

**BEFORE THE AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management  
Act 1991 and the Local  
Government (Auckland  
Transitional Provisions) Act 2010

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of Topics:  
081 zoning in the North West  
(KUMEU-HUAPAI)

**IN THE MATTER** of submissions and further  
submissions set out in the  
Parties and Issues Report  
And Auckland Council evidence

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF PETER ALEXANDER SINTON**

**ON BEHALF OF KUMEU-HUAPAI RESIDENTS & RATEPAYERS ASSOCIATION INC**

**AND**

**DYSART LANE GROUP**

**AND**

**POMONA ROAD GROUP**

## **SUMMARY**

- 1** The purpose of the evidence is to support the position taken by the Kumeu-Huapai Residents & Ratepayers Inc & Dysart Lane Group over the zoning boundaries and likely timetable & zoning options.  
The visions and concept for Kumeu & Districts will be presented in the 081 Hearing in 2016 on the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016.
- 1.2** The evidence applies only to the North-West area of the Unitary Plan and the required 'Future Urban' areas proposed in Kumeu-Huapai and Riverhead areas.

### **KUMEU-HUAPAI AREA**

- 1.3** There is no justification for the extensive area in the district being zoned 'Future Urban,' without the research, Structure Planning and community consultation being completed by the Auckland Council. Such consultation will confirm the extent of the area required with the community.
- 1.4** The area of 'Future Urban' areas does not recognise the rural township character of the District and the Council's proposal is to intensify areas of FUZ without the complimentary Infrastructure Planning being undertaken.
- 1.5** The urban densities and areas are being proposed in inappropriate areas inside the current RUB boundary.
- 1.6** The lack of separation in the Council's zoning classification has resulted in 'Large Lot' zones being included in urban considerations despite the fact that Auckland Council infrastructure is not required for such a zoning category.
- 1.7** Proposed zoning without refinement creates excessive demands for infrastructure planning and costs which can unnecessarily be imposed on ratepayers as a result.
- 1.8** The area between Motu, Tawa, Puke & Trigg Roads because of contours, storm water catchment areas and remoteness is unlikely to be suitable for intensity urbanisation within the planning period.
- 1.9** The RUB boundary fails to include other easy contoured and flood free land closer to the Kumeu Township suitable for future urbanisation.
- 1.10** The evidence of Auckland Transport together with the lack of structure planning & timing by the Council, has resulted in a lack of certainty over the extent of the RUB boundary and the zoning timing and density.
- 1.11** The RUB boundary definition cannot be separated from the individual zoning areas without those being considered together.

### 3.

**1.12** The proposed rural urban Boundary has created huge speculative sales pressures for urbanisation. 17 additional requests for SHAs in the area over and above the two approved by the Housing Office, have been proposed by landowners or groups, all turned down by the Auckland Council & Rodney Local Board.

**1.13** The RUB boundary does not make use of the likely future roading patterns proposed by Auckland Transport.

#### **RIVERHEAD**

The proposal to extend the proposed urban area in Riverhead is contrary to the regional planning objective in that it proposes to use horticultural soil for urban purposes without investigating an alternative.

#### **DYSART LANE**

**1.14** The Dysart Lane Group is a area currently zoned as 'Mixed Rural' which is not used for productive pastoral or agricultural use. The land is owned by lifestyle owners who do not derive income from the land in the Dysart area.

**1.16** The Auckland Transport evidence confirms that the likely 'by pass' road will be immediately adjacent to the development area providing better access to Kumeu & Auckland than currently exists.

**1.17** The level of proposed development of 'Large Lots' will not require in the planning period an unnecessary extension of Council's infrastructure of sewerage & water.

**1.18** The 'Large Lot' category in the Dysart Lane area will enable containment of the intensified area in Kumeu & Huapai to around the commercial centres.

**1.19** Development of 'Large Lots' in this area will encourage a consolidation of a similar style and quality home where they currently exist.

**1.20** The 'Large Lot' zone will encourage a new roading pattern for the development which will not make demands on Council finances.

#### **POMONA ROAD**

**1.21** The small area west of Pomona road is zoned 'Mixed Rural'. The current use of the land and buildings is 'Countryside Living' or 'Lifestyle Living'. As such the productive use of the land is minimal, so the appropriate zoning is 'Countryside Living'.

4.

**1.22** Current land use such as 'Bed & Breakfast' recognises the area as a transition area to rural zoning. There is a semi commercial use of the area based on a rural environment.

### **3.0 SCOPE**

The following is what is covered in this evidence:-

**3.1** Evidence has been given over the 016 hearings regarding the RUB boundary that is attached to this evidence.

A plan showing the proposed RUB has been enclosed as requested by the Commissioners at the 016 hearing. That shows the options for a rural urban boundary

Method of the assessment of population growth determined on the RUB boundary.

Outline of existing approved or in zone development and the likely density for the area.

Rural buffer area identified

Area of 'live' zoning suggested for the Unitary Plan approval

Population calculations based on known zoning densities and outcomes

Lack of Structure Plan effects

Existing zoning and proposed changes

Infrastructure problems in Kumeu-Huapai

Adjacent area and zoning

### **4.0 EARLIER SUBMISSIONS**

**4.1** Dysart lane made earlier submissions based on the request to have 'Large Lot' zoning as a option for their group. That involved consideration of expansion of the 'Future Urban' rather than the consideration of the second alternative option of 'Countryside Living' zoning.

**4.2** Consideration was based on the Auckland Council changing from 'Future Urban' on their Land as in the Draft Unitary Plan to 'Mixed Rural' in the notified plan.

**4.3** As a result of mediation and inspecting evidence from Auckland Council, it has become clearer that the best fit for the zoning is 'Large Lot' (LLZ)

## 5.0 BACKGROUND OF KUMEU & COUNCIL'S POSITION AS AT 10<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2016

5.1 The following is a summary of the development of Kumeu with approvals and progress on Completion:-

- (a) The Huapai Triangle has formal consent from the Council and the first stage development by Cabra Developments is at earthwork stage. This is part of the qualifying development under the SHA approval. The single dwelling sites are located at the end of Nobilo & Station Roads. Net result is 1200 new residential sites are being created.
- (b) Huapai North zoning is operative with development for single dwelling units. There is limited room for alternative density of development although the areas located close to the existing Huapai Reserve have been provided. Development in the area is two thirds completed. It is expected that the balance land zone will be developed over the next 3-4 years. Indication of 2000 new residential units will be the final numbers.
- (c) 'Countryside Living' zoning – There is very little sites left in the 'Countryside Living' zone especially as part of the zoning in the north of Kumeu on Koraha road is now zoned 'Future Urban'.  
Most of the sites in the 'Countryside Living' contain large dwellings and sheds on 1 hectare sites. There are few sites left held by wealthy landowners who have no desire to subdivide.
- (d) Industrial land in Kumeu – most of the sites are now built on.  
There is no further industrial zoning proposed in the Unitary Plan. The industrial activity is restricted to the Main road and Access Road. A small area in Riverhead is currently under development with no new areas zoned. Industrial land availability is now restricted to Westgate development.
- (e) Kumeu commercial development is now reliant on the development proposed behind the existing Kumeu Village. It is proposed to have a mixture of owner/occupier shops, and commercial main street development.  
To the east of the commercial area, it is proposed for 180-220 residential sites which are independent of commercial titles. Residential units will be three storied and multiple units of terrace housing. The application is currently with the Auckland Council for approval.
- (f) The Orahua Road SHA  
This area has been approved by Minister Nick Smith as a SHA in May 2014. The hearing for the 'Concept Plan & Qualifying Developing' was heard on the 17<sup>th</sup> December 2015. The decision has not been released but staff recommendations are for an approval. The site is 14 hectares in the 'Countryside Living' area where the current density of development is 1 dwelling per hectare. The proposal is for residential sites of 225, so the density is 15 times denser than what is proposed for under 'Countryside Living' zone. The new sites are down to 200m<sup>2</sup> with most at 400m<sup>2</sup> in what was a 'Countryside Living' zone. The 'Future Urban' zone hasn't been confirmed as yet and there are challenges to that.

6.

This area highlights the angst in the community in that higher residential densities are proposed where there are no or little infrastructure services available. I have used the estimate SHA yield in my calculation and I accept that the Commission has no ability to alter the decisions of the Minister Nick Smith.

**6.0 OUTLINE OF THE 'RUB' BOUNDARY**

- 6.1 In earlier evidence both from the Auckland Council staff and from the community, focus has been on where the RUB is to be without any analysis of what would be contained within the defined area.
- 6.2 The proposed RUB boundary has created expectation of some future development right, with no timetable of when such rights would occur. The development density and rights haven't been defined except that the area has been identified as being included in the 30year plan.
- 6.3 The nett result has been speculative pressures on land purchases within the RUB area. That in my view has led to higher land sales and created land banking by local and overseas investors.
- 6.4 The nett result is that residential sites and dwellings in the Kumeu area will not meet target of affordable homes.

**7.0 Infrastructure**

- 7.1 The Council in the Unitary Plan have outlined a 30 year growth of the Kumeu-Huapai District. There is no clear direction as to the progressive stages of the growth.
- 7.2 Existing development has created, or is in the process of creating limited infrastructure such as roading, drainage and sewerage disposal. It is limited to the immediate vicinity of each development.
- 7.3 NZTA & Auckland Transport in evidence and in the Press have indicated that:-
  - (a) There will be four lanes to Kumeu expanding from the the existing two lanes from the end of the Motorway at Brighams Creek.
  - (b) A 'by pass' road will be created running parallel to SH 16 on the South side of the existing rail line to service the new residential areas.

- (c) The 'by pass' alignment which is tentative at present, has been indicated in the transport evidence of Messrs. Schalkwyk, Keating, Lovell & McCarthy. That alignment follows a entrance from SH16 east of Kumeu township then follows the public roads of Trotting Track Drive, Waitakere & Farrands Roads. The alignment onto the western end of Station & Nobilo roads, when connected would give access from the Huapai SHA to the end of the motorway at Brighams Creek.

### **7.3 SEWERAGE SYSTEM**

The reticulated sewerage system approved by the Rodney District Council now service only the existing zoned residential & industrial sites. That includes part of the Huapai triangle SHA, but not the Orahia Road SHA. No 'Future Urban' area is currently serviced for sewerage.

### **7.4 Water Supply**

A new Reservoir has been constructed on Old North Road adjacent to the forest. This is the header water supply Reservoir for the Kumeu District. The system has been installed but is not operational as yet.

Reticulation south of the railway is along Access & Station Roads enabling servicing of the Huapai SHA.

### **7.5 RAIL**

The rail track is still used but only for haulage of logs and other freight. There is no passenger Service to Kumeu-Huapai nor is there any planned.

### **7.6 BUS SERVICE**

The existing service is morning and late afternoon only. School buses operate out of those times providing transport for primary & high school students.

- 7.7** The above elements show that there is a serious mismatch between the forward planning for 'Future Urban' and the infrastructure planning to match the growth. Auckland Transport are holding their first meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup> March to discuss transport issues with local residents. The transport solution were not available for consideration at the time of submission and there is still no solutions proposed by NZTA & Auckland transport for the traffic infrastructure for a tenfold increase in residential activity in Kumeu.
- I believe therefore there is little justification in identifying the confirmed long term development areas until a structure plan for the District is completed.
- I also believe the restriction in growth in Kumeu-Huapai be limited to 7-10 years growth including the live zones already under development.

## **8.0 CONCEPT FOR KUMEU-HUAPAI GROWTH**

**8.1** The absence of a Structure Plan for the whole Kumeu-Huapai growth area means there is no guidance for the public to follow for development timing or densities.

**8.2** In terms of determining growth and the potential size and population I have applied the following principles:-

1. Recognising existing residential areas and densities proposed by the Unitary Plan
2. Use the tentative Auckland Transport alignment for 'by pass' roading
3. Accept the two SHAs area in Kumeu-Huapai areas as approved by the Minister Nick Smith
4. Indicate the extent of a 7-10 year growth pattern for the district for live zoning.
5. Recognise School & Reserve locations
6. Ensure the growth of Kumeu-Huapai is consistent of a Rural Township

## **9.0 Planning Approach**

**9.1** I have taken the following approach to Huapai-Kumeu district to determine the appropriate zoning, timing & location.

**9.2** I have applied the principle of highest density in the rural Town Centres and using the Council 'suite' of zones reducing the density logically outward until the rural zoning is reached.

**9.3** The 'Countryside Living' zone in Kumeu has been reduced by 1/3 in North Kumeu and the 'Large Lot' zone (LLZ) is not even in the Council's proposed Unitary Plan.

**9.4** There is a need to recognise the variety of house types and existing land use in applying zoning.

**9.5** 'Future Residential' zoning as advertised, gives no indication of the range of zoning types or where they are to be applied. Likewise the numbers proposed to live in the area is purely guesswork. I have used the 600m<sup>2</sup> section size and applied an area divide of 750m<sup>2</sup> to cope with roading etc; to determine residential site numbers.

**9.6** In the area I believe could be used for 'Large Lot', I have applied a 0.5ha area per site to determine the number of Lots and densities.

**9.7** The conversion of 'Countryside Living' zoning to 'Future Urban' hasn't been based or matched by infrastructure planning. That has resulted in premature applications being made to the Auckland Council to make a live residential zoning with no structure planning in place.



**9.9** The 'Countryside Living' zone and the immediate adjacent zoning is 'Mixed Rural'. The difference is that 'Mixed Rural' has no development rights where as the 'Countryside Living' zone has some subdivision rights and the transferable title rights can be used in this zone. With a substantial area of the zone already subdivided down to 1 ha site, there is little ability to create further sizes in this zone. To some extent there is an advantage to consolidate to 'Large Lot' zoning, than holding the density at the 2.0ha minimum for 'Countryside Living'.

#### **9.10 Rural buffer for Kumeu-Riverhead**

One of the issues that will assist in the Kumeu-Huapai area retaining the 'Rural Township' feel, is to ensure there is a rural buffer between the Westgate urbanisation and the Kumeu Township. The buffer is achieved by the two areas of:-

- (a) Prime Soils - Brighams Creek, Riverhead-Kumeu  
the triangle of prime soils
- (b) The Taupaki river flats including Board Crescent where flooding occurs in winter

Together these areas provide the rural buffer and help Kumeu be retained as a rural Township. There is no reason for further development in these areas.

#### **10.0 Ratepayers Questionnaire**

**10.1** The Kumeu-Huapai Residents & Ratepayers association completed a questionnaire throughout the District. That questionnaire and results is being presented as part of the submission of the Association by Mark Hall at the Unitary Plan hearings.

**10.2** The findings show that the District is not opposed to development, but that it has to be done under a structure plan process and not an ad-hoc approach to one off development, with no co-ordination across the rural Township. The absence of a structure plan has in my view allowed development in the wrong areas and at a density that the community does not accept.

**10.3** As a result of the questionnaire and in the absence of any result from the Auckland Council being made available to the district. The community have proceeded with a vision and concepts for guidance to the commission.

#### **11.0 The Vision**

**11.1** I have resisted the Council's approach of defining the outer limits of the RUB without determining the possible density and timing of development.

**11.2** The existing areas of development together with the approved development already creates significant growth within the 7-10 year timeframe. These areas and known development have been taken into account in the calculations and growth for the area.

**11.3** The areas enclosed in development units are described and form part of the calculation for estimated growth. The outcome based on known densities give a direction of growth and size of the rural township for Kumeu-Huapai.

**11.4** The internal growth roading and infrastructure will have to be defined as part of a structure plan process which the Auckland council are yet to embark on.

**11.5**

	<u>Existing Zone</u>	<u>Proposed Zone</u>
--	----------------------	----------------------

**The Unit Areas are:-**

<b>(A)</b> Existing old residential – Huapai	Res single S.D.	Res single dwelling
<b>(B)</b> Existing Res. – Kumeu	Res single D	Res single dwelling
<b>(C)</b> Huapai North Res – new operative	Res single D	Res single dwelling
<b>(D)</b> Huapai West – proposed Res	F.U.Z.	F.U.Z. single dwelling
<b>(E)</b> Huapai Triangle SHA	Mixed H. Suburban	Mixed H. Suburban
<b>(F)</b> Access/Nobilo Roads	F.U.Z.	Res single dwelling
<b>(G)</b> Access Rd/exits DSIR	Countryside Living	Large Lot
<b>(H)</b> Dysart Lane area	Mixed Rural	Large Lot
<b>(I)</b> Pomona Road Group	Mixed Rural	Countryside Living
<b>(J)</b> Motu to Puke Roads	F.U.Z.	Countryside Living
<b>(K)</b> Motu East to Trigg road	F.U.Z.	Large Lot
<b>(L)</b> Station road to Trigg Road	F.U.Z.	F.U.Z.
<b>(M)</b> Trigg Road to S/Hway 16	F.U.Z.	Large Lot
<b>(N)</b> Kumeu Village (Madden)	Res M.H.S	M.H.S.
<b>(O)</b> Koraha Road, Kumeu	F.U.Z.	F.U.Z.
<b>(P)</b> Oraha Road SHA	SHA	Single dwelling/Large Lot
<b>(Q)</b> Old North Road/Oraha Road	Countryside Living	Countryside Living
<b>(R)</b> Oraha Road exclude SHA	F.U.Z.	Large Lot
<b>(S)</b> Riverhead	F.U.Z.	Countryside Living
<b>(T)</b> Riverhead	F.U.Z.	Countryside Living

11.

The above areas then the proposed densities are applied then the following will result:-

		<u>Population</u>	
		<u>Site</u>	<u>Site</u>
		<u>X 2</u>	<u>X3</u>
1.	Existing Residential		
	Approved residential development	4,400	8,800
	Two SHA developments		13,200
2.	Future Urban	5,300	10,600
3.	Large Lot	1,100	2,200
4.	Countryside living	160	320
		10,960	21,920
		320	480
		21,920	32,880
	Rounded New Sites	11,000	22,000
	Existing sites Nos	1,000	
	Approx increase	10,000	

## 12.0 Planning Conclusion

**12.1** The areas shown on plate 18 zone area, will produce a population of around 30,000 people in the 30 year of projected growth. The area is slightly smaller in area than the Auckland Council has proposed under the Unitary Plan and in a different position.

**12.2** The extent of growth does not include the Countryside Living areas as part of the urban environment, but for the sake of completeness, the Pomona Road Group and the Council area on Puke/Motu Roads have been included in the calculations.

**12.3** The Vision & Concepts will be presented 3 days prior to hearings on the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016, the statistics and questionnaire details will be included in the submission.

**12.4** The current structure plan for Kumeu is out of date and no new plans have been produced by The Council to justify the extent and position of the F.U.Z.

**12.5** The two SHA areas have produced a layout plan to suit the internal development of their area. There is no integration with the wider community for infrastructure.

**12.6** The lack of infrastructure and the planning for the same means there is limited ability to extend live residential zoning until the infrastructure planning is completed.

**12.7** The Auckland Transport & NZ Transport Authority are only just beginning to undertake meetings on transport problems created by growth. The Kumeu meeting is on the 10<sup>th</sup> March 2016. There is no rail and limited bus service.

## 12.

- 12.8** The by pass south of Kumeu is needed to help reduce the congestion in the township to enable the commercial area to function.
- 12.9** The Vision & Concepts for Kumeu has widespread support from the Ratepayers & Community Groups, so it should form, with the Commissioners support, the basis for a structure plan for the District.
- 12.10** The ability for Kumeu-Huapai to be recognised as a rural Township will largely depend on the ability of the council and the community to recognise and ensure the prime soil and Taupaki river flats are maintained as a buffer to the urbanisation of Westgate.

### **13.00 Planning Issues**

- 13.1** Dysart area shown as H does not have flooding issue so the evidence of Ryan Bradley is factually incorrect. Therefore his cross objection to the Dysart Lane Group on soil type and flooding isn't able to be supported. The area is suitable for housing.
- 13.2** The 'Large Lot' proposed zone helps limit the urban growth and puts a buffer around Kumeu without the need for extending public services by the Council.
- 13.3** The Rural Urban Boundary (RUB) needs resolving to a line where the Council's services extend to.
- 13.4** The one off SHA in Orahia Road has created a intense 'Mixed Housing' suburban zone in a 'Countryside Living area. There is no natural buffer for adjacent land owners .  
The absence of a structure plan has enabled the Minister to overpower the Local Board and Auckland Council to create a intensive development with little or no Infrastructure or structure planning.
- 13.5** The area identified as ( J ) between Motu Road & Puke road is in the wrong catchment and is Steep making it difficult for urbanisation. It would be better suited to be 'Countryside Living'.
- 13.6** The area (G) (ex DSIR) LAND IS CURRENTLY ZONED 'Countryside Living) but is very close to Kumeu township. The sites contain 1 ha sections & large homes. The area should be changed to 'Large Lot'. The DSIR land should become a local Reserve, even though it is crown owned.
- 13.7** The area between Nobilo, Station & Access Roads should be made a live zone as all services Are in place and the area is immediately adjacent to the 1200 unit Huapai Triangle SHA.

### **14.0 Supporting Documents**

Enclosed are the supporting documents for the evidence.

P.A. Sinton

11<sup>th</sup> February 2016

