

Waimauku Structure Plan



Waimauku Structure Plan

Phase 2 Consultation Analysis of Feedback Forms

Contents

Executive Summary

- 1. Introduction to project**
- 2. Reasons/objectives for consultation**
- 3. Who was consulted?**
- 4. How were stakeholders consulted?**
- 5. Response Rate of Feedback Forms**
- 6. Methodology for analysis**
- 7. Analysis of feedback forms**
- 8. Conclusion**

Appendix A – Waimauku Structure Plan Process Diagram

Appendix B – Feedback Form

Appendix C – Project Newsletter

Appendix D – Study Area Map

Appendix E – Newspaper Advertisements and Articles

Appendix F – Copies of Feedback Forms Received

Appendix G – Question 1 comments spreadsheet

Appendix H – Question 2 comments spreadsheet

Appendix I – Question 3 comments spreadsheet

Appendix J – Question 4 comments spreadsheet

By Ryan Bradley
(Project Manager)

Reviewed by Peter Vari
(Manager Environmental Policy and Planning)

August 2007

Executive Summary

Rodney District Council is undertaking a Structure Planning exercise for the Waimauku area in response to growth pressures in the area.

The consultation that is the subject of this report is the second phase of consultation that has occurred following the Council's constraints and opportunities research. The Council will use the findings of the consultation to inform the current stage of work, being the development of options.

Approximately 2,500 newsletters (with feedback forms) were printed and distributed to stakeholders. There were 64 feedback form responses (8 of these being via email). Each question on the feedback form is analysed below.

Question 1 – Do you have any comments on the opportunities and constraints as identified by Council (i.e. do you agree or disagree and what are your reasons)?

The most frequent comment was that there was a general agreement with the constraints and opportunities analysis that had been presented (18).

Many respondents took the opportunity to request that the rural environment be protected and a green belt be retained (14). Another repeated theme was a concern with wastewater (10).

A significant number of respondents (16) chose not to answer this question.

Question 2 – Do you consider any of the areas (e.g. cultural heritage, landscape etc) of opportunities and constraints to be more important? Do you consider any constraints to be “no go” areas?

The area that the most respondents considered to be more important was the landscape of the rural area (18).

Respondents also mentioned that areas of importance (or “no-go” areas) are areas of prime agricultural land – particularly the Waimauku plateau (10), cultural heritage (9) and the flood plain areas (7).

A significant number of respondents (18) chose not to answer this question.

Question 3 – The next step of the process will involve Council developing options for the future of Waimauku. Based on the constraints and opportunities information provided, are there any comments you have that could assist Council in developing its options?

Some respondents to this question gave large amounts of information or site specific comments that will be used by the Council in developing options for the future of Waimauku that will go to the public in the next round of consultation.

A number of respondents for this question said that only gradual growth should be allowed for (9) while some also said that Waimauku should be kept as a small village (8) and the rural surrounds/green belt should be retained (8).

A significant number of respondents (16) chose not to answer this question.

Question 4 – Any other comments? (Are there any other questions we should have asked?)

A number of respondents used this question to register their opposition to the Cornerstone proposal on Renall's Farm (7), comment on wastewater issues (6), and express frustration at the feedback form and maps being confusing (6).

A significant number of respondents (16) chose not to answer this question.

Overall themes from all questions

A number of themes came through in more than one of the questions. These included:

- Retaining rural surrounds
- Opposition to Cornerstone's proposal
- Wastewater concerns
- Keeping the village feel
- SH16/Muriwai Rd intersection
- Consultation issues
- Rates relief for farmers
- School issues

The Council will use the findings of this phase of consultation to inform the current stage of work, being the development of options.

1. Introduction to project

Rodney District Council is undertaking a Structure Planning exercise for the Waimauku area in response to growth pressures in the area. The Structure Plan will define a vision for the future of Waimauku and develop a spatial plan to guide growth within the study area over the next 10–20 years.

The project has eight phases before the final Waimauku Structure Plan is adopted and four of these phases are public consultation phases. A copy of the Process Diagram is included in **Appendix A**.

The consultation that is the subject of this report is the second phase of consultation that has occurred following the Council's constraints and opportunities research. The Council will use the findings of the consultation to inform the current stage of work, being the development of options.

2. Reasons/objectives for consultation

This phase of consultation has been carried out in the wider context of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Local Government Act 2002 requiring Councils to undertake public consultation on projects that will impact the community, such as Structure Plans.

The Council's guiding policy document Vision Rodney states as one of its 6 key intents that "*We will determine the future of our District*" meaning that the public have a desire to be involved in planning the future of Rodney.

The objectives of this second phase consultation were to:

- Inform stakeholders of the constraints and opportunities research information.
- Gain feedback on any issues with the information.
- Receive ideas (based on the research) that can be input into the development of options stage.

The results of the feedback will be used to inform the development of options stages of the Structure Plan process.

3. Who was consulted?

The Council is interested in the views of 'stakeholders'. These are people, groups, businesses or organizations that have an interest in the future of the area.

They include residents/landowners/businesses in the study area, interested residents outside the study area, government bodies or organizations with an interest in the study area, potential future residents, and anyone that considers themselves to be a stakeholder.

4. How were stakeholders consulted?

Feedback Forms

The primary means of obtaining feedback throughout this phase of consultation was through a feedback form. A copy of the feedback form is included in **Appendix B**.

The feedback form was distributed through a project newsletter (as shown in **Appendix C**) sent to all landowners in study area (as shown in **Appendix D**) and a list of other stakeholders as agreed by Directions Waimauku.

Newsletters were also available at:

- Waimauku BP
- Waimauku Dairy
- Waimauku Doctors
- Waimauku Landscape Supplies
- Waimauku Vet
- Waimauku Fruit Shop
- Huapai Service Centre
- Muriwai Top Shop
- Muriwai Bottom Shop

Feedback forms were originally required to be returned by Monday 25 June giving stakeholders approximately 3 weeks to provide their feedback. However, following numerous requests from the public the date was pushed back to 23 July, giving a total of approximately 6 weeks for feedback.

Webpage

The project webpage www.rodney.govt.nz/waimauku was updated for this stage of consultation to provide information on the project to stakeholders and offer an online method for feedback. The webpage includes:

- Your feedback (via waimauku@rodney.govt.nz)
- Latest Work
- Project documents and newsletters (including the constraints and opportunities research reports)
- What/Why/Where/How/When/Who
- Frequently asked questions
- Process diagram
- Study area map

The webpage main page received 411 visits over the June-July period. The webpage will remain active for the duration of the project and is updated when new information is available.

Open Days

Open days were held where opportunities and constraints information was displayed and feedback forms were available. A Council staff member was on hand to answer questions or clarify issues. The open days were held at the Waimauku Hall on:

- Tuesday 12 June 7.00pm – 9.00pm
- Wednesday 13 June 10.30am – 2.00pm
- Saturday 16 June 11.00pm – 1.30pm

Approximately 130-160 people attended the open days.

Advertising

The open days and webpage were promoted through the newsletter, newspaper advertisements and newspaper stories. Copies of the newspaper advertisements and articles are included in **Appendix E**.

5. Response Rate of Feedback Forms

Approximately 2,500 newsletters (with feedback forms) were printed and distributed to stakeholders as outlined in section 4 of this report.

There were 64 feedback form responses (8 of these being via email). Copies of the feedback forms received are attached in **Appendix F**.

Who:

- 53 were from individuals
- 6 were from couples
- 4 were from organisations
- 1 was anonymous

Where:

- 40 had a Waimauku mailing address
- 12 had a Kumeu/Huapai mailing address
- 2 had a Muriwai mailing address
- 1 had a Taupaki mailing address
- 5 had a mailing address outside Rodney District.
- 4 had no mailing address

6. Methodology for analysis

The general methodology for the analysis of the feedback forms was for the key themes that emerged for each question to be identified. A list was then made of all the themes which occurred in that particular question and then each feedback form response was classified into one of these.

This general methodology is similar to a “summary of submissions” process that occurs in statutory planning processes such as District Plan Changes.

7. Analysis of feedback forms

Question 1 – Do you have any comments on the opportunities and constraints as identified by Council (i.e. do you agree or disagree and what are your reasons)?

The most frequent comment was that there was a general agreement with the constraints and opportunities analysis that had been presented (18).

Many respondents took the opportunity to request that the rural environment be protected and a green belt be retained (14). Another repeated theme was a concern with wastewater (10).

A significant number of respondents (16) chose not to answer this question.

Below is a list (in no particular order) of all themes raised in *Question 1 – Do you have any comments on the opportunities and constraints as identified by Council (i.e. do you agree or disagree and what are your reasons)?*

- No answer
- Generally agree with analysis
- Concern with wastewater
- Site specific comment on one study area
- Gradual/controlled growth needed - No Cornerstone Development
- Feedback form is confusing/maps hard to read
- Infrastructure needs to be provided before development
- Rates relief - 'Green space' provided by farms doesn't take into account livelihoods of farmers
- Government should not provoke immigration
- Trees to be planted
- No lifestyle blocks
- Prime Agricultural land is flawed
- Don't grow Waimauku
- Protect rural environment/keep a green belt
- More heritage should be identified/protected
- Transport issues including SH16/Muriwai Rd intersection
- More focus on economic/employment opportunities
- Education and Transport should not be considered constraints
- Renall's hill is not a peak - but a gentle plateau
- More opportunities should have been analysed
- School traffic issues need sorting
- Happy with more growth

A spreadsheet calculating the totals is shown in **Appendix G**.

Question 2 – Do you consider any of the areas (e.g. cultural heritage, landscape etc) of opportunities and constraints to be more important? Do you consider any constraints to be “no go” areas?

The area that the most respondents considered to be more important was the landscape of the rural area (18).

Respondents also mentioned that areas of importance (or “no-go” areas) are areas of prime agricultural land – particularly the Waimauku plateau (10), cultural heritage (9) and the flood plain areas (7).

A significant number of respondents (18) chose not to answer this question.

Below is a list (in no particular order) of all themes raised in *Question 2 – Do you consider any of the areas (e.g. cultural heritage, landscape etc) of opportunities and constraints to be more important? Do you consider any constraints to be “no go” areas?*

- No answer
- Agree that there should be some "no-go" areas
- Should be flexibility from Council
- Landscape - Rural area
- Landscape - Renall's Hill
- Landscape - Ridge Lines
- Infrastructure needs to be sorted including transport/public transport
- Waterways
- Bush/forest areas and native habitat
- Prime agricultural land - particularly Waimauku plateau
- Cultural heritage
- Flood plain
- Beaches
- Other - Restrict growth to being centered on the 'Triangle'
- Other - Put growth elsewhere
- Other - No Cornerstone development
- Other - Develop amenities for the public
- Other - Rates relief

A spreadsheet of answers is shown in **Appendix H**.

Question 3 – The next step of the process will involve Council developing options for the future of Waimauku. Based on the constraints and opportunities

information provided, are there any comments you have that could assist Council in developing its options?

Some respondents to this question gave large amounts of information or site specific comments that will be used by the Council in developing options for the future of Waimauku that will go to the public in the next round of consultation. All this information cannot be adequately summarised in this section and the feedback is in full in **Appendix F**.

A number of respondents for this question said that only gradual growth should be allowed for (9) while some also said that Waimauku should be kept as a small village (8) and the rural surrounds/green belt should be retained (8).

A significant number of respondents (16) chose not to answer this question.

Below is a list (in no particular order) of all themes raised in *Question 3 – The next step of the process will involve Council developing options for the future of Waimauku. Based on the constraints and opportunities information provided, are there any comments you have that could assist Council in developing its options?*

- No answer
- Retain green surrounds/green belt
- Waste water should be dealt with by local means
- Keep Waimauku a small village
- Gradual and natural growth should be allowed for only
- Center any village growth on the 'Triangle'
- Public transport (train) is necessary
- No large scale developments (i.e. Cornerstone)
- No terraced housing or flats
- No expansion
- SH16 needs sorting out, particularly the intersection with Muriwai Rd
- Keep cultural heritage sites for farming purposes
- Increase density in some areas
- Cornerstone development is a good option for growth
- Use lifestyle blocks as a buffer between town and country
- Set aside land for a retirement village
- Rates relief for farmers
- Infrastructure costs should be borne by developers
- Building design should be of a high standard
- Make more receiving land available for transferable rights
- Keep bush and wetland protection subdivision rights
- Consider land for mini motor-cross club
- Protect bush in Hinau Rd
- School - issues with existing school and need to plan for new schools
- Develop other areas before Waimauku/Don't consider Waimauku a growth node
- Urban sites have a minimum 1,000m²/900m²
- Rural to have minimum 1ha/2ha

- Develop recreation complex with pool
- Rezone landscape yard from rural to a more appropriate zoning
- Honour Vision Rodney
- More time needed for feedback
- Protect indigenous flora and fauna
- Consider an extension of Freshfields Rd to Foster Rd
- Continue to send the newsletters and consult
- Green belt can discriminate against large block land owners
- Don't allow more subdivision of 10acre blocks/no more lifestyle blocks
- Clear information needed on pros and cons of options
- Consult with Vision Waimauku on options
- Develop Waimauku like Matakana
- Walkway across SH16
- Consider further development around Wintour Rd
- Consider a Freshfields to Wintour Rd connection
- Be aware of SH16's function
- Remove bush and wetland protection subdivision rights

A spreadsheet of answers is shown in **Appendix I**.

Question 4 – Any other comments? (Are there any other questions we should have asked?)

A number of respondents used this question to register their opposition to the Cornerstone proposal on Renall's Farm (7), comment on wastewater issues (6), and express disapproval at the consultation mechanism, particularly the feedback form and maps being confusing (6).

A significant number of respondents (16) chose not to answer this question.

Below is a list (in no particular order) of all themes raised in *Question 4 – Any other comments? (Are there any other questions we should have asked?)*

- No answer
- No
- Waimauku should deal with its own wastewater
- SH16/Muriwai Rd intersection needs to be fixed
- SH16 speed limit through Waimauku needs to be reduced and pedestrian access provided
- Village should be kept small - walking distance
- Keep rural village look and feel
- Don't rezone rural land - clear designation between urban and rural
- More footpaths/cycleways/bridleways needed
- Schools - Proposed school site is poor, traffic chaos at existing primary, new high school
- Public transport - need train
- Cornerstone development could be good

- Against Cornerstone development
- Infrastructure is important - what will be the costs on the Council and ratepayers?
- Appropriate areas needed in Waimauku for transferable titles
- Countryside needs to be recognised as a tourism attraction
- Allow more lifestyle block development
- The feedback form is confusing, maps hard to read, and not enough time for feedback
- Vision Waimauku is doing a great job in involving the local community
- Vision Waimauku does not representative of most residents in the area
- Keep consulting with the public
- Directions Waimauku should not have developers on it
- The opportunities and constraints study is excellent
- Publicly notified procedures for all development in sensitive high value zones
- A landscape scheme needed
- Protect bush
- More connection with the river needed - what are the council's plans
- Village Green' on triangle should not be allowed to be developed
- Reroute Muriwai Rd
- Future subdivisions should have native screen plantings
- Extend Waitakere's limit on development to include fringe villages of Waitakeres
- Create recreational lakes
- Triangle development of a poor standard
- Larger developments allow for effects to be mitigated within the site

A spreadsheet of answers is shown in **Appendix J**.

Overall themes from all questions

A number of themes came through in more than one of the questions. These included:

- Retaining rural surrounds
- Opposition to Cornerstone's proposal
- Wastewater concerns
- Keeping the village feel
- SH16/Muriwai Rd intersection
- Consultation issues
- Rates relief for farmers
- School issues

Below are the issues that are considered to fall within these categories.

Retaining rural surrounds (44)

- Q1 - Protect rural environment/keep a green belt (10)
- Q2 - Landscape - Rural area (18)
- Q2 - Landscape - Ridge Lines (3)

- Q3 - Retain green surrounds/green belt (8)
- Q4 - Don't rezone rural land - clear designation between urban and rural (5)

Opposition to Cornerstone's proposal (21)

- Q1 - Gradual/controlled growth needed - No Cornerstone Development (4)
- Q2 - Landscape - Renall's Hill (4)
- Q2 - Other - No Cornerstone development (1)
- Q3 - No large scale developments (i.e. Cornerstone) (5)
- Q4 - Against Cornerstone development (7)

Wastewater concerns (19)

- Q1 - Concern with wastewater (9)
- Q3 - Waste water should be dealt with by local means (4)
- Q4 - Waimauku should deal with its own wastewater (6)

Keeping the village feel (17)

- Q2 - Other - Restrict growth to being centered on the 'Triangle' (5)
- Q3 - Keep Waimauku a small village (4)
- Q3 - Center any village growth on the 'Triangle' (6)
- Q4 - Village should be kept small - walking distance (4)
- Q4 - Keep rural village look and feel (3)

SH16/Muriwai Rd intersection (14)

- Q1 - Transport issues including SH16/Muriwai Rd intersection (5)
- Q3 - SH16 needs sorting out, particularly the intersection with Muriwai Rd (4)
- Q4 - SH16/Muriwai Rd intersection needs to be fixed (5)

Consultation issues (10)

- Q1 - Feedback form is confusing/maps hard to read (3)
- Q3 - More time needed for feedback (1)
- Q4 - The feedback form is confusing, maps hard to read, and not enough time for feedback (6)

Rates relief for farmers (9)

- Q1 - Rates relief - 'Green space' provided by farms doesn't take into account livelihoods of farmers (3)
- Q2 - Other - Rates relief (5)
- Q3 - Rates relief for farmers (1)

School issues (6)

- Q1 - School traffic issues need sorting (1)
- Q3 - School - issues with existing school and need to plan for new schools (2)
- Q4 - Schools - Proposed school site is poor, traffic chaos at existing primary, new high school (3)

8. Conclusion

The findings of the feedback form analysis will be incorporated into the Waimauku Structure Plan process as discussed below.

Questions 1 and 2 have provided information on the respondent's assessments of the opportunities and constraints research. This information will be used to refine this research in its use in the development of options stage.

Question 3 has provided ideas for Council to consider in the development of options stage.

Question 4 has provided general comments and questions to Council. These comments and questions will be evaluated in terms of project management (particularly consultation) and some comments will be considered in the development of options stage also.

The questions in the feedback form did not illicit the type of responses sought on many occasions with some respondents being confused by the questions or simply using the question spaces to write in themes that they wanted the Council to be aware of, regardless of the intended direction of the question.

In light of this, the feedback form for the next stage of consultation will need to be reviewed with consideration given to having more closed questions to make it simpler to comprehend. However, the feedback form will also need to continue to give the opportunity for less structured feedback with open ended questions.

Answers to some of the issues and questions raised in the feedback form process will be placed on the "Frequently Asked Questions" section of the project webpage at www.rodney.govt.nz/waimauku.

Appendix A – Waimauku Structure Plan Process Diagram

Appendix B – Feedback Form

Appendix C – Project Newsletter

Appendix D – Study Area Map

Appendix E – Newspaper Advertisements and Articles

Appendix F – Copies of Feedback Forms Received

Appendix G – Question 1 comments spreadsheet

Appendix H – Question 2 comments spreadsheet

Appendix I – Question 3 comments spreadsheet

Appendix J – Question 4 comments spreadsheet