

## DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW

# Proposed Waimakariri District Plan - Submission

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

### Submitter details

(Our preferred methods of corresponding with you are by **email** and **phone**).

Full name: Woodend-Sefton Community Board

Email address: com.board@wmk.govt.nz

Phone (Mobile): 0272543940

Phone (Landline): 0800965468

Postal Address: Private Bag 1005, Rangiora

Post Code: 7440

Physical address: 215 High Street, Rangiora

Post Code: 7400

(if different from above)

Please select one of the two options below:

☒ I **could not** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (go to Submission details, you do not need to complete the rest of this section)

☐ I **could** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please complete the rest of this section before continuing to Submission details)

Please select one of the two options below:

☒ I **am** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

A) Adversely affects the environment; and

B) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition.

☐ I **am not** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

A) Adversely affects the environment; and

B) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition.

## Submission details

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are as follows: *(please give details)*

Urban Form and Development (UFD-P10)  
Energy, Infrastructure and Transport (TRAN-S1)  
Historic Heritage (HH-SCHED2 & HH-093)  
Subdivision (SUB-S17)  
General District-wide matters - earthworks and Lighting  
Residential Zones (GRZ, MRZ & SETZ)  
Zoning (OSZ)  
Town Centre Zone (TCZ)  
Special Purpose Zones  
Other - Iconic Features, Active Transport

My submission is that: *(state in summary the Proposed Plan chapter subject and provision of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons) (please include additional pages as necessary)*

Urban Form and Development (UFD-P10) - support with amendment  
Energy, Infrastructure and Transport (TRAN-S1) - support with amendment  
Historic Heritage (HH-SCHED2 & HH-093) - oppose  
Subdivision (SUB-S17) - Addition to Esplanade reserves  
General District-wide matters - earthworks and Lighting - Support that quarrying is restricted & lighting be softer  
Residential Zones (GRZ, MRZ & SETZ) - support with amendment  
Zoning - - oppose  
Open Space (OSZ) - support  
Town Centre Zone (TCZ) - oppose  
Special Purpose Zones - Support  
Other - Iconic Features, Active Transport

I/we have included: 8 additional pages

I/we seek the following decision from the Waimakariri District Council: *(give precise details, use additional pages if required)*

On all areas relating to this submission

## Submission at the Hearing

☒ I/we wish to speak in support of my/our submission

☐ I/we do not wish to speak in support of my/our submission

☐ If others make a similar further submission, I/we will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

## Signature

*Of submitters or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter(s)*

Signature S Powell

Date 24 November 2021

*(If you are making your submission electronically, a signature is not required)*

## Important Information

1. The Council must receive this submission before the closing date and time for submissions.
2. Please note that submissions are public. Your name and submission will be included in papers that are available to the media and public. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the District Plan review process.
3. Only those submitters who indicate they wish to speak at the hearing will be emailed a copy of the planning officers report (please ensure you include an email address on this submission form).

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further
- It contains offensive language
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

**Send your submission to:** Proposed District Plan Submission  
Waimakariri District Council  
Private Bag 1005, Rangiora 7440

**Email to:** [developmentplanning@wmk.govt.nz](mailto:developmentplanning@wmk.govt.nz)

**Phone:** 0800 965 468 (0800WMKGOV)

**You can also deliver this submission form to one our service centres:**

**Rangiora Service Centre:** 215 High Street, Rangiora

**Kaiapoi Service Centre:** Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 176 Williams Street, Kaiapoi

**Oxford Service Centre:** 34 Main Street, Oxford

**Submissions close 5pm, Friday 26 November 2021**

**Please refer to the Council website [waimakariri.govt.nz](http://waimakariri.govt.nz) for further updates**

## Draft District Plan Submission – Woodend-Sefton Community Board

Section	Subsection		Support/Oppose/Amend	Reason
<b>District-wide Matters</b>				
Urban Form and Development	UFD-P10 Managing reverse sensitivity effects from new development	(2) Minimise reverse sensitivity effects on primary production from activities within new development areas through setbacks and screening, without compromising the efficient delivery of new development areas.	Support with amendment - particularly (2) but request it be clarified that it includes all new residential developments, not just those in Rangiora and Kaiapoi	At present there have been new developments which are directly beside rural which creates issues with reverse sensitivity in terms of everyday functioning of a rural lot e.g. working dogs, odour, sprays, noise. Screening or setbacks are needed.
Energy, Infrastructure and Transport	Transport Standards TRAN-S1 Design standards for new roads		Support with amendment. 1. Some footpaths need to be wider in residential areas. 2. Additional provision for where the footpath is provided on only one side of the road this should be located on the side that will allow sun to reach it in the winter. 3. Road width and roundabouts should be designed to allow for any possible public transport use in the future on main routes in residential developments.	1. Wider footpaths to allow for accessibility and shared use, particularly given the increase in powered devices e.g. e-scooters, mobility scooters, powered skateboards. 2. Where a footpath is provided only on one side it needs to be where it will not be overly shaded by buildings or fences during the winter as the only footpath available can be slippery and/or icy. There are some examples of this in Pegasus e.g. Arahura Road at the Lakeside Drive end where the footpath is shaded all day in winter. 3. Public transport is often not given much consideration when new developments are planned and this needs to be incorporated into design so that roundabouts provide sufficient manoeuvring space and the road is wide enough to allow for the public transport and parking.
Historic Heritage	HH-SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items	Listing HH-093 - Heritage Listing on former Sefton Library at	Oppose	The Trustees of the former Sefton Library have been taking part in a lengthy legal process to appoint them and to change the Trust Deed to allow for the sale of this property to help fund the building of a new community

		14 Pembertons Road, Sefton		<p>hall at Sefton, as the existing hall is earthquake damaged. The community is aware that the sale of this property will help fund their new community hall. The Sefton Pubic Hall Society (Inc) presented a feasibility study to the community for consideration with the decision made to build a new community hall. This has been recorded through Council documents. The Board has been supportive of the Hall Society and their endeavours to find the best option for the community hall and also the Trustees to get the Trust Dee on the former library changed. The funds from the sale of the library are required to make building a new community hall financially viable. Members of this Society are also Trustees of the former Sefton Library. The Trustees would be able to provide further information about the condition of the library and the process they have been working through.</p> <p>The community hall is an integral part of the day-to-day life of Sefton and surrounding community, it is part of the fabric of the community. It is used by the school pupils, community groups, sports clubs.</p> <p>The options to restore, repair, adapt, or reuse the former library building are not feasible in terms of costs and it will only further deteriorate. There is no money to restore or repair the building or to carry out the earthquake strengthening work required. The small size makes it impractical for many purposes. The option to relocate is not feasible as it is a concrete building. It was built in 1923 and the original tile roof has been replaced by corrugated iron so it is not in original condition. It is not located on public reserve as stated in the summary. Very few people District wide would even know that this building exists or know the history behind it and the Board believe it does not have District-wide significance. The philanthropy of James Young will remain even without the physical library building. It could be viewed that his philanthropy will allow a new hall to be built for the community to replace the existing earthquake</p>
--	--	-------------------------------	--	---

				damaged one. But this can only happen if the property does not have a heritage listing on it.
Subdivision	SUB-S17 Esplanade reserves or strips	Table Sub-2	Add in Pegasus Lake to this table. If this is not feasible then an easement should be put in place to provide an open space zone along the lakefront at 64, 66 and 70 Pegasus Main Street (from Bob's Bridge to existing commercial area) to allow public access around the entire lakefront.	<p>The District Plan has objectives and policies in the Public Access section relating to public access to and along water bodies and the CMA throughout the District and these apply across the Plan.</p> <p>From Section 229 of the Resource Management Act 1991:</p> <p>An esplanade reserve or an esplanade strip has 1 or more of the following purposes and includes "(b) to enable public access to or along any sea, river, or lake." The proposed zoning of land along the Pegasus Lake frontage from Bob's bridge to the existing businesses to medium density residential includes right up the lakefront with no esplanade strip or open space zone. This is inconsistent with the rest of the Pegasus lakefront which has an open space zone. Public access to be able to walk right around the lakefront needs to be maintained. Allowing development right up to the lakefront would change the amenity value, the visual aspect of the lake and Bob's bridge, and restrict public access. There is also a risk if development is allowed right up to the lake edge that this would not be in keeping with the environment around the rest of the Lake and allow run off of nutrients and/or herbicides into the Lake from private property.</p>
General District-wide matters	Earthworks	Specific large scale earthwork activities will require resource consent assessment with rules and standards introduced.	Support the quarrying restrictions near urban and residential areas.	The effects from quarrying can be detrimental to the health and wellbeing of nearby residents with things like dust, noise, traffic movements. There may also be a negative impact on the groundwater.

	Lighting	Lighting of footpaths		Where possible lighting of footpaths should be softer and perhaps on a sensor so that it is only on when triggered. This would be more sustainable, better for ecology including insects, viewing the night sky, and reduce light spill.
Area Specific Matters				
Residential Zones	General Residential Zone (GRZ)	GRZ-BFS8 Fencing	Support with amendment - not allowing variations to resource consents, especially bulk variations by developers, re height and/or visual permeability of front boundary fences.	Residential zones should have an open feel with good sight lines between the property and the street frontage for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• safety - shading of footpaths and poor visibility for vehicles entering and leaving driveways; and</li><li>• security - of property and people; and</li><li>• providing a positive visual streetscape</li></ul> High and/or low visual permeable fences close to the front boundary or site boundary with a walk/cycleway or reserve are not conducive to providing a sense of community, a positive streetscape, and do not provide safety or security to the residents or those passing by the property. For new developments these have often been dealt with by covenants put in place by the developer, however, they are dependent on the developer being willing and able to enforce the covenants in the long-term. Once a developer has finished with the development, the level of interest in enforcing covenants can wane.
	Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ)	MRZ-BFS8 Fencing		
	Settlement Zone (SETZ)	SETZ-BFS8 Fencing		
Zoning				
Zoning on Pegasus lakefront at 64, 66 and 70 Pegasus Main Street (from Bob’s Bridge to existing commercial area)			Oppose	See SUB-S17 Esplanade reserves or strips. If an esplanade reserve or strip cannot be put in place an open space zone along the lakefront should be in place to ensure development cannot occur right up to lake edge allowing for continued public access and a continuation of the walkway around the perimeter of Pegasus Lake. The new community centre is an important part of this zone and must be allowed for. This also includes the possibility of something for the youth to be nearby, subject to consultation of what to actually provide and

		<p>the best location. Budget has been approved for both projects.</p> <p>Pegasus town has lost a lot of the planned business/town centre zone over the last few years with rezoning of land to residential. This has included 149 Infinity Drive, 1 Lakeside Drive, the creation of Waituna Street as residential. This has meant an extremely scaled down Local Centre Zone (LCZ) for Pegasus. The Board notes the recent release of the decision on Private Plan Change 030 which declined the rezoning of approximately 12.8 ha as Business 1 (Town Centre zone) within Ravenswood, and providing statutory recognition as a Key Activity Centre (KAC) with the intent of facilitating some 35,000 m<sup>2</sup> Gross Floor Area (GFA) of core retail activities. This decision along with the loss of business zoned land at Pegasus has meant that the Woodend/Pegasus/Waikuku area does not have a Town Centre which is capable of servicing the retail needs of the area. The small Town Centre Zone in Ravenswood and the existing LCZ in Woodend will not provide the retail needed for this growing area. For this reason the zoning of the land to MRZ is opposed. The remedy sought is that the District Plan Review process determines how much land at Ravenswood could be rezoned from MRZ to Town Centre Zone. See Ravenswood TCZ submission point for full information.</p> <p>The community has been waiting to see plans from Templeton Group, the current owner of this land for some time. Until the plans have been released and with some commitment from the owners then the Board is unable to support the zoning of this land.</p>
Open Space Zone (OSZ) on Pegasus lakefront and island (between the two pedestrian bridges)	Support	<p>The OSZ zoning around the lakefront is important to the community and to visitors to Pegasus. Having access to the open space, the walkway and to the lake must be maintained. In addition, the OSZ zoning for the 'island', which is accessed by the two pedestrian bridges is also</p>



		important with its two beaches, BBQ area with built in gas BBQ, tables, shade structure and waterfall. This area allows for different groups to enjoy the outdoors without impinging on privacy.
Town Centre Zone (TCZ) - Ravenswood	Oppose	<p>The recent decision to decline Private Plan 030 Ravenswood with one primary reason given that it would result in significant retail distribution effects on Rangiora and Kaiapoi. The recommendation was for the Council to take the opportunity of the District Plan Review to give effect to the requirements of a Key Activity Centre in this Vicinity, albeit at a different scale to that proposed. The Waimakariri District Development Strategy 2018 (WDDS) stated “Based on this analysis and community feedback received the KAC will be located at North Woodend subject to further work being undertaken through the District Plan Review and with the developers to identify the exact location and ensure good town centre outcomes are achieved.” However, the TCZ policy TCZ-P1 states that “North Woodend is a new emerging centre that will provide opportunities over time for town centre activities in the Woodend/Pegasus commercial catchment.” This provides no timeframe. And the size of the TCZ zone in the District Plan is not commensurate with the rapid population growth in the area. The Board would like to see a process where the Council works with the developer and seeks input from the Board to provide a reasonable sized TCZ to serve the needs of the local area and SH1 as indicated in the District Development Strategy. This is particularly important given that Pegasus will not have the Town Centre as planned and business land has been rezoned over the last few years to residential and is relying on retail being available at Ravenswood. This would also serve those travelling on SH1 given that Ravenswood has high visibility from vehicles travelling both north and south and there is easy and fast access/exit via a roundabout. This could include Large Format Retail.</p>

<b>Special Purpose Zones</b>		
Pegasus Resort Zone	Support	Support is conditional upon protection of existing residential lots and housing
<b>Other</b>		
Identification and recognition of iconic features in the District	<p>There is provision in the District Plan for protection of Historic Heritage. However, more modern architecture, art, monuments or features across the District don't fit the criteria. There are features and structures today that need some form of recognition so that they can become the historic heritage in the future. Examples in the Board area include the Woodend War Memorial, Bob's Bridge in Pegasus, the Pegasus Pou. This recognition could mean that any consent application which was in the immediate vicinity or might have some effect would raise a flag which indicated that the consent should be looked at in relation to possible effects and if necessary the relevant Board could be consulted. These iconic features in the District mean a lot to the community, are often regularly photographed and they deserve some form of recognition as being important and respected.</p>	
Safe active transport	<p>The Board strongly is in support of safety for communities. This includes pedestrian and cycling safety between towns and also between residential and recreational, churches, community facilities and shopping areas. With the rapid growth in the Woodend/Pegasus area there is no way of safely crossing SH1 at the Pegasus roundabout for access to the commercial development, residences, golf course, lake and beach. The Board has proposed that an underpass be installed at the Pegasus/Ravenswood roundabout to facilitate safe passage for pedestrians and cyclists. This is contrary to the New Zealand Transport Agency – Waka Kotahi (NZTA) proposal to single lane the roundabout to slow the traffic. The consequence of this will be fewer gaps in the traffic which will make it less safe for pedestrians and cyclists to cross. There has been no indication of when</p>	

	<p>funding might be available. The Board requests Council advocate strongly for an underpass.</p> <p>This is an example of development that was consented with little forethought, in this case of how pedestrians and cyclists would safely cross SH1 when the Ravenswood Commercial area and Bob Robertson Drive opened. There is also no safe way to cycle or walk along SH1 between Woodend/Pegasus and Ravenswood. The Board believes that this type of infrastructure should be in place for when it is first needed, not as an add on later. Active transport modes need to be planned for as part of any development</p>
--	--