees as well as would be the case with a single RLZ lot on the site;
  - Allow for a buffer between the Woodend Bypass designation and the more typical residential development proposed in the east of the site;
  - Result in limited servicing requirements for these lots, and in particular low to no impact on stormwater networks. The stormwater from the LLRZ areas can be mitigated largely within the lots (roof water detention tanks) with swale detention for rainwater from driveway impermeable surfaces, as stated in Mr Hopkins’ evidence.

## CANTERBURY REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT

37. The District Plan Section 32 report for Strategic Directions and Urban Form and Development states that the Council's chosen approach for Policy UFD-P3 Large Lot Residential Areas complies with the following RPS objectives and policy.

- **Objective 5.2.1 Location, design and function of development**
- **Objective 5.2.2 Integration of land use and regionally significant infrastructure**
- **Objective 6.2.1 and 6.2.1a Recovery framework**
- **Objective 6.2.2 Urban form and settlement pattern**
- **Objective 6.2.3 Sustainability**
- **Policy 6.3.9 Rural residential development.** (I note that the SD & UFD s32 report (page 20) referred to this as an Objective.)

38. A brief analysis of these objectives and policies is provided here, commensurate with the scale of the proposed rezoning (only three LLRZ lots in total at the District Plan's specified density, one of these lots being already existing, and possibly up to six lots in total, if council were to approve a future non-complying subdivision).

39. Objective 5.2.1: It would contribute to "*consolidated, well designed and sustainable growth in and around existing urban areas as the primary focus for accommodating the region's growth*" as the location is peri-urban and only 1km from the Woodend Local Centre on SH1.

40. Objective 5.2.2: Investigations have shown that infrastructure can be provided efficiently as part of Woodend's existing and proposed infrastructure.

41. Objective 6.2.1 refers to a framework that "*avoids urban development outside of existing urban areas or greenfield priority areas for development, unless expressly provided for in the CRPS*". This site adjoins an existing urban area, although it is not within an existing urban area or greenfield priority area. Northeast Woodend was a greenfield priority area in Our Space 2018-2048 (Figure 16) but it has now been zoned as an existing urban area and built out.

42. Objective 6.2.1a sets housing bottom line targets which the new lots would contribute to.

43. Objective 6.2.2 prioritises a greater focus on intensification rather than greenfield development over time, while also requiring: "*Managing rural residential development outside of existing urban and priority areas*".

44. Objective 6.2.3 (Sustainability) is supported by the proposal, in particular "(2) *retains identified areas of special amenity and historic heritage value*", as the Heritage NZ listed homestead will be retained and its setting preserved by a large lot format; and "(4) *provides a range of densities and uses*".

45. Policy 6.3.3 (Development in accordance with outline development plans) is reflected in the Proposed District Plan Policy SUB-P6 (Criteria for Outline Development Plans) and is discussed in the Proposed District Plan policy assessment below.

46. Policy 6.3.9 (Rural residential development) is the critical RPS policy and has been copied below for reference.

### **6.3.9 Rural residential development**

In Greater Christchurch, rural residential development further to areas already zoned in district plans as at 1st January 2013 can only be provided for by territorial authorities in accordance with an adopted rural residential development strategy prepared in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002, subject to the following:

1. In the case of Christchurch City, no further rural residential development is to be provided for within the Christchurch City Plan area;
2. The location must be outside the greenfield priority areas for development, Future Development Areas, and existing urban areas;
3. All subdivision and development must be located so that it can be economically provided with a reticulated sewer and water supply integrated with a publicly owned system, and appropriate stormwater treatment and disposal;
4. Legal and physical access is provided to a sealed road, but not directly to a road defined in the relevant district plan as a Strategic or Arterial Road, or as a State highway under the Government Roading Powers Act 1989;
5. The location and design of any proposed rural residential development shall:
  - a. avoid noise sensitive activities occurring within the 50 dBA Ldn air noise contour surrounding Christchurch International Airport so as not to compromise the future efficient operation of Christchurch International Airport or the health, well-being and amenity of people;
  - b. avoid the groundwater protection zone for Christchurch City's drinking water;
  - c. avoid land between the primary and secondary stop banks south of the Waimakariri River;
  - d. avoid land required to protect the landscape character of the Port Hills;
  - e. not compromise the operational capacity of the Burnham Military Camp, West Melton Military Training Area or Rangiora Airfield;
  - f. support existing or upgraded community infrastructure and provide for good access to emergency services;
  - g. avoid significant reverse sensitivity effects with adjacent rural activities, including quarrying and agricultural research farms, or strategic infrastructure;
  - h. avoid significant natural hazard areas including steep or unstable land;
  - i. avoid significant adverse ecological effects, and support the protection and enhancement of ecological values;
  - j. support the protection and enhancement of ancestral land, water sites, wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga of Ngāi Tahu;
  - k. where adjacent to or in close proximity to an existing urban or rural residential area, be able to be integrated into or consolidated with the existing settlement; and
  - l. avoid adverse effects on existing surface water quality.
6. An outline development plan is prepared which sets out an integrated design for subdivision and land use, and provides for the long-term maintenance of rural residential character.
7. A rural residential development area shall not be regarded as in transition to full urban development.

47. I note that the policy restricts any LLRZ areas to those areas identified in the RRDS, which this site is not. I also note that the NPS-UD (2020) is a higher order document than the



Canterbury RPS and it was issued after the RPS (2013) was adopted by the Regional Council. In view of that I consider that NPS-UD Objective 6 and Policy 8 can have precedence over RPS Policy 6.3.9, should the circumstances require this. As noted earlier, NPS-UD Policy 6 provides *“Local authority decisions affecting urban environments are responsive to plan changes that would add significantly to development capacity and contribute to well-functioning urban environments, even if the development capacity is: unanticipated by RMA planning documents...”*

48. Assuming creation of LLRZ beyond areas already in the RRDS is possible, I provide the following commentary against the remainder of Policy 6.3.9 (excluding clauses that do not apply because they refer to other parts of Canterbury):

- (2) the location is not in a greenfield priority area, Future Development Area or existing urban area; this clause is met.
- (3) the engineering evidence by Mr Hopkins has confirmed servicing is feasible; this clause can be met, subject to further design of services.
- (4) the traffic evidence by Mr Carr has confirmed access can be provided to a local road; this clause can be met, subject to further design or access.
- (5.f) the lots would connect to existing or upgraded community infrastructure and provide for good access to emergency services; this clause can be met, subject to further design of services and access.
- (5.g) the lots would not cause reverse sensitivity effects with adjacent rural activities or strategic infrastructure, as described elsewhere in this evidence statement; this clause can be met.
- (5.h) natural hazards and (5.i) ecological effects are not significant concerns in this location; this clause can be met.
- (5.j) effects on values of Ngāi Tahu have been the subject of initial consultation with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and the response indicates that these matters can be managed sensitively through a future resource consent process; this clause can be met, subject to further discussion and design.
- (5.l) effects on surface water quality also can be managed sensitively through appropriate stormwater system design. This matter was raised by the Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga response. I note that rural residential land use is low intensity and typically has limited or minimal activities that may affect water quality such as fertiliser application, intensive livestock grazing or hazardous substance and pesticide storage and use. This clause can be met, subject to further design for the stormwater system.
- (6) an ODP has been provided which provides for these matters; this clause has been met.
- (7) there is no intention to transition the LLRZ area to full residential development and Council is able to control this through its future subdivision approvals (or refusals); this clause can be met.

## PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

49. The Panel's direction is that evidence must be limited to the parts of the Proposed District Plan which the hearing is about, in this case Large Lot Residential Zone. I refer to provisions in other parts of the Proposed District Plan only to the extent that these objectives and policies support (or do not support) or inform the allocation of land as Large Lot Residential Zone, without proposing change to those provisions in this submission. I refer here to the Strategic Direction (SD), Urban Form and Development (UFD) and Subdivision (SUB) provisions.

### Objective SD-02 Urban Development

50. SD-02 includes the following clauses of particular relevance to new LLRZ areas.

*“Urban development and infrastructure that:*

*4. provides a range of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to achieve the housing bottom lines in UFD-O1;*

*5. supports a hierarchy of urban centres, with the District's main centres in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Oxford and Woodend being: ...(c) the focus around which residential development and intensification can occur.*

*9. provides limited opportunities for large lot residential zones in identified areas, subject to adequate infrastructure”*

51. The proposed LLRZ area is adjacent to an existing town. This supports the hierarchy within which Woodend is a focus for residential development. I note that this would conflict with Policy UFD-P3, which tends to direct LLRZ away from existing towns. However in this case there is adequate infrastructure available and the new area of LLRZ would not block future urban expansion as it is bounded by the Bypass designation.

### UFD-O1 - Feasible development capacity for residential activities

52. The objective proposes 6,300 residential units (2018-2028) and 7,100 units (2028-2048). The proposed rezoning would make a small contribution to these targets.

53. Policies UFD-P1 and UFD-P2 do not relate to Large Lot Residential land use, we will address these policies in our Hearing Stream 12E evidence.

### Policy UFD-P3 Identification/location and extension of Large Lot Residential Zone areas

54. Policy UFD-P3 identifies two possible scenarios for new Large Lot Residential Zone areas.

55. (1) Located in the LLRZ Overlay. These areas are adjacent to existing LLRZ areas and do not apply to the site at 110 Parsonage Rd, or in the immediate vicinity of Woodend. The closest LLRZ Overlay is located at Gressons Road, Waikuku about 2-3km north of the site.  
[Or]
56. (2) Located so that it meets criteria 2(a) to (e). I have assumed Council interprets these criteria to all apply at once (i.e. connected by 'and'). The proposed LLRZ rezoning in this location complies with the following criteria:
- (b) is not located within an identified Development Area of the District's main towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend identified in the Future Development Strategy;*
  - (d) occurs in a manner that makes use of existing and planned transport infrastructure and the wastewater system, or where such infrastructure is not available, upgrades, funds and builds infrastructure as required, to an acceptable standard;*
  - (e) is informed through the development of an ODP.*
57. With regard to 2(b), Figure 13 of the District Development Strategy 2018 indicates urban growth areas to the north and the southeast of Woodend and not to the east of Woodend.
58. With regard to 2(d), I refer to the expert evidence provided by Mr Carr (traffic and transportation) and Mr Hopkins (civil engineering) who have identified no obstacles in terms of infrastructure. Our team has met with the Council's development planning and engineering staff who did not raise any significant concerns with servicing.
59. With regard to 2(e), please refer to the discussion of SUB-P6 below.
60. The proposed rezoning would not comply with the following criteria and, therefore, would not comply with the policy as a whole:
- (a) occurs in a form that is attached to an existing Large Lot Residential Zone or Small Settlement Zone and promotes a coordinated pattern of development;*
  - (c) is not on the direct edges of the District's main towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend, nor on the direct edges of these towns' identified new development areas as identified in the Future Development Strategy;*
61. I understand that the intent of 2(a) and 2(c) is to keep LLRZ areas confined to their existing, limited locations and to prevent new LLRZ areas locking up land adjacent to existing towns and preventing future expansion of those towns in subsequent district plan iterations. If this is the concern it will not really apply in this location as the planned Woodend Bypass will prevent expansion of Woodend any further east.
62. I consider that the proposed LLRZ zoning still complies broadly with the intent of the policy and could be considered as an acceptable exception to two of its sub-clauses.

## **Policy UFD-P10 Managing reverse sensitivity effects from new development**

63. Ms Edmonds has noted that the site is not close to existing major infrastructure. It is, however, adjacent to the future Woodend Bypass route. It is not unusual for housing to be adjacent to major roads. The mitigation of acoustic and visual effects from a road (whether new or upgraded) is a matter of acoustic design of the buildings, building orientation and if necessary design of bunds, barriers and (for visual effects) planting. It will not be possible for lot purchasers or residents to submit against or formally complain about the Bypass as it has been approved by designation and forms part of the existing environment in planning terms.
64. The adopted Bypass design already includes a noise wall on the west of the Bypass adjacent to the site, because of the existing homestead at 110 Parsonage Rd and another at 100 Parsonage Rd. Drawing RP02-S02 (Sector 2 - PPFs and NZS6802 Criteria) in the Marshall Day noise assessment report<sup>1</sup> for the NZTA Notice of Requirement, shows the noise barriers proposed. The exact height, location and other matters will be subject to final modelling results and design. The barrier extends from adjacent to 144 Main North Rd, at the north end of Woodend, to south of Gladstone Rd. The plan cannot be reproduced for copyright reasons but can be viewed in the original report.
65. As Ms Edmonds has noted, reverse sensitivity to rural activities is unlikely as the nearby areas are mostly residential, stormwater reserve or used for small-scale, non-commercial or low intensity (grazing) agriculture.

### **Objective SUB-01 Subdivision Design**

66. I consider that the proposed rezoning is not inconsistent with this objective, although the subdivision design is at an early stage (an ODP has been provided) and the final design would be subject to resource consent consideration by Council.

### **Objective SUB-02 Infrastructure and Transport**

67. While design is at an early stage, all infrastructure and transport matters can be addressed as noted previously, in reliance on the evidence of Mr Carr and Mr Hopkins.

### **Policy SUB-P6 Criteria for Outline Development Plans**

68. At this stage of design SUB-P6 is the main subdivision policy of relevance.
69. An Outline Development Plan broadly meeting Council's requirements in SUB-P6 was provided with Ms Edmonds' evidence. I accept that some matters in that policy are not addressed in detail in the ODP (they are in other parts of our evidence) and we will look at amending this in Hearing Stream 12E evidence.

---

<sup>1</sup> Marshall Day Acoustics (2013) WOODEND BYPASS. Noise Assessment. Rp 002 R08 2011124C. 21 October 2013

70. The outline plan we have provided is a map, which was based on the format of the existing East Woodend ODP (EWD - East Woodend Development Area) provided in the Proposed District Plan. Further to this, SUB-P6 appears to require a supporting text document to explain some of the matters e.g. how infrastructure will be provided and funded. We can add this information prior to the circulation date for Hearing Stream 12E.

### **Policy SUB-P8 Infrastructure**

71. As noted under Objective SUB-02 above, all infrastructure and transport matters can be addressed.

### **General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones**

72. These policies are generally applicable and in general can be complied with at the stage of seeking resource consents, rather than being relevant to zoning.

73. RESZ-P12 Outline development plans relates to use of land once an ODP is in place.

74. RESZ-P14 Development density requires new Large Lot Residential Zone Overlays to achieve a net density of 1 to 2 households per hectare. While the concept masterplan would have 6 LLRZ lots (households) in 1.6ha, which is 3.75 households per hectare, the submitter would be able to work with 3 lots (households) in 1.6ha, which is 1.875 households per hectare and complies with the policy, if necessary.

### **Objective LLRZ-O1 Purpose, character and amenity values of Large Lot Residential Zone**

75. The eastern part of the site can meet these requirements. The possible exception may be 'low levels of noise', once the Bypass has been constructed. I have noted earlier that noise barriers must be constructed by NZTA which will reduce the noise to acceptable levels. I also note that the proposed LLRZ Overlay at Gressons Rd is adjacent to State Highway 1 in parts. This location may not require construction of barriers by NZTA as long as the design of the highway or its traffic flows do not change.

### **Policy LLRZ-P1 Maintaining the qualities and character**

76. These matters can all be addressed through design at subdivision.

### **Policy LLRZ-P2 Managing activities**

77. These matters can be managed at subdivision stage, but in general they will not apply as all of the LLRZ lots are intended to be residential only.

### **Policy LLRZ-P3 Reverse sensitivity**

78. As discussed earlier, reverse sensitivity is unlikely to be an issue given the adjacent land uses.

## **Policy LLRZ-P4 Amenity values**

79. These matters can all be addressed through design at subdivision.

## **Policy LLRZ-P5 Large Lot Residential Zone Overlay**

80. An ODP has been developed which adequately addresses Policy SUB-P6 for the proposed LLRZ area.

## **Objective RLZ-O1 Purpose of the Rural Lifestyle Zone**

81. The Proposed District Plan proposes Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) as the site zoning. While the site almost meets the minimum size criterion (3.7ha site area vs 4ha minimum for RLZ) in important respects it is not a fit with this zone.

82. The purpose of the RLZ is: *“Primary production activities and activities reliant on the natural and physical resources of the rural environment occur while recognising that the predominant character is small rural sites with a more intensive pattern of land use and buildings than the General Rural Zone.”*

83. The site has not been used for primary production for many decades. It has been developed into a park setting with ornamental specimen trees and some fruit trees. It is difficult to envision the site returning to primary production use. It does rely in a broad sense on the natural and physical resources of the rural environment, such as the space for the trees to grow. Overall, locking the site into RLZ is not an efficient use of the natural and physical resources of the District as a readily available opportunity for housing will be lost.

## **COMMENT ON PROPOSED SITE MASTERPLAN LOT SIZES**

84. The proposed site masterplan provided as Appendix A to Ms Edmonds' evidence indicates lot areas that are less than the Proposed District Plan standard for LLRZ (5,000m<sup>2</sup> average with 2,500m<sup>2</sup> minimum). The lot sizes of the notional six lots shown are 7,425m<sup>2</sup> (Mairangi Homestead), 1,905m<sup>2</sup>, 1,997m<sup>2</sup>, 1,400m<sup>2</sup>, 1,407m<sup>2</sup> and 1,979m<sup>2</sup>, a total of 1.61ha. I accept that these would not meet the proposed standard and would require a non-complying activity subdivision consent.

85. An alternative subdivision pattern, for example, would be one lot of 7,425m<sup>2</sup> (Mairangi Homestead) and two 4,344m<sup>2</sup> lots, which would comply with the District Plan average area of 5000m<sup>2</sup>.

86. The proposed ODP for the site simply shows an LLRZ zoning for this part of the site. It does not show the individual lots, which are a resource consent matter. Should it be so rezoned the submitter could decide at resource consent the layout option to pursue and have this considered by Council through its normal resource consent assessment processes. The submitter would accept a three lot layout at resource consent stage if necessary.

## CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

87. For the purposes of a section 32 RMA alternatives assessment I consider that the alternatives for this site, particularly the eastern part of the site, are:

- Rural Lifestyle Zone. The site would need to remain as one lot to be close to the 4ha minimum area. This is the zone shown in the Proposed District Plan;
- Large Lot Residential Zone over the whole site. This would yield about 7 lots at average 5,000m<sup>2</sup>;
- Medium Density Residential Zone over the whole site, with no limitation on the lot number other than that set by the development controls;
- Medium Density Residential Zone over the whole site, with an overlay or a 'specific control' (as defined in the Proposed District Plan) to limit development to around 32 lots;
- Large Lot Residential Zone in the east and Medium Density Residential Zone in the west, as proposed in our evidence.

88. The benefits and costs of each option against environmental, economic, social and cultural criteria are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Section 32 summary assessment of options

<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Rural Lifestyle Zone (whole site)</b>	
	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Costs</b>
Environmental	Retain open landscape Retain ecology associated with mature trees (mainly exotic species)	
Economic		Under-utilisation of land resource close to urban area and services
Social	Large lot around the listed heritage house	Opportunity for local housing provision lost or delayed The heritage building cannot be adequately maintained or restored with the minimal rental income from the current land use
Cultural	No cultural effects from development, although these are expected to be low risk	
Other		
<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Large Lot Residential Zone (whole site)</b>	
	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Costs</b>
Environmental	Retain a largely open landscape Retain most of ecology associated with mature trees	

Economic		Under-utilisation of land resource close to urban area and services
Social	Additional large lots available in the District for people who prefer these	Limited housing provision (6 additional lots)
Cultural	Likely to be limited effects on water quality	
Other		RPS and PDP policy discourages LLRZ immediately adjacent to towns and that was not planned through the RRDS
<b>Option 3</b>	<b>Medium Density Residential Zone over the whole site, with no limitation</b>	
	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Costs</b>
Environmental		Landscape 'edge' to Woodend lost in this location Ecology associated with mature trees lost, other than immediately around the heritage building Heritage building would lose its current spacious setting Difficult to retain and protect the scheduled trees at this density. May exceed servicing capacity for wastewater and stormwater.
Economic	Efficient use of land resource, if servicing is possible	
Social	Significant housing provision, could be 80 lots or more, depending partly on how much stormwater treatment area must be reserved.	
Cultural		May be adverse effects if water cycle effects cannot be managed, noting that the soil infiltration rate is low
Other		
<b>Option 4</b>	<b>Medium Density Residential Zone (whole site) with ~32 lot limit</b>	
	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Costs</b>
Environmental	The density limit would enable the developer to avoid sensitive areas of the site (some of the mature trees and the Bypass designation) in designing a subdivision layout	Developer is not required to distribute density in any particular way
Economic	Efficient use of land resource, should be economic to provide servicing	
Social	Moderate but significant housing provision – about 31 additional lots in total	



Cultural		May be some effects on water resources, these are low risk and can be managed through design and consultation
Other		
<b>Option 5</b>	<b>Large Lot Residential Zone (east), Medium Density Residential Zone (west)</b>	
	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Costs</b>
Environmental	<p>Retain an open landscape in the east of the site</p> <p>Retain most of the ecology associated with mature trees in the east of the site</p> <p>Higher density provided where it is beneficial, adjacent to open space and views of the ranges</p> <p>Lower density provided where it is beneficial, near Bypass designation</p>	
Economic	Efficient use of land resource, should be economic to provide servicing	
Social	<p>Moderate but significant housing provision – about 31 additional lots in total</p> <p>Housing choice of medium density units</p>	
Cultural		May be some effects on water resources, these are low risk and can be managed through design and consultation
Policy and other		RPS and PDP policy discourages LLRZ immediately adjacent to towns and that was not planned through the RRDS

## CONCLUSION

89. I consider that a LLRZ zoning for the eastern part of the site would provide a good environmental outcome despite RPS and PDP policies which seek to tightly control additional RRLZ zoning, particularly adjacent to existing urban areas. I consider that NPS-UD Policy 8 would allow Council to take this approach to the site zoning.

90. In this case the LLRZ area would be small (about 1.6ha), it would enable a suitable buffer to be retained around the heritage building to maintain its character and would provide a degree of separation or buffer between the Woodend Bypass designation and the proposed MRZ area on the site. The change in land use would be from an existing lifestyle residential use and would not convert existing productive land to large lots.

91. As an alternative (while not the subject of the current hearing), Medium Density Residential Zone over the whole site could deliver acceptable outcomes, if associated with an overlay or a 'specific control' to limit development to around 32 lots.

92. Retaining the RLZ zoning of the property would prevent any further development of the site and it would mean funding would not be available to maintain and restore the existing, listed heritage building.

**BERNARD GAVIN WARMINGTON**

7 July 2024

**Attachment A – Cultural Advice Report - Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga**

# CULTURAL ADVICE REPORT

J5915 – 110 Parsonage Road

---

To: Align

Contact: Victoria Edmonds

## 1.0 Mana Whenua Statement

Ngāi Tahu are tangata whenua of the Canterbury region and hold ancestral and contemporary relationships with Canterbury. The contemporary structure of Ngāi Tahu is set down through the Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 (TRoNT Act). The TRoNT Act and Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act (NTCSA) 1998 sets the requirements for recognition of tangata whenua in Canterbury.

The Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 and the NTCSA 1998 gives recognition to the status of Papatipu Rūnanga as kaitiaki and mana whenua of the natural resources within their takiwā boundaries. Each Papatipu Rūnanga has their own respective takiwā, and each is responsible for protecting the tribal interests in their respective takiwā, not only on their own behalf of their own hapū, but again on behalf of the entire tribe.

The following Rūnanga hold mana whenua over the project's location, as it is within their takiwā:

- Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga

## 2.0 Summary of Proposal

Rainer & Ursula Hack are undertaking preliminary design for a proposed development at 110 Parsonage Road, Woodend.

The preliminary design plan provided included 31 residential allotments between 280 m<sup>2</sup> and 1,979 m<sup>2</sup> plus a 7,425 m<sup>2</sup> allotment containing the existing dwelling.

Water supply and wastewater service is to be provided via the Waimakariri District Council reticulated networks.

Stormwater service is to be retained by a detention basin and possibly above ground tanks on some larger lots. The overflow will run into MacIntosh Drain which is a tributary to Kaiapoi River.

The subdivision scheme plan has not been finalised and this consultation is pre-application consultation based on conceptual design only.

For pre-application consultation feedback from Rūnanga is preliminary and general. Mana whenua reserve their right to change their position as more information becomes available as part of the consenting process.

### 3.0 Consultation Methodology

Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited review the application documents and undertake an assessment of the application against the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan.

A briefing report is prepared for Kaitiaki representatives who have been mandated by the Papatipu Rūnanga they represent to speak on behalf of hapū on environmental issues.

A Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited staff member consults with Kaitiaki representatives to discuss the application and Kaitiaki provide feedback based on Mātauranga Māori.

The Cultural Advice Report is provided to outline the relevant policies in the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan and the feedback provided by Kaitiaki representatives.

The relevant policies and Kaitiaki feedback for this application are provided in the following sections of this report.

### 4.0 Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013

The Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan (IMP) is a written expression of kaitiakitanga, setting out how to achieve the protection of natural and physical resources according to Ngāi Tahu values, knowledge, and practices. The plan has the mandate of the six Papatipu Rūnanga, and is endorsed by Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, as the iwi authority.

Natural resources – water (waterways, waipuna (springs), groundwater, wetlands); mahinga kai; indigenous flora and fauna; cultural landscapes and land - are taonga to mana whenua and they have concerns for activities potentially adversely affecting these taonga. These taonga are integral to the cultural identity of ngā rūnanga mana whenua and they have a kaitiaki responsibility to protect them. The policies for protection of taonga that are of high cultural significance to ngā rūnanga mana whenua are articulated in the IMP.

The policies in this plan reflect what Papatipu Rūnanga support, require, encourage, or actions to be taken with regard to resolving issues of significance in a manner consistent with the protection and enhancement of Ngāi Tahu values, and achieving the objectives set out in the plan.

The relevant Policies of the IMP to this proposal have been identified as:

#### 5.3 WAI MĀORI

##### CHANGING THE WAY WATER IS VALUED

**WM2.3** To require that decision making is based on intergenerational interests and outcomes, mō tātou, ā, mō kā uri ā muri ake nei.

## WATER QUALITY

**WM6.2** To require that water quality in the takiwā is of a standard that protects and provides for the relationship of Ngāi Tahu to freshwater. This means that:

- (a) The protection of the eco-cultural system is the priority, and land or resource use, or land use change, cannot impact on that system; and
- (b) Marae and communities have access to safe, reliable, and untreated drinking water; and
- (c) Ngāi Tahu and the wider community can engage with waterways for cultural and social well-being; and
- (d) Ngāi Tahu and the wider community can participate in mahinga kai/food gathering activities without risks to human health.

### *Discharges*

**WM6.8** To continue to oppose the discharge of contaminants to water, and to land where contaminants may enter water.

### *Costs and benefits*

**WM6.23** To ensure that economic costs do not take precedence over the cultural, environmental and intergenerational costs of poor water quality.

### *Waipuna*

**WM13.8** To require that waipuna are recognised as wāhi taonga in district and regional plans. This means:

- (a) Explicit recognition of the value of waipuna to tāngata whenua;
- (b) Effective policies, rules and methods to protect waipuna from abstraction, stock access, drainage and run-off, including prohibiting any direct discharges and requiring riparian margins to buffer adjacent land use; and
- (c) Explicit objectives to restore degraded waipuna.

### *Efficiencies*

**WM8.11** To support activities and strategies to improve the efficiency of water use in urban and rural situations, including:

- (a) Water efficiency technology in residential, commercial, industrial and urban environments:
  - (i) rainwater storage tanks;
  - (ii) greywater reuse;
  - (iii) reduced or low flow devices (e.g. low flush toilets and efficient showerheads); and
  - (iv) water efficient appliances.

**Comment:** *Fundamental to tāngata whenua perspectives on freshwater is that water is a taonga, and water management and land use should reflect this importance.*

## 5.4 PAPANUKU

### SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT

#### *Basic principles and design guidelines*

**P4.3** To base tāngata whenua assessments and advice for subdivision and residential land development proposals on a series of principles and guidelines associated with key issues of importance concerning such activities, as per Ngāi Tahu subdivision and development guidelines.

## STORMWATER

**P6.1** To require on-site solutions to stormwater management in all new urban, commercial, industrial and rural developments (zero stormwater discharge off site) based on a multi tiered approach to stormwater management:

- (a) Education - engaging greater general public awareness of stormwater and its interaction with the natural environment, encouraging them to take steps to protect their local environment and perhaps re-use stormwater where appropriate;
- (b) Reducing volume entering system - implementing measures that reduce the volume of stormwater requiring treatment (e.g. rainwater collection tanks);
- (c) Reduce contaminants and sediments entering system - maximising opportunities to reduce contaminants entering stormwater e.g. oil collection pits in carparks, education of residents, treat the water, methods to improve quality; and
- (d) Discharge to land based methods, including swales, stormwater basins, retention basins, and constructed wetponds and wetlands (environmental infrastructure), using appropriate native plant species, recognising the ability of particular species to absorb water and filter waste.

## EARTHWORKS

**P11.1** To assess proposals for earthworks with particular regard to:

- (a) Potential effects on wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga, known and unknown;
- (b) Potential effects on waterways, wetlands and waipuna;
- (c) Potential effects on indigenous biodiversity;
- (d) Potential effects on natural landforms and features, including ridge lines;
- (e) Proposed erosion and sediment control measures; and
- (f) Rehabilitation and remediation plans following earthworks.

### *Indigenous vegetation*

**P11.8** To require the planting of indigenous vegetation as an appropriate mitigation measure for adverse impacts that may be associated earthworks activity.

### *Erosion and sediment control*

**P11.9** To require stringent and enforceable controls on land use and earthworks activities as part of the resource consent process, to protect waterways and waterbodies from sedimentation, including but not limited to:

- (a) The use of buffer zones;
- (b) Minimising the extent of land cleared and left bare at any given time; and
- (c) Capture of run-off, and sediment control.

**Comment:** *An important kaupapa of Ngāi Tahu resource management perspectives and practice is the protection and maintenance of the mauri of Papatūānuku, and the enhancement of mauri where it has been degraded by the actions of humans.*

## 5.5 TĀNE MAHUTA

### MAHINGA KAI

#### *Ki Uta Ki Ta*

**TM1.4** To promote the principle of Ki Uta Ki Tai as a culturally appropriate approach to mahinga kai enhancement, restoration and management, in particular:

- (a) Management of whole ecosystems and landscapes, in addition to single species; and

- (b) The establishment, protection and enhancement of biodiversity corridors to connect species and habitats.

## INDIGENOUS BIODIVERSITY

### *Integrating indigenous biodiversity into the landscape*

**TM2.8** To require the integration of robust biodiversity objectives in urban, rural land use and planning, including but not limited to:

- (a) Indigenous species in shelter belts on farms;
- (b) Use of indigenous plantings as buffers around activities such as silage pits, effluent ponds, oxidation ponds, and industrial sites;
- (c) Use of indigenous species as street trees in residential developments, and in parks and reserves and other open space; and
- (d) Establishment of planted indigenous riparian margins along waterways.

**Comment:** *The protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity and mahinga kai should occur through a shared, coordinated effort between tāngata whenua, local authorities, conservation groups and communities.*

## 5.8 NGĀ TŪTOHU WHENUA

### RECOGNISING CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

**CL1.1** To require that local and central government recognise and provide for the ability of tāngata whenua to identify particular landscapes as significant cultural landscapes, reflecting:

- (a) Concentration, distribution and nature of wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga;
- (b) Setting within which sites occur and significance of that setting;
- (c) Significance with regard to association and relationship to place; and
- (d) Degree of risk/threat.

### WĀHI TAPU ME WĀHI TAONGA

**CL3.1** All taonga within the takiwā of Ngāi Tahu, accidental discovery or otherwise, belong to the Papatipu Rūnanga/ Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu.

### *Protecting wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga.*

**CL3.8** To require, where a proposal is assessed by tāngata whenua as having the potential to affect wāhi tapu or wāhi taonga, one or more of the following:

- (a) Low risk to sites:
  - (i) Accidental discovery protocol (ADP).
- (b) High risk to sites:
  - (i) Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA);
  - (ii) Site visit;
  - (iii) Archaeological assessment, by a person nominated by the Papatipu Rūnanga;
  - (iv) Cultural monitoring to oversee excavation activity, record sites or information that may be revealed, and direct tikanga for handling cultural materials;
  - (v) Inductions for contractors undertaking earthworks;
  - (vi) Accidental discovery protocol agreements (ADP).

## SILENT FILES



**CL4.2** There are many wāhi tapu that are not identified as silent files, and this must be recognised and provided for in central, territorial and regional planning processes.

*Comment: For Ngāi Tahu cultural heritage isn't something that happened in the past; but rather a reflection of an ongoing and enduring relationship with the land.*

#### **4.1 Guidance to Avoid, Remedy, or Mitigate any Effects on Cultural Values**

The above policies from the Mahaanui IMP provide a framework for assessing the potential adverse effects of the proposed activity on cultural values and provide guidance on how these effects can best be avoided, mitigated, and/or remedied.

The whole of the Canterbury region has cultural landscape value: Ngāi Tahu travelled through, engaged with and named the land, and tāngata whenua history is part of the landscape. However, within this landscape of Ngāi Tahu land use and occupancy particular areas are identified as cultural landscapes.

A cultural landscape is a geographical area with particular (and often related) traditional, historical, spiritual and ecological value to Ngāi Tahu. An area may be identified as a cultural landscape due to the concentration of values in a particular location, the particular importance of the area to Ngāi Tahu cultural, history or identity, or the need to manage an area as a particular landscape unit. Cultural landscapes are integral to Ngāi Tahu culture, identity and history, and are testament to relationship of tāngata whenua with the land over time. They are intergenerational: providing future generations (of tamariki and mokopuna) the opportunity to experience and engage with the landscape as their tūpuna once did.

Land use and development activities in the takiwā must be managed in way that works with the land and not against it. Papatūānuku sustains the people, and the people must in turn ensure their actions do not compromise the life supporting capacity of the environment. The cultural, social and economic wellbeing of people and communities is dependent on a healthy and resilient environment.

For tāngata whenua, the current state of cultural health of the waterways and groundwater is evidence that water management and governance in the takiwā has failed to protect freshwater resources. Surface and groundwater resources are over-allocated in many catchments and water quality is degraded as a result of urban and rural land use. This has significant effects on the relationship of Ngāi Tahu to water, particularly with regard to mauri, mahinga kai, cultural well-being and indigenous biodiversity.

Ngāi Tahu has a particular interest in indigenous biodiversity, both for its inherent value on the landscape and the ecosystem services it provides, and with regard to mahinga kai. Indigenous flora and fauna have sustained tāngata whenua for hundreds of years, providing food, fibre, building materials, fuel, medicine and other necessities. The relationship between tāngata whenua and indigenous biodiversity has evolved over centuries of close interaction and is an important part of Ngāi Tahu culture and identity.


Kaitiaki for Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga have concerns about the effect of residential development on the cultural landscape and the loss of indigenous habitat. The site should be surveyed to determine whether there is indigenous species that should be retained and protected.

In addition, the site should be surveyed to determine whether there are any springs on the site. If springs are discovered the subdivision should be designed to protect and enhance the spring head.

Stormwater from residential development should be treated prior to discharge into the Waimakariri District Council reticulated system.

Low impact design methods, such as, rain and greywater collection and re-use systems, minimising impervious surface area and the use of water saving plumbing fixtures and appliances is encouraged for residential development. The developer should refer to Ngāi Tahu Subdivision and Development Guidelines for low impact design methods endorsed by mana whenua (see Appendix 1).

Planting of indigenous species is encouraged for residential development to increase indigenous habitat, filter sediment and sequester carbon.



On behalf of Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd, this report has been prepared by Kelly Sunnex | Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd Environmental Advisor, and peer reviewed by Megan Hickey | Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd Senior Environmental Advisor.

Date: 9<sup>th</sup> October 2023

## NGĀI TAHU SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

**Note:** These guidelines are to be read in conjunction with Policies P4.1, P4.2 and P4.3

### Cultural landscapes

- 1.1 A cultural landscape approach is the most appropriate means to identify, assess and manage the potential effects of subdivision and development on cultural values and significant sites [refer Section 5.8 Issue CL1].
- 1.2 Subdivision and development that may impact on sites of significance is subject Ngāi Tahu policy on *Wāhi tapu me wāhi taonga and Silent Files* (Section 5.8, Issues CL3 and CL4).
- 1.3 Subdivision and development can provide opportunities to recognise Ngāi Tahu culture, history and identity associated with specific places, and affirm connections between tāngata whenua and place, including but not limited to:
  - (i) Protecting and enhancing sites of cultural value, including waterways;
  - (ii) Using traditional Ngāi Tahu names for street and neighborhood names, or name for developments;
  - (iii) Use of indigenous species as street trees, in open space and reserves;
  - (iv) Landscaping design that reflects cultural perspectives, ideas and materials;
  - (v) Inclusion of interpretation materials, communicating the history and significance of places, resources and names to tāngata whenua; and
  - (vi) Use of tāngata whenua inspired and designed artwork and structures.

### Stormwater

- 2.1 All new developments must have on-site solutions to stormwater management (i.e. zero stormwater discharge off site), based on a multi-tiered approach to stormwater management that utilises the natural ability of Papatūānuku to filter and cleanse stormwater and avoids the discharge of contaminated stormwater to water [refer to Section 5.4, Policy P6.1].
- 2.2 Stormwater swales, wetlands and retention basins are appropriate land based stormwater management options. These must be planted with native species (not left as grass) that are appropriate to the specific use, recognising the ability of particular species to absorb water and filter waste.
- 2.3 Stormwater management systems can be designed to provide for multiple uses. For example, stormwater management infrastructure as part of an open space network can provide amenity values, recreation, habitat for species that were once present on the site, and customary use.
- 2.4 Appropriate and effective measures must be identified and implemented to manage stormwater run off during the construction phase, given the high sediment loads that stormwater may carry as a result of vegetation clearance and bare land.
- 2.5 Councils should require the upgrade and integration of existing stormwater discharges as part of stormwater management on land rezoned for development.
- 2.6 Developers should strive to enhance existing water quality standards in the catchment downstream of developments, through improved stormwater management.

### **Earthworks**

- 3.1 Earthworks associated with subdivision and development are subject to the general policy on *Earthworks* (Section 5.4 Issue P11) and *Wahi tapu me wahi taonga* (Section 5.8, Issue CL3), including the specific methods used in high and low risk scenarios for accidental finds and damage to sites of significance.
- 3.2 The area of land cleared and left bare at any time during development should be kept to a minimum to reduce erosion, minimise stormwater run off and protect waterways from sedimentation.
- 3.3 Earthworks should not modify or damage beds and margins of waterways, except where such activity is for the purpose of naturalisation or enhancement.
- 3.4 Excess soil from sites should be used as much as possible on site, as opposed to moving it off site. Excess soil can be used to create relief in reserves or buffer zones.

### **Water supply and use**

- 4.1 New developments should incorporate measures to minimise pressure on existing water resources, community water supplies and infrastructure, including incentives or requirements for:
  - (i) low water use appliances and low flush toilets;
  - (ii) grey water recycling; and
  - (iii) rainwater collection.
- 4.2 Where residential land development is proposed for an area with existing community water supply or infrastructure, the existing supply or infrastructure must be proven to be able to accommodate the increased population *prior* to the granting of subdivision consent.
- 4.3 Developments must recognise, and work to, existing limits on water supply. For example, where water supply is an issue, all new dwellings should be required to install rainwater collection systems.

### **Waste treatment and disposal**

- 5.1 Developments should implement measures to reduce the volume of waste created within the development, including but not limited incentives or requirements for:
  - (i) Low water use appliances and low flush toilets;
  - (i) Grey water recycling; and
  - (ii) Recycling and composting opportunities (e.g. supporting zero waste principles).
- 5.2 Where a development is proposed for an area with existing wastewater infrastructure, the infrastructure must be proven to be able to accommodate the increased population *prior* to the granting of the subdivision consent.
- 5.3 New rural residential or lifestyle block developments should connect to a reticulated sewage network if available.
- 5.4 Where new wastewater infrastructure is required for a development:
  - (i) The preference is for community reticulated systems with local treatment and land based discharge rather than individual septic tanks; and
  - (ii) Where individual septic tanks are used, the preference is a wastewater treatment system rather than septic tanks.

### Design guidelines

- 6.1 New developments should incorporate low impact urban design and sustainability options to reduce the development footprint on existing infrastructure and the environment, including sustainable housing design and low impact and self sufficient solutions for water, waste, energy such as:
  - (i) Position of houses to maximise passive solar gain;
  - (ii) Rainwater collection and greywater recycling;
  - (iii) Low energy and water use appliances;
  - (iv) Insulation and double glazing; and
  - (v) Use of solar energy generation for hot water.
- 6.2 Developers should provide incentives for homeowners to adopt sustainability and self sufficient solutions as per 6.1 above.
- 6.3 Urban and landscape design should encourage and support a sense of community within developments, including the position of houses, appropriately designed fencing, sufficient open spaces, and provisions for community gardens.
- 6.4 Show homes within residential land developments can be used to showcase solar hot water, greywater recycling and other sustainability options, and raise the profile of low impact urban design options.

### Landscaping and open space

- 7.1 Sufficient open space is essential to community and cultural well being, and the realization of indigenous biodiversity objectives, and effective stormwater management.
- 7.2 Indigenous biodiversity objectives should be incorporated into development plans, consistent with the restoration and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity on the landscape.
- 7.3 Indigenous biodiversity objectives to include provisions to use indigenous species for:
  - (i) street trees;
  - (ii) open space and reserves;
  - (iii) native ground cover species for swales;
  - (iv) stormwater management network; and
  - (v) home gardens.
- 7.4 Indigenous species used in planting and landscaping should be appropriate to the local environment, and where possible from locally sourced seed supplies.
- 7.5 Options and opportunities to incorporate cultural and/or mahinga kai themed gardens in open and reserve space can be considered in development planning (e.g. pā harakeke as a source of weaving materials; reserves planted with tree species such as mātai, kahikatea and tōtara could be established with the long term view of having mature trees available for customary use).
- 7.6 Developers should offer incentives for homeowners to use native species in gardens, including the provision of lists of recommended plants to avoid, discounts at local nursery, and landscaping ideas using native species.