

Summary of Submissions
 From Public Consultation - Open Days May 2009

Submission Number	Submitter
1	Kumeu/ Huapai Residents & Ratepayers Assoc.
2	Dave Hurley
3	Dale & Allan Wallace
4	Kylie & Jonathan Wallace
5	Milenko Boric
6	Leith & Susie Maskovich
7	Lee McKeown
8	R Garry
9	N & K G Bishop Properties Ltd
10	Glynis Edmunds
11	Ian Taylor
12	Chris & Rochelle Bates
13	Kate & Nigel Kelly
14	Tonia Matthews
15	Althea Moss
16	Linda Woodhams
17	Michael Brajkovich, Brajkovich Family Trust & Kumeu River Wines Ltd
18	Pohutukawa Development Company Ltd C/- WOODS
19	Yeungjun (Lawrence) Yoo
20	Grant & Christine Smith
21	Kenneth D & Helen E Hay
22	Christine Rose
23	Gavin Campbell
24	David Fisher
25	Jennifer R Faulder
26	D J Faulder
27	Douglas Family Trust
28	Christopher Barber*

29	L Barber*
30	Kerry Hamilton*
31	Irene Van West*
32	Ian Dutton*
33	Anonymous*
34	John Middleburg*
35	Anonymous*
36	Collin and William Barton*
37	Barnaby Wallace*
38	Peter Van Leeuwen*
39	Jennifer R Mein*
40	Hutchinson Consulting Engineers for Cabra Developments Ltd.

* Online Internet Submission.

1. *What are your views on the pedestrian walkways and open spaces in the proposed residential area?*

No Comment – 3

Support what is proposed – 18

Would like to see some changes to what was proposed (specify) – 8

Do not support what is proposed – 6

Submitter 1: There should be easy access to the domain.

Submitter 3: Would like to see area set aside for sports centre in domain. Should be more parking around domain.

Submitter 4: Queries whether any thought has been given to cycling and horse riding paths. Huge numbers of these people in this area with nowhere safe to ride. Cyclists are an issue on our rural/main roads - too many of them. No cycle lanes. Many people do not slow down for horses. Consider incorporation of safe road riding and access across SH16 for horse riders – Bridlepaths are supported.

Submitter 10: Kumeu River extended walkway would be expensive, need high maintenance and in times of sudden flooding extremely dangerous. Money would be better spent on walkway boardwalk on north side of river through bush and out of flood area / or link 'watercourses' with access to roads, or walkway around domain and showgrounds. Regional Parks i.e. Muriwai are nearby for walking and recreation.

Submitter 14: Walkways and open spaces, corners, planting, seats, linked areas all very important for pleasant environment and safety. Station Rd needs a safe walkway for children attending Huapai School.

Submitter 15: Walkway along Kumeu River should commence at Oraha Road Bridge - to link with existing path from library area to Oraha Road.

- Submitter 18: The PDC landholding borders an existing stream along which a pedestrian network is proposed. It is PDC's intention to embrace this walkway as part of the proposed development.
- Submitter 20: Planned walkways are excellent.
- Submitter 22: More walking and cycling off-road networks are required.
- Submitter 24: More walkways to allow access to parks and public areas without using the main road.
- Submitter 29: More open spaces as it is a semi-rural area. Do not hem in the local existing population.
- Submitter 30: Submitter queries why anyone would build walkways in flood areas.
- Submitter 37: The submitter considers that the plans seem confused and that some of the diagrams seem to contradict each other. It is queried what exactly are the 'special rules' which apply "to the land around 72 Matua Road (my residence)?" The submitter states that both 'esplanade' and 'medium density housing' are shown on diagrams on the web site.
- Submitter 39: Submitter is opposed to the proposed residential area. The submitter is proud to live in Huapai mainly because it is rural and not built up like so many other areas in Auckland. Concerns are raised in the submission about the loss of 'ruralness', as well as traffic effects and effects on the character and heritage of the area. The submitter suggests that instead the Council "put money into making the main road like a village (e.g. Matakana)". The submitter also emphasizes the importance of the area as a wine region and seeks this as a focal point.

2. *Do you think that the proposed new residential zoned area in Huapai North has an appropriate range of house types/section sizes?*

No Comment – 2

Yes – 13

No – 8

Would like to see some changes to what was proposed (specify) – 14

- Submitter 1: Huapai North Area should have minimum area per section of 750m². This will enable existing 1500m² sections to be subdivided as expected by existing owners. No need for high density around domain. High density should be closer to Kumeu Township, i.e. Maddren land.
- Submitter 3: Huapai North should have minimum size per section of 750m². Roads need to be wider. "NO HIGH DENSITY whatsoever in Huapai should be considered in the proposed Maddren development."
- Submitter 4: No high density in Huapai. Minimum size 750 m². No apartments.
- Submitter 5: Do not believe in high density for Huapai. The Huapai North area sections should have a minimum area of 750m².
- Submitter 6: Section sizes are too small; 1500m² should be minimum. No high density, that should be in township by Maddrens.

- Submitter 7: Small sections are a great idea.
- Submitter 10: As long as new roads suitable for access to rural areas, e.g. stocktrucks. Switchstation 'Transpower' should be shown on plans. Is it appropriate to have medium density housing so close?
- Submitter 11: Not enough information available at present.
- Submitter 12: Believe people pay more to live next to reserve, hence having low cost housing in the 'Park Residential Policy Area' goes against this belief. Also, it only seems fair to make all surrounding properties that border park zoned as High Intensity Residential.
- Submitter 13: Would prefer to see bigger section sizes retained, i.e. 1000m² min. for 'country feel'.
- Submitter 14: Variation is important.
- Submitter 16: Multi-level townhouses out of keeping with this area and have huge potential to 'go wrong' and become cheap/dodgy housing. Suggest drop option entirely.
- Submitter 18: PDC supports the rezoning of the Huapai North area, however would like to see some changes. PDC land holdings are located at 217 Matua road and 46 Gilbransen Road, which is within the proposed Low Intensity Residential Policy Area on the western most fringe of the Huapai North residential Zone. It is PDC's intention to develop its sites in two parts comprising a residential subdivision with section sizes averaging 780m² and the second part comprising a retirement village. PDC therefore requests that the Council consider revising the density requirements of the Low Intensity Residential Policy Area to allow for higher intensity development, providing that openness and amenity can be maintained through good design.
- Submitter 19: Generally supports the Park Residential and greater intensity development opportunities.
- Submitter 22: Support range of house sizes and residential opportunities, but don't support cheap, low quality, low amenity development. Tight controls important to ensure this doesn't turn into low cost, low quality slums.
- Submitter 23: Would like to see sections large enough to allow subdivision (cross lease) 5 to 10 years after original house built, with covenants to control this.
- Submitter 28: Submitter would like to see an increase in the size of sections to complement the rural area.
- Submitter 29: Submitter considers that the culture is being lost to small sections and this area should be set aside for people with larger sections who take pride in their gardens. Don't want a low cost South Auckland housing ghetto situation in this area.
- Submitter 30: Submitter strongly objects to the Council wanting to turn the area into an urban area. Any section under 1500 sq m is considered high

density. The submitter states that *“Auckland is the most sparsely populated city in the world. Why would any forward thinking Council even consider such a proposal, when the ARC has just finished spending \$200+ million of ratepayers’ funds to build a bus expressway on the North Shore, and yet it is proposed to bring extra population into an area with no existing services”*. The submitter also raises concerns over on-site servicing, the money spent on the upgrade to Matua Road. The submitter supports the ‘Super City’.

- Submitter 32 The submitter considers that adjoining landowners should be consulted and their views taken in to account re lot sizes e.g. 4 to 1 hectares, countryside living, rural etc. The submitter also considers that developers, land bankers and the ARC should not be determining development, the community should decide and RDC should listen to the ratepayers.
- Submitter 33 Identical comments to Submitter 32 above.
- Submitter 34 This submitter has some concerns with regard to the proposed housing for the land bordering the flood zone. The submitter, along with his daughter and son-in-law, operate a commercial flower growing business and has done so for the past 23 years. The submitter’s concerns are for the proposed housing on the neighbouring property, close to my boundary. At present there is a good distance between the business and housing and he has never received any complaints with regards to the business. The submitter’s concern is that once houses are built much closer to the boundary, people will complain about certain aspects of the business, such as the use of lights during the night. The submitter chose to come here 23 years ago because the property was rural and well separated from urban zoning and would like it to remain this way.
- Submitter 35 The submitter considers that adjoining landowners should be consulted and their views taken in to account re lot sizes e.g. 4 to 1 hectares, countryside living, rural etc. The submitter also considers that developers, land bankers and the ARC should not be determining development and that the community should decide and RDC should listen to the ratepayers.
- Submitter 37 The submitter notes that while the design is very impressive for an urban community, Huapai/Kumeu is a small rural village and the attraction for residents is for lifestyle and rural blocks, not for urban housing. The submission states that *“Creating new housing here will drive away those homeowners who want a peaceful rural environment and destroy the wonderful atmosphere of the area”*.
- Submitter 38 Submitter raises concern about the 15% of the Medium Intensity Area within Precincts 1 and 2 being able to be identified as Park Residential Policy Area and as a result have site sizes of 450m² to 600m². It is noted that the locations are to be determined as a part of any Development Concept Plan application and that, as this submitter could be the neighbour to these, he will be able to comment. The submitter prefers not to have high density housing on the boundaries to Sunny Crescent.

Submitter 39 The submitter totally disagrees with the range of house types/section sizes and considers that *"...if you have to develop Huapai at all, downsize the proposal and make sections at least 3000m² so it still gives us that rural feel that we love and that so many admire"*.

3. *Do you like the idea of water course being a feature of the proposed Huapai North residential zone?*

No Comment – 3

Yes – 24

No – 2

Would like to see some changes to what was proposed (specify) – 2

Submitter 1: Walkways should be linked to water courses for easy access.

Submitter 4: Walkways should be linked to water courses.

Submitter 5: Not necessary, added expense. Give us footpaths please.

Submitter 6: Area is in a flood zone. Flooding will happen again.

Submitter 10: But should be incorporated with additional green spaces. Will there be a safety issue with child access?

Submitter 15: They enhance landscape - ponds at northern end of Tapu Rd are attractive. Walkway (proposed) along Kumeu River will bring into focus a neglected part of area.

Submitter 18: As previously mentioned, PDC landholding borders an existing stream and it is proposed to enhance this area to create an attractive feature as part of the proposed development.

Submitter 22: Ensure appropriate quality treatment of stormwater and stream water, plantings, access, safety and security, as well as connections that are well integrated with existing open space and amenities.

Submitter 24: Develop water play areas in these areas for kids to sail boats or paddle around.

Submitter 28 The submitter considers green spaces and public spaces are important to residential areas.

Submitter 30 The submitter considers that there are more than enough problems with surface water and flooding now without encouraging more.

Submitter 32 The submitter comments that Council should *"Individually consult all landowners who live around and adjacent to the residential zone and get their views. Consult the ratepayers"*.

Submitter 37 The submitter notes that there is significant flooding in the area, both in the field behind the submitter's house (72 Matua Road) and coming across from the land on the other side. The submitter goes on to state that *"Water courses will definitely assist in directing this water away as well as improving the atmosphere of the area."*

Submitter 38 The submitters points out that there is a high volume of water washing across the back of their (83 Sunny Crescent) and their neighbour's sections during periods of continual rain since Universal Homes removed all the trees from the block of land behind them.

Submitter 39 The submitter proposes that Huapai stay relatively the same and requests that it be given a "*village feel around the main road*". The submitter also seeks low population.

4. *Do you have any further comments?*

Submitter 1: No need for water supply by Council. Water tanks sufficient.

Submitter 3: Water Tanks only. No need for town water supply.

Submitter 4: No need for water supply by Council. Water tanks more than sufficient.

Submitter 6: Wider community has no real idea of what is being proposed. Support for this plan will come from developers and those with vested interests, not average ratepayer living in Kumeu for lifestyle.

Submitter 8: Maddren's river earthworks will make flooding worse further north. River should be cleared right out to Kaipara. Huapai to Woodhill floods badly now.

Submitter 10: Feature of Huapai/Kumeu is number of horseriders. Bridlepaths would be great. Handouts didn't include all maps, etc that were shown on wall at open day - would make this process more accessible to community. Thanked the organisers for the open days.

Submitter 12: Would like to see our property re-zoned from low intensity to be included in the 'Park Residential Policy Area'.

Submitter 15: No retail should be provided. Don't need more shops. The Council must provide more footpaths as people regularly walk SH16-Matua Road-Tapu Road circuit. All this residential development will create even bigger problems at Tapu Road/SH16 intersection, especially north-bound traffic - high traffic area with school and reserve close by.

Submitter 16: Has the Council taken full area of flood plain into account? Have experienced how quickly water rises and cuts off Rheingold Place to car access. Not sure good idea to build right up to edge of flood plain.

Submitter 17: SH16 Kumeu - Huapai is hamstrung by the State Highway. The highway makes traffic movements around the town extremely difficult and dangerous. It acts as a barrier to pedestrians and results in the disconnection of the community. We feel that any consideration of development in the Kumeu - Huapai area is incomplete without looking seriously at a by-pass option for State Highway 16. The construction of a by-pass would result in great benefits for the township and the community at large. Local traffic circulation will be greatly improved, and the service nature of a small rural township such as Kumeu will be greatly enhanced, to the benefit of everyone. The increased flow of traffic on State Highway 16 is in conflict with general circulation traffic

around the Township and provision of a bypass should be seen as a priority.

Servicing - Opposes the connection of water and wastewater to town.
Population - Do not agree with the projected population increases outlined in the Structure Plan.

Viticulture and Winemaking are firmly entrenched activities in the Kumeu area and add to the amenity and landscape value of the area.

- Submitter 18: PDC requests that retirement villages be provided for in the Low Intensity Residential Policy Area.
- Submitter 19: While generally supporting the proposed Huapai North Residential Zone change, there are a number of concerns. Firstly, the indicative road requires an unreasonable area of land. Re-routing the indicative road through the middle of the property would also permit development of new residential areas to access both sides of this road. Secondly, the submitter suggests that it is not ideal to have different residential zones within one property. The submitter requested that in light of property being located close to the proposed commercial area, the Park Residential Policy Area should be applied across all of the property. The submitter also raises concerns over the possible lack of compensation in respect of land required for the indicative road as it will be required to serve the wider community rather than to meet the need of any proposed subdivision.
- Submitter 20: Concern over large scale intensive development and how it will impact on what is an extremely delicate river system. Stormwater flooding already an issue which has historically caused huge problems, especially when high Kaipara tides coincide with extreme weather conditions. Rezoning extra land to deferred residential is not an option and should be disregarded as it creates an expectation and owners start agitating for permission to develop much earlier, together with putting pressure on Council staff and resources and ratepayers funds. Recommends that keep current service town concept, plan for an extra 1500 people (+500 in other towns) living in a garden suburb concept where a maximum of 40% of a given area is in building and hard areas to enable self contained water disposal systems (although not entirely against Watercare) and setback rules are enforced and co-ordinated specimen tree plantings are provided in front. On an area close to Huapai shops provide a retirement complex (Matua Road) to serve local needs and create a garden suburb. It is essential to look at the entire Auckland area and it is ridiculous to place large populations 8km outside the MUL. Placing large numbers in Kumeu-Huapai is wrong and unnecessary.
- Submitter 22: Ensure development of high quality in urban form, streetscape, landscape, low impact stormwater treatment and building materials.
- Submitter 24: Footpaths on one side of road through low density areas. Even if these are only fine metalled, this allows traffic and pedestrians to be separated. Provide more lifestyle blocks on Nobilo land.
- Submitter 26: There has been large local input to various workshops/meetings so proposed rezoning is largely supported by district opinion.

- Submitter 27: There has been expectation over the last 11 years that the site would be zoned medium intensity. To this effect an application was lodged with the Council under R30352 for a nine-lot subdivision. Although the application is on hold, initial discussions with Council officers confirmed general support for the proposal. Overall it is considered that the site is suitable for zoning for medium intensity for a number of reasons, including the location of the site being immediately adjacent to existing residential areas, the flat topography of the site, the ability to design a solution to address potential effects on the 100 year flood level, the extent of residential development west of Matua Road, the potential scope for the provision of a recreation reserve area adjacent to Kumeu River and all of the planning documents since 1998 (albeit non-statutory) have identified the land for medium intensity development.
- Submitter 29 The submitter questions the need for more shopping areas as we are constantly informed NZ is over supplied with shops, and requests that the Council *“Leave this to existing planned areas”*.
- Submitter 30 The submitter queries why submitters do not get to speak to their submissions?
- Submitter 31 The submitter sates *“About time”*.
- Submitter 32 The submitter does not support the residential zone in Huapai North on the grounds: (a) *“That there is no infrastructure, no additional school and it will add to traffic problems with Tapu Road, Matua Road and Highway 16 intersections”*. (b) *“Two years ago there were a large number of signatories against residential subdivision in this area”*. The submitter states that *“Most residents value the rural area and do not want to live in the “suburbs” because the ARC defines Kumeu/Huapai as a growth area, especially now that the ARC no longer exists”*.
- Submitter 34 The submitters state that they are not alone in their views that *“we chose to live in this area because of its rural setting. These proposed changes will take this away, that is a shame”*.
- Submitter 36 The submitter would like to see a lot more landscaping around the open areas and within the water courses and would like to have broadband internet services brought within the community.
- Submitter 37 The submitter states that *“Kumeu/Huapai is a lovely village, with a great community and wonderful rural atmosphere. This atmosphere attracts many visitors to the wineries, shops and coffee shops. Increased housing and industry will make the town into another Auckland suburb more like Massey than a rural village. This will reduce the number of visitors and damage the local economy”*.
- Submitter 38 The submitter congratulations the Council on coming up with a plan that he thinks can work. The submission states that *“It’s been a long hard battle I know with us locals but we have to accept our part in the growth of Auckland. We just want to make sure what we end up with will be good for the majority”*.
- Submitter 39 The submitter is opposed to ‘townhouses’ and to *“cutting up our rural land”*.

Submitter 40 The submitters request that all 'X-intersections' be staggered to create 'T-intersections' and that indicative roads be aligned with existing property boundaries as much as possible. The submitters consider that this is more consistent with the Council's Engineering Standards and will improve sightlines and safety.

The submitter also requests that Council *"Provide a strip of Medium intensity residential policy area on the northern side of the indicative road to the north of Matua Road"*.

The submission does not specifically state which land is owned by their clients.