

**NOTICE OF MEETING**

**STRATEGY AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEE**

**TO:** Penny Webster - Mayor  
Crs Zane Taylor (Chairperson)  
Ross Craig  
Pat Delich  
Michael Goudie  
Gaye Harding  
John Kirikiri  
Dave Parker QSM  
Grahame Powell  
June Turner  
Greville Walker  
Wayne Walker  
Suzanne Weld

The Strategy and Community Committee will meet in the Council Chamber, Centreway Road, Orewa on Thursday, 9 September 2010, commencing at 9.00 a.m. for the purpose of considering submissions on the Draft Puhoi Structure Plan.

for: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
Rodger Kerr-Newell

OREWA  
2 September 2010

\* \* \* \* \*

**INDEX**

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1.	Apologies	1
2.	Consideration of Submissions on the Draft Puhoi Structure Plan	1

\* \* \* \* \*

ITEM NO: 1

---

**APOLOGIES**

ITEM NO: 2

---

**REPORT**



**TO** Strategy and Community Committee  
**ON** 9 September 2010  
**FROM** Raewyn Catlow – Manager: Urban Design and Development  
Ruth Andrews – Policy Planner

**APPROVED BY** Warren MacLennan – Assistant Chief Executive

**SIGNATURE**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Warren MacLennan".

**SUBJECT** **CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS ON THE DRAFT PUHOI  
STRUCTURE PLAN**

**FILE REF** TP/9/71/1

---

**PURPOSE OF REPORT:**

<input type="checkbox"/> Information only	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategic decision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Statutory process
<input type="checkbox"/> Community issue	<input type="checkbox"/> Contract decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Delegation	<input type="checkbox"/> Appointment
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative matter			

**IMPLICATIONS:**

(i)	Is this matter significant in terms of Council's Policy on Significance? No
(ii)	Implications in terms of Vision Rodney? The draft Puhoi Structure Plan and the amendments proposed in this report are consistent with Vision Rodney and Planning Rodney.
(iii)	Implications in terms of Long Term Council Community Plan / Annual Plan? Projects identified in the draft Structure Plan are required to be included within the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP).
(iv)	Implications in terms of other Council Strategic documents or Council Policy? No
(v)	Is a budget amendment required? No. Implementation of the Puhoi Structure Plan will occur following its adoption. Project costs will be included within the LTCCP. However, some of the projects identified are long term and are more suitable to be included in the next review of the LTCCP.

(vi)	Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required?
	The Puhoi Structure Plan has been the subject of consultation with the Puhoi Community and interest groups since 2004. Open days and public meetings occurred between 2008 – 2010, during which the community was invited to workshops and attended other (non-council organised) community meetings to prepare its Vision. This report is an analysis of public submissions received on the draft Structure Plan which was notified on 20 July 2010.
(vii)	Does a decision on this matter require approval by the Auckland Transition Agency? (yes / no / advice being sought?)
	No

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Capital cost implications	Not applicable
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding source of capital costs	Not applicable
Ongoing operational cost implications	Not applicable
Is it currently budgeted for?	Not applicable
Funding & rating impact (whether resulting from capital expenditure or arising directly)	Not applicable

### SUMMARY:

This report reviews submissions on the draft Puhoi Structure Plan and recommends some amendments to the Structure Plan based on the issues that have been raised.

A detailed summary of individual submissions is contained in **Appendix 1**. For convenience the issues raised by submitters have been grouped into like topics.

*Note: A full copy of submissions will be available in the Councillor's office.*

A total of 30 submissions were received. Six submissions were generally or unreservedly supporting the Structure Plan; ten submissions were opposed to some aspects of the report, of which two were outrightly opposed to every aspect of the Structure Plan. The rest of the submissions (14 in number) were supporting the Structure Plan in part, with many seeking changes or amendments. A very brief summary of the focus of each submission is outlined in Table 1 of the report.

### RECOMMENDATION:

**That subject to further evidence being presented at the hearing of submissions on 9 September 2010, the recommendations on the submissions to the draft Puhoi Structure Plan, set out in this agenda report, be adopted.**

## 1.0 Background

For convenience the following acronyms and terms have been used in the report.

ARC	Auckland Regional Council
Council	Rodney District Council
ITA	Integrated Transport Assessment
PCF	Puhoi Community Forum
NZTA	New Zealand Transport Agency
Structure Plan	The Draft Puhoi Structure Plan

The Structure Plan process was initiated in 2004 and includes the following generally sequential stages:

- Background research
- Consultation
- Constraints and opportunities
- Consultation
- Further technical studies
- Preparation of Draft Structure Plan
- Information evening
- Draft Structure Plan notified for submissions.

The Structure Plan was notified on 20 July 2010 and the Council is now at the final consultation stage of the structure plan process. Following the hearing, the Council will make decisions on any changes to the Structure Plan, after which the final Puhoi Structure Plan will be formally adopted.

It is important to note, when reading the following report and recommendations, that the Structure Plan is not a statutory document and therefore any proposed land uses or other notations do not have any legal effect even when the Plan is adopted. A statutory District Plan change (a publicly notified process) is required to implement the outcomes of the Structure Plan.

## **2.0 Report structure**

The various points from all submissions have been grouped together into 12 subject topics. Some submissions included multiple points, and accordingly are considered under more than one subject topic. Topics and the report section under which they are discussed are as follows:

- |                                     |             |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| • General support or opposition     | Section 3.1 |
| • Design Guidelines (Appendix E )   | Section 3.2 |
| • Growth/Zoning                     | Section 3.3 |
| • Landscape Character Zoning        | Section 3.4 |
| • Traffic Calming/Pedestrian Issues | Section 3.5 |
| • Historic Issues                   | Section 3.6 |
| • Commercial/retail issues          | Section 3.7 |
| • Motorway                          | Section 3.8 |
| • Miscellaneous                     | Section 3.9 |

Under each section, the key issues are summarised, an officer response is provided, and a recommendation is made as to whether the submissions should be supported or not supported. Where a submission has been supported, a recommendation is subsequently made as to any changes that should be made to the Structure Plan.

*Please note: Due to the extremely tight deadlines involved in reading and considering the reporting on the submissions in time to allow possible adoption of the Structure Plan by 30 September, the recommended changes to the Structure Plan have not been implemented for the purpose of this meeting. The amendments will be made and a revised Structure Plan will be tabled after the Council has deliberated on the submissions and a final report will be prepared recommending adoption of the Structure Plan.*

### 3.0 Submissions

#### 3.1 List of submitters

The following table provides a brief outline as to the extent to which each submitter supports or opposes the Structure Plan and an outline of the key focus of support or concerns. A more detailed summary of individual submissions is contained in **Appendix 1**.

##### Submissions supporting

#	Name	Issues Raised
8	Craig Davis (Davis Coastal Consultants)	Supported with respect to pedestrian connectivity as their recent work 'sits well' with the outcomes of Village Core, heritage and connection infrastructure.
16	ARC	Supported on the basis of no-growth in line with ARPS.
26	Murray Seymour	Supported – particularly guidelines and landscape provisions.
27	Gillian Seymour	Supported – especially the guidelines.
29	Jennifer Long	Supported – especially design controls.
30	Dennis Richards	Supported – especially the design guidelines and landscape guidelines.

##### Submissions supporting in part

#	Name	Issues Raised
1	Larry Mitchell	Supported in part, but did not want the guidelines to have statutory effect. Opposed other aspects of the Structure Plan.
2	Kathryn Mankelow	Supported with changes, including review of the Historic Precinct and a review of the guidelines accordingly.
3	Judy Lyons	Agreed with many aspects of the guidelines.
4	Priscilla and Hans Everts	Generally supported the outcomes, in particular the application of precinct rules to the entire Special 14 Zone, the landscape character zones and the guidelines (subject to changes). Appreciated the wide range of issues for consideration.
5	B C & S Marcroft	Generally supported – acknowledged and thanked RDC. Suggested minor changes.
7	Te Araroa Trust	Supported with conditions relating to word changes. Open Space/Walkways.
9	RJ Glanville	Sought 4000m <sup>2</sup> lots, inclusion of cemetery in the Historic Village, found design requirements too restrictive and sought wording changes. Future subdivision and building should be required to fund new footpaths etc.
10	K Pegrume	Strongly opposed to 'brick and tile' houses and sought changes to guidelines to make them more stringent. Include former Prime Resources land on map in Structure Plan.
11	Russell Green	Maintain character but concerned that controls were too restrictive.
15	David Dodsworth	Supported with particular emphasis on several outcomes and subject to some changes for others.
18	Kath Anderson	Sought 50km/h restrictions along Puhoi Village, against guidelines apart from applicable to Puhoi Historic precinct. Seeks 4000m <sup>2</sup> sites.
19	Jan Gordon-Walters and R. Walters	Generally supported, subject to changes to the guidelines.
20	Peter Straka	Supported or strongly supported many outcomes, not in favour of others (including residential backdrops).
23	Gordon Smith	Sought to preserve only some backdrops. Scope for zoning change to make smaller lots. No support for Traffic calming.

## Submissions opposing

#	Name	Issues Raised
6	Stu Miller	Opposed on several points, particularly guidelines.
12	Paul and Jenny Kaufmann	Opposed on several points and wished it to be 'cancelled and abolished'.
13	Natalie Paynter	Opposed in particular the guidelines.
14	W O Shollum Trust	Opposed in particular restrictions on development/guidelines.
17	Kenneth Braines	Opposed to having his property included in landscape character zone.
21	Desmond and Heather Schollum	Opposed to all outcomes of the Structure Plan.
22	Graeme Webber	Opposed to the guidelines and traffic calming. Demand for smaller sections.
24	Diane Glanville	Wanted 4000m <sup>2</sup> sites and changes to pedestrian/vehicle provisions. Concerned that Puhoi would be over-governed.
25	John Simons	Opposed to all outcomes of the Structure Plan (lengthy submission on background information and errors). Where any particular comments were raised in the report.
28	Trevor Sampson	Opposed (lengthy submission which contained comments on every part of the Structure Plan which are discussed in report).

### 3.2 Topic: Design Guidelines – Appendix E to the Structure Plan

#### Summary of key issues raised

Seven submitters (submissions 6, 12, 13, 14, 21, 25 and 28) were strongly opposed to the inclusion of guidelines describing them as 'unworkable' and 'unrealistic', although one of those submitters (submission No 28) suggested that the zone controls in the Historic Precinct be amended to make provision for new buildings to be constructed in a New Zealand (NZ) colonial style. Four submissions (submissions 10, 27, 29 and 30) were fully in support, including one submitter (submission 10) who considered the guidelines would need to be strengthened if they were to achieve their intended purpose.

Twelve submitters (submissions 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 11, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22 and 23) supported the guidelines in part or agreed that some guidelines were needed to protect the rural and historic character of the village and its surrounding area (or in the case of submission 2, considered that the guidelines needed to be reviewed in conjunction with a view of the entire zone controls for the Historic Precinct).

The level of partial support varied significantly and submitters were generally divided in their views about how they should be implemented.

Some submitters suggested that the guidelines should have no statutory force at all (i.e. implemented as non statutory guidelines) whilst others proposed that they be implemented in a way that would provide discretion to vary from the standards (or some of the standards). One submitter suggested that the words 'should be met' rather than 'must be met' be used, to allow scope to vary the requirements.

Some of the submitters only commented on individual guidelines (for example that the position of garages, façade or roof colours or the type of materials used in windows, should not be prescribed). In particular, there were a number of submitters who were opposed in principle to the Council imposing controls on type and colour of building materials, in particular the use of 'brick and tile' houses.

Some submitters supported the guidelines in the historic village but were opposed to any form of control of development in the surrounding rural landscape.

## Discussion

The Guidelines (in Appendix E to the Structure Plan), were developed as a mechanism to implement the community's wish to protect the historic character of the Puhoi Village, as well as the rural landscape values/landscape setting, in the surrounding hills and valleys that provide viewsheds into and out of the town. This was a specific direction in the 2008 Vision for Puhoi document, of which four of the eight vision statements were directly related to this purpose:

*Our Puhoi will be –*

- *A special place for residents and visitors alike – it's not just what Puhoi has got, it's what we haven't got that makes us special*
- *A rural village that retains and builds on its unique Bohemian character and heritage*
- *A place that manages growth to protect its rural setting, including ridgelines and trees as well as enhance the historic village core*
- *A protected and historic village – a special place.*

At the public meeting held to launch the Structure Plan, the questions indicated there was some confusion about the status of the guidelines and how these would be implemented. This meeting was followed up with an informal meeting of some members of the Puhoi Community Forum where the options for implementation were discussed. However, most of the submitters were unaware of these options and it is important to clarify the options for implementation.

As noted above, the Structure Plan is a non statutory document and, as such, the guidelines are included (as an appendix) to identify a range of performance standards, which, if implemented would achieve the outcomes envisaged in the Puhoi Vision.

As is often the case, the vision a community agrees to at a strategy level, is often different to that which individual households are prepared to accept, particularly if it is affecting their future aspirations to subdivide or develop their land. However, the guidelines do not need to be implemented as mandatory controls when they are ultimately incorporated into the District Plan.

One option is to include the guidelines as non statutory guidelines which are taken into consideration when an application is required for consent. This begs the question of course, as to whether a consent is required under the District Plan in the first place, which is an issue in its own right.

Another option which could meet the majority of concerns raised in the submissions is to include the general performance standards in the guidelines as assessment criteria which are triggered when an application does not meet the development controls. Again, this is contingent on whether a resource consent is required for building, and even then, an applicant has an opportunity to vary the standards if it can be demonstrated that the adverse effects can be mitigated.

A third option (possibly the option that most submitters have assumed will be the case) is to apply the guidelines as mandatory development controls that must be met in all circumstances.

The submissions opposing the use of guidelines are not supported. As noted above, the overarching strategic objectives in the Puhoi Vision are to provide some form of protection of the historic village and the view corridors out of and into the town. If there were no guidelines (or similar way of managing future built form) there would be little purpose in having a structure plan at all.

Many residents expressed concern about the loss of character that has occurred as a result of recent development which they considered digresses quite strongly from the Puhoi 'vernacular'. They also considered that the current District Plan provisions were not strong enough to prevent similar future developments undermining the future character of the town and rural landscape. Guidelines have been developed in response to the built form elements

that people do not like, and the question is more about how these can be implemented rather than whether there should be any at all.

There were differing views amongst the submitters about how this should be achieved, but most were opposed to the application of mandatory controls. The submissions which supported the guidelines in part are supported and it is suggested that an additional paragraph or section be included in the Structure Plan, reinforcing that the guidelines (and indeed the Structure Plan itself) is not a statutory document and that the method of implementing some or all of the guidelines would be subject to a future variation or plan change process, which itself would be the subject of a formal notification and hearing process.

Furthermore, it is suggested that the tone of the guidelines be softened by removing any wording that implies they will be mandatory controls. Submission 4 provided a well articulated solution that appears to achieve this outcome by proposing that all references to the words 'must be met' in the guidelines are replaced with the words 'should be met'.

### Recommendations

1. That submissions 27, 29 and 30 (supporting the guidelines) be noted, but that no changes be made to the Structure Plan.
2. That submission 10 seeking stronger controls and submission 2 seeking a review of the guidelines not be supported.
3. That submissions 2, 3, 6, 12, 13, 14, 18, 21, 25 and 28 opposing the guidelines not be supported.
4. That submissions 1, 3, 4, 9, 11, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22 and 23 be supported, or supported in part, by changing the wording in the Structure Plan to substitute the words 'must be met' with the words 'should be met'.

3.3 Topic: Growth/Zoning
--------------------------

### Summary of key issues raised

Ten submitters (submissions 1, 10, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 28) commented on this topic.

Five submitters (1, 17, 22, 23, and 28) were opposed to restricting future growth/development in Puhoi, including some who sought an opportunity for future subdivision of their properties. Of these, one submitter (submission 1) supported a greater intensification of development with the Special 14 Zone which has an existing minimum lot size of 4000m<sup>2</sup>; and another, (submission 28) sought a relaxation of zoning restrictions to allow development in all zones without requirement for resource consent (in other words a rezoning from General Rural to Countryside Living to allow increased subdivision/houses).

Four submissions (18, 22, 23 and 24) sought lot sizes of 4000m<sup>2</sup> or an extension of the Special 14 Zone into the Countryside Living Zone, to allow subdivision of lots into sizes that were the same as the village (i.e. 4000m<sup>2</sup>). However, in the case of submissions 18 and 24 it is unclear whether the submitters were supporting or opposing further subdivision, as one stated *4000m<sup>2</sup> minimum lot size will ensure that urban type subdivisions are not created and cottage industries are encouraged* and the other proposed 4000m<sup>2</sup> in the Historic Precinct when the minimum lot size is already 4000m<sup>2</sup>.

Submission 10 requested that the (former) Prime Resources land be explicitly indicated in the Structure Plan maps to ensure that the design guidelines were also applicable to this land.

Submission 16 (ARC) supported the strategy of limited growth, in keeping with the existing ARPS and to protect existing values.

Submission 17 referred to a property near the perimeter of the study area and sought to 'stop any zone change' at this property's boundary as he was considering possible future subdivision to allow a further dwelling to be constructed.

Submission 25 discussed wider issues to do with growth and expressed concern about the indicative subdivision map in the Structure Plan; however it made no request for any specific relief.

### Discussion

The global intent of most of these submissions was to change the zone or zone provisions to allow for further subdivision/development. The Structure Plan discusses the rationale for limiting the future growth/intensification of Puhoi and at a wider strategic level, Puhoi has not been identified (and is regarded as being unsuitable) for accommodating an increase in population and economic activities. Regional plans and strategies support this position and indicate that Puhoi is not suitable for intensification due to various growth-management challenges and environmental constraints. Increases in population growth result in increased demand for services and infrastructure and could incrementally erode the historic character of the village and the informal rural character and landscape setting of the view corridors surrounding the town.

The existing controls in the Special 14 zone were originally intended to protect the historic character of the Puhoi village, and a number of submissions have quite rightly pointed out that even these controls are allowing development to proceed that is not in keeping with this character. In a similar context, an increased number of houses on the slopes and valleys in the surrounding area would incrementally erode the still relatively undeveloped character of the landscape.

It is important to note that there are existing subdivision and development opportunities under the current zonings and these can reasonably be expected to occur in the future. The Countryside Living area to the west of the village provides a 'buffer' between the more populated village 'hub' and the wider general rural area. There are some subdivision opportunities within the Countryside Living Zone under current zoning rules which would in fact provide further development opportunity. The wider General Rural Zone also allows for further growth and subdivision.

Re-zoning of any General Rural areas to Countryside Living would substantially increase the intensity of the land in the General Rural Zone and would be tantamount to expanding the area of Puhoi identified for accommodating residential development. The cumulative effect of such a rezoning would be contrary to the desired outcomes for Puhoi and lead to greater population intensity which, as discussed above, is not suitable for this catchment. In addition the ARC's documents, although not fully operational, set a direction to avoid adding future countryside living opportunities throughout the region in unsuitable areas.

It is considered that an anticipated small but gradual increase in population will continue to occur under the existing controls, while still ensuring the rural environment is maintained. If the design guidelines are implemented in a way that has a reasonable influence on how development is sited and designed, then any future subdivision/development that does occur should minimise the visual impact on the landscape and assist in maintaining the rural character.

The submissions seeking further intensification of land within the village, the existing Countryside Living Zone and the General Rural Zone over and above that already provided for, would not be consistent with the desired outcomes for Puhoi as a whole and are not supported.

In relation to submission 10, there is no reason why the former Prime Resources land cannot be shown on the map; however the extent to which the guidelines can be applied is limited and cannot contradict any guidance on siting and design in the Environment Court decision.

In relation to submission 17, there are no zone changes proposed and the owner will retain any existing rights he has to subdivide his land.

In relation to submission 25, no relief is sought; however it is pertinent to note that the subdivision map in the Structure Plan simply indicates the potential to create further lots under current provisions. This is a desktop GIS interpretation of available growth-areas based on the existing provisions in the District Plan. It was not possible (without significant resources) to analyse or describe every property within the study area, and identify every variable or constraint which may affect its future subdivision potential. The purpose of the

map was to provide a general indication, albeit as the submitter correctly points out, with areas of uncertainty.

### Recommendations

5. That submissions 16, 17 and 25 be noted but that no changes be made to the Structure Plan.
6. That submissions 1, 18, 22, 23, 24 and 28 not be supported on the basis of the above discussion in relation to managing future growth.
7. That submission 10 be supported in part and the former 'Prime Resources' owned land be identified on the relevant Structure Plan maps.

3.4 Topic: Landscape Character Zones
--------------------------------------

Eleven submitters (submissions 3, 4, 5, 12, 15, 17, 20, 25, 26, 28 and 30) commented on this topic.

Six submitters (submissions 3, 4, 5, 15, 26 and 30) supported the Landscape Analysis and/or the landscape character zones in whole or in part, in order to protect the landscape character of the hills and valleys around the town. Submissions 3 and 26 also supported the planting of vegetation along the road and screen planting in front of Puhoi Close and the lower valley floor generally. Submission 5 particularly supported the landscape analysis No 13/14 which covers the entrance hill to the village.

The other five submitters (submissions 12, 17, 20, 25 and 28) were opposed to the landscape protection provisions in one form or another. Submissions 12 and 20 objected to the protection of view corridors and submission 28 was opposed to the landscape character zones outright, and said they were not raised as part of any community consultation.

In relation to submission 17: although it did make a specific reference to the landscape character zone, it appears the submitter did not want his property in a landscape character zone as this would restrict or prohibit future subdivision.

Submission 25 was concerned about an error in Appendix C – Landscape Analysis (i.e. 'Saleyards Valley' is noted as zone 4 in the front photograph/map and later referred to as zone 5 in the text).

### Discussion

The general comments opposing the landscape character zones were similar to those opposing the Design Guidelines: namely that there should be no controls imposed on future development, in particular the siting and design of buildings.

The Landscape Analysis (in Appendix C of the Structure Plan) identifies the landscape values unique to each of the different zones that have been identified. Some of the landscape zones are of much greater significance than others and the Landscape Analysis reaches a conclusion for each landscape zone about the extent to which some direction may be required for siting and design of buildings, the need for screen planting and so on. The landscape character zones do not include any development restrictions per se. Rather they are there to inform the preparation of the Guidelines and to provide a strategic basis for supporting any future overlay controls in the District Plan. A particular example where a restrictive overlay is envisaged in the District Plan is the large prominent hill that marks the entrance to Puhoi from the highway and provides a backdrop to the town when approaching from the north. Such overlays would allow the specific provisions to be included in the District Plan restricting the construction of buildings on ridgelines (again a matter that was specifically included in the 2008 Puhoi Vision document).

The landscape character zones (and indeed the Design Guidelines) are proposed in the Structure Plan as tools to help achieve the vision the community has set for itself. Their ultimate incorporation into the District Plan will be subject to a future variation or plan change process and at that time, the community (or individuals) will have an opportunity to comment

on the detailed provisions, which at that stage, could limit their subdivision or development rights depending on how they are incorporated.

The objections seeking the exclusion of the landscape character zones are not supported, as this is considered to be fundamental to the underlying vision of protecting the landscape values of the town.

It is also relevant to note that community consultation as part of the Vision workshops clearly identified that protection of key views was highly desirable to maintain the rural character of the area. In order to fulfil this action point, some form of identification and subsequent recommendation for various critical landscape zones was logically necessary.

Submission 17 is not supported insofar as the points made about future subdivision were incorrect in terms of the application of landscape character zones to the property cited.

#### Recommendations

8. That submissions 3, 4, 5, 15, 26 and 30 be noted but that no changes be made to the Structure Plan.
9. That submissions 12, 20, and 28 not be supported on the basis of the above discussion in relation to protecting landscape values.
10. That submission 17 not be supported as the landscape character zones are not affecting the submitter's rights to subdivide his land.
11. That submission 25 be noted and the necessary amendment to the 'Landscape Analysis' be made to correct the discrepancy between text and the photo overlay/map which describes Saleyards Valley.

3.5	Topic: Traffic Calming and Pedestrian Issue
-----	---

#### Summary of key issues raised

This topic groups together the several pedestrian and walkways issues, as well as the transportation/traffic-calming issues. Overall it attracted 13 submissions.

The majority of submissions in support acknowledged the traffic calming needs and pedestrian/walkway improvements within the village and beyond. Some submitters (submissions 2, 5, 25 and 28) considered that the traffic-calming provisions were too urban in scale.

Appendix D to the Structure Plan contains the T2 draft report on traffic calming. This went through a further review by the community, the results of which were not taken into consideration as part of the Structure Plan. A number of submitters (submissions 2, 4, 5, 15, 18, 20, 24, 25 and 28) raised this directly or indirectly and suggested that the wording of the Structure Plan outcome for traffic and transportation (and Appendix D) be altered accordingly.

Submissions 22 and 23 (and implicitly, submissions 25 and 28) opposed the idea of traffic calming. A number of submissions (18 and 24) sought review of, or extension to the 50km/h speed limit zone through the village. One submission (8) also supported the outcomes as they were in line with recent work undertaken with community planning for jetty location.

In terms of pedestrian and walkway issues, submission 7 in particular, proposed a change in wording of paragraph 3.7 of the Structure Plan to incorporate specific mention of the entry and exit points for the section of walkway which still needs to be completed.

#### Discussion

It is important to note that the T2 document and the Frame Group Walkway/Cycleway report are draft documents that were used to support the Structure Plan outcomes and provide some additional traffic calming methods within the village area. They also seek to improve walkway/cycleway and pedestrian connectivity through the village and beyond. Implementation would require further consultation with both community and Council staff. The

submitters who raised the issue of the traffic-calming report having been through a further iteration with the community were quite correct however, and a key amendment to the Structure Plan outcome will be to update section 3.9 to incorporate these changes.

It should also be noted that a further simultaneous recommendation of the Structure Plan is that the recommendations of the T2 report would be in keeping with the Design Guidelines for the public realm (which recommend that urban-scale transport infrastructure be avoided and that informal softer and more sympathetic designs be used to achieve the objectives).

The speed limit through the village is 50 km/h increasing to 80 km/h past the village 'hub'. Any change to speed limits would require consideration under the Council Bylaw. Requests for an extension to the slower speed limit beyond that which already applies in the village could be made as part of the annual speed limit review. This follows a process in which the Council would consider the merits and effects of altering the speed limit, and includes such factors as the existing speed limit, the character of the surrounding land environment, the function of a road, the number and nature of side roads, vehicle, cycle and pedestrian activity, crash data and any speed survey data. The implementation of the proposed traffic calming measures is also within the ambit of the Council to assist with traffic and pedestrian safety.

Community consultation outlined desires for improving overall pedestrian access and traffic safety. General wider issues of walkways and connectivity were also identified during the consultation process. As has been noted in the Structure Plan, there are numerous concurrent strategies which are ongoing and which tie into the outcomes of the Structure Plan (for example, the Te Araroa Trail and the Puhoi Memorial Park Management Plan).

As previously noted, outcomes of the Structure Plan relating to improved walkways, connections and traffic safety are not statutory matters and may not be implemented through the District Plan. However, to remove any recommendations for improved traffic safety or improvement to walkways and connectivity would be inconsistent with the Vision. It is important that such outcomes are retained in the Structure Plan to add weight to future applications to annual plans for funding for connectivity/pedestrian access projects.

### Recommendations

That submissions 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 15, 18 and 20 be supported on the basis that they support the traffic and transportation outcomes of the Structure Plan or sought changes to section 3.9 to incorporate the latest recommendations and processes.

12. That submissions 22, 23, 25 and 28 not be supported on the basis of the above discussion.
13. That the wording of Section 3.9 of the Structure Plan (Traffic and Transportation) be amended to include details of the revised community recommendations
14. That the wording of Section 3.7 of the Structure Plan be amended to specifically incorporate the Te Araroa walkway 'entry and exit' points.
15. The the wording of Section 3.7 of the Structure Plan be amended to specifically incorporate the Te Awaroa walkway 'entry and exit' points.

3.6	Topic: Historic Issues
-----	------------------------

### Summary of key issues raised

Submissions 4, 5, 15 and 16 supported and commented on heritage and historic issues. In particular they agreed with the recommended outcome of the Structure Plan that recommends changes or review of the provisions for the Historic Precinct Zone and the Special 14 Zone. Others (submissions 9 and 14) sought additional sites or buildings to be included in the Special 14 Zone. One submission (28) opposed making the historic precinct larger and sought removal of the reference to 'Special 14 Zone' which applies to the Historic Village. It also sought the removal of any design guidelines applicable to the Special 14 Zone. This submission also raised some general issues related to heritage within the Structure Plan, such as the replacement of 'Bohemian' with 'NZ Colonial' particularly where it refers to buildings.

Submission 2 was concerned that more recent development has already compromised the character of the Historic Precinct and sought a full review of the Precinct to ensure that the provisions are relevant and updated to acknowledge recent development. Submission 28 also acknowledged the funding that the Council has supplied for maintenance and upgrading of heritage buildings (through the Heritage Grant funding) within the Special 14 Zone.

### Discussion

A major theme in the Structure Plan is to protect and enhance Puhoi's heritage, particularly the village zone. The theme is implicit in many of the outcomes of the Plan, not just the recommendations of the Heritage Section (3.6). The recommendations in the Structure Plan are a response to the community vision which emerged during the consultation process and which sought outcomes such as establishing a village 'heart' with a distinct character and form. This includes identifying new buildings or sites for protection, the inclusion of appropriate controls in the Special 14 Zone and possible expansion of the Historic Precinct (in terms of identifying other heritage features which contribute to the heritage values in the village).

As has been discussed previously, the incorporation of the design guidelines for Special 14 Zone would provide some protection and respect for existing heritage buildings and features within the historic village. Managing future built form by way of incorporating the guidelines into the District Plan would achieve the Vision of helping to protect historic character. As previously noted, the way these are incorporated is still a matter for consideration; however in principle, the guidelines are a fundamental adjunct to protecting the character of this unique historic settlement. Accordingly, the submissions opposing any design guidelines for the Special 14 Zone are not supported, as this would be inconsistent with the vision and underlying purpose of the Structure Plan.

The Structure Plan promotes a heritage review to determine if there are further heritage/archaeological sites within the catchment which should be protected under the District Plan; and to determine if the boundary of the 'Heritage Precinct' should be expanded. It must be noted that this is a recommendation of the Plan which will necessitate further investigation and may lead to a variation or change to the District Plan. Again this would be subject to the formal plan change process of including additional sites or buildings or altering the Heritage Precinct boundary.

It is also important to note that formal changes to any boundaries or the inclusion of further sites are not implemented at the Structure Plan stage. Rather, the recommendations are intended to lead to further investigation. The submissions which sought to extend the Heritage Precinct or the Special 14 Zone or which sought to have specific buildings included in the District Plan as Heritage Items are noted and supported.

A further recommendation of the Structure Plan is to review the assessment criteria for the Special 14 Zone to ensure they provide adequate guidance for activities within the zone, including the Heritage Precinct. This again would be undertaken by way of a variation or change to the District Plan. Community concerns (as part of the Vision consultation) identified a perception that current District Plan provisions for the zone may not be followed rigorously enough, resulting in developments/re-developments which are not in keeping with the character and amenity of the area, particularly within the village. It is therefore considered that the submissions which sought strengthening and review of the Special 14 Zone be noted and supported.

One submission (28) raised concerns about the way in which heritage is generally referred to within the Structure Plan (for example, the focus on 'Bohemian' rather than 'NZ Colonial'). While it is recognised that the historic buildings are colonial, it is understood that the reference to 'Bohemian' is important to the original settlers and their descendants and sets Puhoi apart from other similar historic villages by recognising the origins of its early settlers. This aspect continues to be celebrated within the community and to minimise any reference to these origins would minimise the uniqueness of Puhoi.

## Recommendations

16. That submissions 4, 5, 9, 14, 15 and 16 be noted (on the basis that they supported recommended changes or review of the provisions for the Historic Precinct Zone/Special 14 Zone or sought additional sites or buildings to be included in the Special 14 Zone), but that no changes be made to the Structure Plan.
17. That submission 28 not be supported on the basis that it sought removal of the Design Guidelines for the Special 14 Zone; opposed any review of the provisions for the Special 14 Zone; and sought to remove reference to the Bohemian origins of the early settlers.

3.7	Topic: Commercial/Retail Issues
-----	---------------------------------

Five submitters (submissions 2, 16, 20, 25 and 28) commented on this topic: three submissions (2, 16 and 20) supported or conditionally supported the proposal to provide for some small scale retail and commercial opportunities adjacent to the existing shop and in the vicinity of the existing (soon to be relocated) fire station. Two submitters (submissions 25 and 28) were outrightly opposed to the designation of any further land for retail/commercial development.

Submission 2 sought to include property HO37 in the identified area for retail/commercial development. Submission 16 supported the designation of an area for possible future commercial development on the basis that it will encourage some tourist related economic activities.

Submission 20 supported a further concentration of retail/commercial activities in the village core and provided conditional support for the sites that have been identified.

### Discussion

As noted in the Structure Plan, consultants, Property Economics, carried out a retail service zone land demand forecast for Waimauku, Riverhead, Waitoki, Kaukapakapa and Puhoi in January 2008. The report assessed population forecasts and estimated potential future retail expenditure in Puhoi to the year 2026. The report predicted that up to 600m<sup>2</sup> of retail floor space could be supported

Puhoi has not been identified as a settlement for future intensification, however the Property Economics Report identified the potential for a small amount of additional retail/commercial floor space to meet the needs of forecasted population growth (based on existing subdivision opportunities in the District Plan). The recommendation to add another 600m<sup>2</sup> was based on sound planning principles and as agreed by submitter 16 (the ARC) it will provide some limited opportunities to enhance the economic base of the town which is reliant on tourism.

Accordingly, the two opposing submissions are not supported.

### Recommendations

18. That submissions 2, 16 and 20 be noted but that no changes be made to the Structure Plan.
19. That submissions 25 and 28 not be supported, for the reasons outlined in the above discussions.

3.8	Topic: Motorway
-----	-----------------

### Summary of key issues raised

Six submitters (submissions 1, 2, 3,4,12 and 28) commented on this topic. The over-arching theme raised by submitters in relation to this topic was the desire to see support in the Structure Plan for continuation of the motorway from Puhoi to Wellsford, in particular the provision of on and off-ramps to Puhoi to maintain a direct connection to the motorway. The

submitters were quite explicit in their desire to see, at the very least, a positive statement in the Structure Plan to support the motorway access to Puhoi, with one (submission 28) making the suggestion that the Structure Plan should not be decided before the motorway route was finalised.

## Discussion

The Puhoi Structure Plan acknowledged the ongoing development of the motorway extension and its anticipated impact on the Puhoi Village and community but made no specific comments about this, due to fact that the project is still in the preliminary design stage. It did note that the project would be taken into consideration as part of the traffic and transport actions.

The Roads of National Significance (RONS) project was open for public consultation at the same time as the Puhoi Structure Plan and this created considerable contention in the community. Whilst the Council has attempted to deal with the motorway as a separate issue, some submitters considered that the Structure Plan should deal with the issue.

Since the Structure Plan was open for submissions, the Council has considered its position on the proposed RONS project and expressed its support for an interchange in the vicinity of Puhoi or Mahurangi. It is pertinent to quote an extract from the Council's submission which explained its reason for this position:

*Council supports the concept of a new off line motorway, subject to the provision of connectivity between the new motorway and key northern Rodney communities – being Puhoi, Warkworth and Wellsford. The need for such access provisions is discussed in section 4 below.*

### *Puhoi/Mahurangi West*

*In 2008 the Council, in consultation with the Puhoi community, adopted Vision Puhoi. Vision Puhoi (2008) identifies the protection of the historic character of the town and its surrounding rural landscape as important. The small rural town character (including its unique historical base, the river and the relatively undeveloped view corridors into and out of the town) are part of the economic asset that underpins the attractiveness of Puhoi as a tourist destination.*

*Currently the Council is consulting on a draft Structure Plan for Puhoi which sets out the proposed future strategic planning direction. Despite the proximity to the State Highway, Puhoi is not predicted (or planned) to grow significantly in the next 40 years. This reflects the community's wishes as stated in Vision Puhoi. Whilst it is possible that the limiting direct road access will minimise pressure, it is considered that there are other mechanisms to manage growth at a local level (District Planning) which may not be at the expense of the economy in general and the tourist industry in particular. The final Structure Plan (and future plan changes) will suggest appropriate mechanisms to manage development.*

*There are many people in the Puhoi community (in particular business owners) who consider access to and from the new highway critical to the long term economic viability of Puhoi. The village has become a thriving tourist destination and the asset which underpins the industry is the unique Bohemian history and character of this small rural village and its surrounding landscape setting. Rather than bypass the village, the proposed highway could provide an opportunity to enhance and promote Puhoi/Mahurangi west as a tourist destination.*

*In addition to the historic village of Puhoi, the following places are also of tourism significance:*

- . Waiwera - Thermal Pools*
- . Wenderholm – ARC Regional Park with historic Couldrey House*
- . Mahurangi West – ARC Regional Park – Sullivans Bay*

*These places attract many visitors, both within the region and international, and their continued viability is dependent on easy and safe road access.*

*There are several other important factors pertinent to the consideration of access at/or near Puhoi. One of the principal drivers for Northern Gateway Toll Road is the poor road safety record of former SH1 between Silverdale and Puhoi. Without an access point at/or near Puhoi, some traffic currently using the Northern Gateway Toll*

Road will be forced back onto the old state highway (former SH1). This 'redirected' traffic will need to exit the Northern Motorway at the Orewa Interchange. This traffic will add to current traffic flows along Grand Drive, West Hoe Road and Hibiscus Coast Highway between Orewa and Puhoi. This journey represents an additional travel distance of some 6 km - a notable reduction in service for those travelling from or to the Puhoi/Mahurangi West area. The above mentioned roads did carry much higher traffic volumes before the opening of the Northern Gateway Toll Road. However, over the past 18 months residents and road users along these routes have become accustomed to the lower traffic volumes they expected following opening of the Northern Gateway Toll Road. Furthermore, heavy vehicle travel at night to Waiwera, Puhoi and nearby areas will have to exit the motorway at the Silverdale Interchange as heavy vehicles are not permitted on Grand Drive from 7pm to 7am.

Whilst the foregoing comments focus on localised issues, there will nevertheless be the need for emergency access on and off the new motorway when situations dictate motorway closure related to vehicle crashes or motorway maintenance and repairs. These are necessary and the cost of providing motorway access for Puhoi/Mahurangi West can be partially mitigated by combining emergency access and an interchange at/or near Puhoi.

Not to be overlooked is the extensive forestry activity through which the new route will pass. Convenient motorway access (in the vicinity of Puhoi) will have notable economic benefits for this industry. And at the same time it will ensure there is no reversion to logging trucks travelling through the local communities of Hatfields Beach, Orewa and Silverdale.

In summary, Council considers that there is a strategic and operational policy justification for supporting both a 'no growth strategy' and a motorway interchange at/or near Puhoi to retain the economic/tourism potential of the wider Waiwera/Puhoi/Mahurangi West area.

#### *Conclusion*

.....The Council generally concurs with the project as outlined to date but notes that in depth investigation will be necessary in detailing connectivity between the new highway at Wellsford and even more particularly at Warkworth. The Council further considers there is a strong case for connectivity to the new highway in the vicinity of Puhoi/Mahurangi West and seeks NZTA's review and amendment of its proposals with a view to providing such connectivity.

In summary there are a range of reasons why the Council supports a motorway interchange in the vicinity of Puhoi or Mahurangi. However; in terms of its implications for the Structure Plan, future growth and development of Puhoi should be managed through appropriate provisions in the District Plan rather than relying on crude mechanisms such as the existence or otherwise of a motorway interchange.

Accordingly, the submissions are supported in part insofar as it is considered appropriate to update the Structure Plan to include relevant extracts from the Council's submission to the NZTA and to include an additional paragraph, noting the importance of ensuring that any future variations to the District Plan make it quite clear that the existence or otherwise of any future motorway interchange should not be a basis for justifying additional growth in population and economic activities in Puhoi.

#### Recommendation

20. That submissions 1, 2, 3, 4, 12 and 28 be supported in part, in terms of acknowledging the Council's support for a motorway interchange in the vicinity of Puhoi or Mahurangi.
21. That the Structure Plan be updated to include relevant extracts from the Council's submission to the NZTA and to include an additional paragraph noting the importance of ensuring that any future variations to the District Plan make it quite clear that the existence or otherwise of any future motorway interchange should not be a basis for justifying additional growth in population and economic activities in Puhoi.

### Summary of key issues raised

Four submitters (12, 14, 15, and 28) raised a number of topics of a miscellaneous nature or which are extraneous to the actual Structure Plan's content.

Submissions 12 and 28 made reference to the consultation process and expressed general dissatisfaction, for example, that some people had been left out. Submissions 12 and 14 perceived that the Structure Plan was too rushed. Submission 15 contained submission points about opposing the fire station's new location; amendment to the name of the Puhoi Memorial Park; adding the Puhoi Tearooms to the list of Puhoi's amenities under section 2.9; and some comments about map notations. Submission 28 sought re-numbering of the document's content and removal of inconsistencies and repetition. It also sought that some matters be defined or redefined, such as 'rural character' and the statement that farming and forestry are the main source of income for Puhoi residents.

### Discussion

The structure plan process began in 2004 and gained momentum in 2008 with the development of Vision Puhoi and preparation of the background and technical documents which informed the final draft Structure Plan. The perception that the process has been rushed is not supported. It is agreed that timeframes have been tight, particularly in the last few months, however the rationale behind this was to ensure continuity and that the Plan did not lose momentum during the transition to the Auckland Council. Further, it was anticipated as part of the Annual Plan that the Puhoi Structure Plan be adopted prior to the end of the 2010/2011 year.

Consultation in 2008 and 2009 attempted to capture the views of as many residents in the community as possible, with workshops and follow-up invitations to provide additional comments via mail. It is acknowledged that opinions will always differ on the best way to deal with the level of consultation; however it is considered that the consultation process for the Puhoi Structure Plan has continued for a number of years with different people becoming involved at different times. The consultation process has elicited valuable comments and opinions from the public, which have been used, along with technical documents, to draft the Plan. It is also important to note that this is by no means the end of the consultation process to realise the final outcomes and recommendation of the Structure Plan. Some recommendations in the Structure Plan will ultimately be implemented by way of a variation to the District Plan, whilst others will be implemented in consultation with the community when the time arises.

In regard to the location of the fire station and the name of the Memorial Park (including on the map), it is noted that these have already been addressed separately via the Management Plan process. The recommendation from the hearing report for the Puhoi Memorial Park Management Plan in response to relevant submissions was:

*It is recommended that the existing park name remain. The park was named as Puhoi Pioneers' Memorial Park to acknowledge the early pioneers who donated and developed the original park, and for those who served and died in the First and Second World Wars.*

Section 2.9 lists a number of amenities and services available in Puhoi village. The addition of the Puhoi Tearooms is supported.

The Structure Plan is not a lengthy document and it is considered that the numbering of paragraphs and pages are sufficient to be able to make adequate reference to each section. Any minor inconsistencies in terms of paragraph numbering will be addressed.

In terms of defining 'rural character', the statement of character in the Structure Plan and the descriptive background information accompanying it, implicitly also describe the environment in the wider hinterland. It is not considered that a defining passage on rural character would add anything substantial to that already described. Similarly, the statement *the setting beyond the Village is largely undeveloped* is a reasonable way to describe this wider environment

when compared to the village area, particularly when taking into consideration the low intensity settlement patterns (which also has scope for further development).

The submission point that farming and forestry are the main source of income for Puhoi residents is not a substantive matter and will be reviewed.

### Recommendations

22. That the miscellaneous issues raised in submissions be acknowledged and noted where appropriate.
23. That the Structure Plan be amended:
  - to add 'Puhoi Tearooms' to the list of 'Current Amenities and Community Facilities' (in Section 2.9)
  - to correct any inconsistencies with paragraph/page numbering
  - to review the statement saying that 'farming and forestry are the main source of income for Puhoi residents.'

# APPENDIX 1

