

**Annexure B: s32AA Evaluation**

# Rangitahi Ltd s32AA Evaluation

## Introduction

Section 32AA of the RMA sets out the requirements for undertaking and publishing further evaluations. A further evaluation is required only for any changes that have been made to, or are proposed for, the proposal since the evaluation report for the proposal was completed (s32AA(1)(a)). It must be undertaken in accordance with s32(1) to (4) and must be at a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the changes.

An evaluation of the changes to the Proposed Waikato District Plan (PWDP) provisions which are set out in Rangitahi’s evidence-in-chief (EIC) for Hearing 25 – Zone Extents follows using the template provided in Appendix 10 of the s42A Framework Report and with particular focus on the proposed Future Urban Zone (FUZ) for Rangitahi South.

**Table 1: Rezoning Proposal**

The specific provisions sought to be amended	Assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives of the Proposed Waikato District Plan (PWDP)
The rezoning proposal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed changes to the PWDP are summarised as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Amend the planning maps to rezone the area described as Rangitahi South (annexure A, Inger EIC) from Rural to Future Urban.</li> <li>(b) Delete Section 1.10.1.1 (Waikato District Development Strategy 2015) and Section 1.10.1.2 (Waikato District Economic Development Strategy 2015) and replace them with a new Section 1.10.1.1 (Waikato 2070 Growth and Economic Development Strategy) to reflect that Waikato 2070, which was adopted by WDC in May 2020, has superseded the 2015 strategies.</li> <li>(c) Amend Policy 4.1.18 (Raglan) to describe Rangitahi and the other Residential zoned areas as the locations for short to medium term growth, the FUZ south of the Rangitahi Peninsula as the location for long-term growth and to set out that future growth and structure planning is to be guided by an overarching spatial plan for Raglan.</li> <li>(d) Include the recommended objectives, policies and rules set out in Appendix 2 of the s42A Framework for the FUZ.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. The proposed rezoning of Rangitahi South to FUZ, which is the main focus of this evaluation, reflects the potential for development of Rangitahi to continue to extend south of the existing Rangitahi Peninsula Zone in future. The FUZ provisions require that a plan change would need to be progressed to rezone from FUZ to a ‘live’ zone. The rezoning to a ‘live’ zone could potentially involve extending the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone further south over the FUZ.</li> </ol>

	<p>3. The specific changes to the PWDP to address (1)(b) to (c) above are as follows (additions shown <u>underlined</u> and deletions shown in <del>strikethrough</del>):</p> <p>(a) Delete Section 1.10.1.1 (Waikato District Development Strategy 2015) and Section 1.10.1.2 (Waikato District Economic Development Strategy 2015) and replace them with a new Section 1.10.1.1 as follows:</p> <p><u>“1.10.1.1 Waikato 2070 Growth and Economic Development Strategy</u></p> <p>(a) <u>The Waikato 2070 Growth and Economic Development Strategy (Waikato 2070) provides a long-term plan to achieve the Council’s vision of creating liveable communities. It takes an integrated approach to future growth in the Waikato District, combining economic and community development with future land use and infrastructure planning. Whilst enabling growth, Waikato 2070 aims to do this in a way that protects the environment, which is essential for the health and wellbeing of the people. The strategy is important for informing future planning, investment and decision-making by the Council for the district. It provides the indicative extent and timing for future growth cells, subject to further investigation and feasibility.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>Town Centre Plans will be completed within the short term to outline future development and investment in towns and Structure Plans for growth cells identified in Waikato 2070 will be developed. Structure Plans and Town Centre Plans will form the basis for amendments to the District Plan via Variations/Plan Changes to enable development of growth areas identified in Waikato 2070.”</u></p> <p>(b) Amend Policy 4.1.18 as follows:</p> <p><u>“4.1.18 Policy – Raglan</u></p> <p>(a) <u>Raglan is developed to ensure:</u></p> <p>(i) <u>Infill and redevelopment of existing sites occurs;</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>A variety of housing densities is provided for;</u></p> <p>(iii) <u>Rangitahi <del>and the Residential zoned areas are</del> is the only areas that provides for <del>the short to</del> medium term growth;</u></p> <p>(iv) <u><del>and medium to</del> Long term growth is to be provided for in the Future Urban Zone south of the Rangitahi Peninsula. <del>and is</del> This area is to be planned and developed in a manner that connects to the existing town and maintains and enhances the natural environment and Raglan’s special character; <del>and</del></u></p> <p>(v) <u>There are connections between the town centre, the Papahua Reserve and Raglan Wharf; and</u></p> <p>(b) <u>Future growth and structure planning for growth areas is to be guided by an overarching spatial plan for Raglan. The spatial plan shall be prepared by 2023 with input from tangata whenua, the local community and other stakeholders to enable and manage long term growth of the town whilst protecting Raglan’s special character.”</u></p>
<p><b>Relevant objectives of the PWDP</b></p>	<p>4. A review has been undertaken of the notified PWDP and the key objectives and policies which have been identified as being most relevant for consideration of the proposed changes are contained in Appendix I to this s32AA Evaluation. A summary of the key provisions follows.</p> <p><b>Strategic Objectives and Directions</b></p> <p>5. Sections 1.5 and 1.12 relate to the strategic objectives and directions for the district. They address a range of matters,</p>

	<p>including compact urban development, planning for urban growth and development, cross-boundary issues, urban growth, transport and logistics and the natural environment.</p> <p>6. Section 1.12.8 is helpful to consider first because it summarises the overarching directions for the development of the objectives, policies and other provisions within the district plan. The overarching directions are:</p> <p><i>“(i) Urban development takes place within areas identified for the purpose in a manner which utilises land and infrastructure most efficiently.</i></p> <p><i>(ii) Promote safe, compact sustainable, good quality urban environments that respond positively to their local context.</i></p> <p><i>(iii) Focus urban growth in existing urban communities that have capacity for expansion.</i></p> <p><i>(iv) Plan for mixed-use development in suitable locations.</i></p> <p><i>(v) Encourage community collaboration in urban growth decisions.</i></p> <p><i>(vi) Protect and enhance green open space, outstanding landscapes and areas of cultural, ecological, historic, and environmental significance.”</i></p> <p>7. Section 1.5.1 refers to accommodating growth through a more compact urban form, including greater densities in existing settlements. It recognises the “live, work and play” benefits of urban growth occurring within towns and villages through a compact form of urban development.</p> <p>8. Section 1.5.2 explains that defined growth areas have been zoned and that their development is to be guided by master plans and comprehensive structure plans which must be produced before land is rezoned for urban development. It refers to the Future Proof settlement pattern and to the importance of avoiding unplanned encroachment into rural land by containing development within defined urban areas to avoid rural residential fragmentation. It recognizes master plans developed in consultation with the local community as an approach for ensuring that valued elements of local character are respected as growth occurs. Section 1.12.1 also recognises master plans as an important method for establishing settlement patterns of land use and transport and services. The PWDP does not define the terms ‘master plans’ and ‘structure plans’. The important premise is the need for a comprehensive planned approach to be taken.</p> <p>9. Section 1.5.4 recognises the potential issues associated with uncoordinated growth, including increased rural land subdivision and impacts on high quality soil, cultural and heritage values, the quality, character and vitality of urban environments and the efficient provision and utilisation of infrastructure and services. Section 1.5.4(c) refers to Future Proof and the WRPS:</p> <p><i>“It is important that the district’s settlement pattern is consistent with the Future Proof Strategy’s settlement pattern, as set out in the (RPS), with the expectation that any growth within Waikato district is managed within the population and land allocation limits, as included within the WRPS or as addressed by the Future Proof Strategy and any subsequent changes made to the WRPS.”</i></p> <p>10. Future Proof and the WRPS are addressed below as part of the Assessment of Higher Order Policy Documents. Both of</p>
--	--

these documents recognise the importance of responsiveness in terms of decision making where there is updated information and a robust evidential basis. This is important in the case of the PWDP because there is new population growth information available, which should be used to inform decisions on urban zoning rather than strictly adhering to outdated land allocations.

11. In that regard, Section 1.12.7 relates to managing change. It refers to the importance of WDC effectively consulting with and including its community in decision making while co-operating with other authorities on regional strategic policy. One of the ways that WDC has recently sought to manage change is through preparation of the Waikato 2070 strategy. The process to prepare the strategy included community consultation, submissions, and hearings. One of the outcomes of Waikato 2070 is the definition of new growth areas within some parts of the district as a growth management response to change which has occurred. Waikato 2070 states that it has been prepared to help deliver on the Future Proof strategy.
12. Section 1.12.3 relates to the Built Environment. Matters which are recognised as being important for the district are a wide variety of housing forms (including affordable options), quality design that enhances and reflects local character and the cultural and social needs of the community and a compact urban environment that is focused in defined growth areas.

#### **Urban Environment**

13. Chapter 4 contains the objectives and policies for the urban environment.
14. Objective 4.1.1 sets out the minimum dwelling targets for the district based on the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC). Having detailed regard to this objective is not necessary because the NPS-UDC has now been superseded by the NPS-UD. It is therefore likely that Objective 4.1.1 will be reviewed and amended in some form through the PWDP process.
15. Objective 4.1.2 requires the future settlement pattern to be consolidated in and around existing towns. Policy 4.1.3(b) sets out that urban growth areas must only be located where they are consistent with Future Proof (2017). Policy 4.1.4 addresses staging of development and the need for infrastructure to be provided for development. Policy 4.1.5 sets gross density targets of 12-15 dwellings per hectare in residential areas.
16. Objective 4.17 seeks for development to be attractive, connected, and reflective of the existing character of towns. This is an important objective for Raglan's future growth because the town has been recognised in reports and evidence related to the PWDP as having special character. Objectives which address intensification to achieve compact urban form need to be balanced for Raglan, more than most places, to ensure that new development does not erode existing character.
17. Policies 4.1.8 and 4.1.9 address integration and connectivity and maintaining landscape characteristics. Integration and connectivity are addressed in the context of transport, infrastructure, open space and community facilities and services. New development must maintain the fundamental shape, contour, and landscape characteristics. This will be an important consideration for Rangitahi South in future, much as it has been for structure planning and development of the Rangitahi

	<p>Peninsula to date.</p> <p>18. Policy 4.1.18 is specific to Raglan. It promotes infill and redevelopment of existing sites and a variety of housing densities and it seeks to maintain connections between the town centre, the Papahua Reserve and Raglan Wharf. While infill and redevelopment are promoted, there is a potential tension in Raglan with more intensive forms of housing and the strong need to maintain the special character of the town. Only very limited areas are likely to exist within the town where intensive forms of housing are appropriate.</p> <p>19. One aspect of Policy 4.1.18 that Rangitahi is seeking changes to is the identification of Rangitahi within the notified PWDP as the only area that provides for medium term future growth. The proposed changes reflect that Rangitahi and other Residential zoned areas in Raglan should be identified as the locations for short- and medium-term growth (which is within 3 years and 10 years respectively in accordance with the NPS-UD) and that Policy 4.1.18 should also address areas intended for long-term growth (which is 10-30 years in accordance with the NPS-UD), being the proposed FUZ south of the Rangitahi Peninsula. The proposed changes also address the need for an overarching spatial plan for Raglan to enable and manage growth whilst protecting Raglan's special character.</p> <p><b>Rural Environment</b></p> <p>20. Chapter 5 contains the objectives and policies for the rural environment. The PWDP identifies Objective 5.1.1 as the strategic objective for the rural environment which has primacy over all other objectives in Chapter 5. The objective states:</p> <p><i>“5.1.1 Objective – The rural environment</i>  <i>(a) Subdivision, use and development within the rural environment where:</i>  <i>(i) high class soils are protected for productive rural activities;</i>  <i>(ii) productive rural activities are supported, while maintaining or enhancing the rural environment;</i>  <i>(iii) urban subdivision, use and development in the rural environment is avoided.”</i></p> <p>21. The strong directive to avoid urban subdivision, use, and development in the rural environment is an entirely expected and reasonable approach for areas which are not zoned for urban purposes through the PWDP. This objective will be very important for maintaining the integrity of the PWDP and for protecting rural areas from unplanned urban growth once decisions on zoning have been made.</p> <p>22. However, it is considered that the objective does not prevent decisions being made to rezone land from Rural to an urban zoning where urban rezoning is demonstrated to be suitable through evidence and where rezoning has been considered on balance against the broad policy framework in the PWDP and in higher order policy.</p> <p>23. While the strategic and urban environment provisions in the PWDP clearly promote an approach of consolidation to achieve compact urban form, they also support expansion of urban communities to accommodate growth and that growth</p>
--	---

	<p>will predominantly occur in and around existing towns within the District.</p> <p>24. There is a clear rural environment theme within the PWDP which prioritises the value of high-class soils and their protection for productive rural activities. This is evident in Objective 5.1.1(a)(iii), Objective 5.2.1(a) and Policies 5.2.2 and 5.2.3. The proposed FUZ does not contain high quality soils. While the Class 4 and 6 soils indicates the productive potential of the land is more limited, opportunities can nevertheless be considered through structure planning for maintaining and enhancing the productive use of balance areas of the FUZ where they are not suited for urbanisation or environmental enhancement.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <p>25. Policy 6.1.13 relates to infrastructure for future growth areas and requires infrastructure services to be developed to a standard that enables the service to be extended to future growth areas where appropriate.</p> <p>26. Objective 6.4.1 requires infrastructure to be provided for and integrated with subdivision, use and development. Policies 6.4.2 and 6.4.3 require subdivision and development to be provided with necessary infrastructure to a suitable standard. Policy 6.4.5 addresses roading infrastructure, requiring provision for safe vehicle, pedestrian and cycling access and a roading pattern which provides good connectivity and integrates with adjacent land identified as future growth areas including public transport such as bus stops.</p>
<p><b>Scale and significance of the rezoning proposal</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed FUZ Site</b></p> <p>27. The site for the proposed FUZ is shown on the analysis maps which are attached to Ms de Lambert's EIC. The site is located immediately to the south of the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone. It consists of rolling contoured land within the coastal environment which contains areas identified in the notified PWDP as Significant Natural Areas. There are also mapped coastal hazard areas in the notified PWDP around the site's coastal margins. In these respects, the site has close similarities with characteristics of the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone.</p> <p>28. The total area covered by the FUZ is approximately 51 hectares. However, like the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone, the proposed zone boundaries are larger than the anticipated development areas. This allows for refinement of the development areas to occur through further analysis and structure planning prior to 'live-zoning'.</p> <p>29. Initial analysis identifies approximately 24 hectares of land within the FUZ as potentially being suitable for urbanisation as well as approximately 6 hectares of land within the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone (i.e. approximately 30 hectares total). This is based on a precinct development approach similar to the current Rangitahi Structure Plan. The total anticipated yield for the additional development precincts within the southern part of the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone and the FUZ is approximately 350-450 dwellings based on a density range of 12-15 dwellings per hectare. The final development precincts will be confirmed through more detailed analysis as part of structure planning.</p> <p>30. The proposed FUZ is of importance at a local and regional level to assist in meeting future housing demand in Raglan in the</p>

long-term (10 to 20-year period). It will ensure that the land is clearly identified for future growth to provide certainty to landowners, infrastructure providers and the community which will assist in planning for infrastructure services and growth planning processes, including structure planning. It is anticipated that structure planning is most likely to involve amending the current Rangitahi Structure Plan (which is included in the PWDP) to incorporate the additional development areas which are immediately to the south.

### **Infrastructure**

31. Mr O’Callaghan’s and Mr Clark’s EIC for Rangitahi confirms that the proposed FUZ will enable existing infrastructure within the Rangitahi Peninsula to be used efficiently and that infrastructure challenges for future growth in Raglan are not insurmountable. Key issues are consenting and likely upgrades to the town’s wastewater treatment plant to meet current environmental standards for treatment and disposal, additional storage for water supply and the replacement or upgrading of the one-way bridge across the Whaingaroa Inlet which separates Raglan West from Raglan East. WDC’s 2021 LTP is expected to assist in clarifying the funding and programming for these required upgrades.

### **Assessment of Higher Order Policy Documents**

32. Relevant higher order documents include the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD), New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) and Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS). The Future Proof Sub-Regional Growth Strategy and Waikato 2070 are relevant growth strategies to consider.

### **National Policy Statement on Urban Development**

#### Relevance of NPS-UD to Decision Making

33. WDC is a Tier I local authority under the NPS-UD.
34. The NPS-UD must be considered by local authorities that have an urban environment within their district or region when making planning decisions which affect an urban environment. An urban environment under the NPS-UD is any area of land that is, or is intended to be, predominantly urban in character and is, or is intended to be, part of a housing and labour market of at least 10,000 people. Raglan meets this definition because the Waikato 2070 Growth and Economic Development Strategy identifies a possible future population of 12,500 people in Raglan in 2070.

#### Assessment of Demand and Development Capacity

35. The NPS-UD requires local authorities to ensure provision of sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand for housing and business land over the short term, medium term, and long term. Sufficient development capacity for

	<p>housing refers to development capacity which is plan-enabled<sup>1</sup>, and infrastructure ready<sup>2</sup>, feasible and reasonably expected to be realised<sup>3</sup>, and which meets expected demand plus the appropriate competitiveness margin. The NPS-US defines short term as within the next 3 years, medium term as between 3-10 years, and long term as 10-30 years.</p> <p>36. Every local authority is required to assess demand for housing and business land and determine the development capacity that is sufficient to meet demand in the short term, medium term, and long term. Tier 1 local authorities, including WDC, are required to do this through preparation of a Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment (HBA) which must estimate, for the short term, medium term, and long term, the demand for additional housing in different locations, including in terms of dwelling types.</p> <p>37. HBAs must include a competitiveness margin over and above expected demand for Tier 1 (and Tier 2) local authorities. The competitiveness margins for housing and business land are 20% for the short term and medium term and 15% for the long term. HBAs must also quantify, as numbers of dwellings, the housing development capacity for the short term, medium term, and long term to enable a comparison between demand and capacity. If there is any insufficiency, the local authority must identify where and when this will occur and analyse the extent to which RMA planning documents, a lack of development infrastructure, or both, would cause or contribute to the insufficiency.</p> <p>38. Tier 1 local authorities must also prepare a Future Development Strategy (FDS) every 6 years and in time to inform preparation of their next LTP. FDSs must be informed by the most recent HBA, amongst other things, and must provide at least sufficient development capacity over the next 30 years to meet expected demand. It must spatially identify the broad locations in which development capacity will be provided, the development infrastructure and additional infrastructure will be required to support that development capacity (along with the general location of corridors and sites required to provide it), and any constraints on development. Regard must be had to the relevant FDS by a local authority when preparing or changing RMA planning documents. Local authorities must also prepare and implement an implementation plan for their FDS (separately from the FDS) and the implementation plan must be updated annually.</p> <p>39. The s.42A Framework Report explains that the NIDEA demand analysis is being used to inform the HBA for the Future Proof area which is underway and due to be published in the first half of 2021<sup>4</sup>. This timeframe is consistent with the NPS-UD which requires that Tier 1 local authorities must have completed a HBA for housing by 31 July 2021. Tier 1 local authorities must make their first FDS publicly available in time to inform the 2024 LTP.</p>
--	--

<sup>1</sup> Zoned for short term and medium term and identified in a FDS for long term.

<sup>2</sup> For short term, there must be adequate existing development infrastructure to support the development of the land. For medium term, the short term criteria must be met or there must be funding identified in a Long-Term Plan for adequate infrastructure to support the development of the land. For long term, the short term or medium term criteria must be met or the development infrastructure required to support the development capacity must be identified in the local authority's infrastructure strategy.

<sup>3</sup> Feasible includes what is commercially viable to a developer based on costs and revenue. Local authorities may use any appropriate method to determine what is feasible and reasonably expected to be realised, provided the methods, inputs and assumptions are outlined and justified.

<sup>4</sup> s42A Framework Report, paras 187 and 268.

40. Every Tier 1 local authority must also amend its regional policy statement or district plan to give effect to the provisions of the NPS-UD as soon as practicable. It is understood that the forthcoming HBA outcomes will inform the Phase 2 update to Future Proof. It is likely that the WRPS will then be updated.
41. Dr Fairgray's EIC has considered the NIDEA demand analysis. This approach means there is likely to be a high degree of consistency between the demand analysis in Dr Fairgray's evidence and the future HBA.
- Key NPS-UD Policies
42. The objectives and policies of the NPS-UD are contained in Part 2.
43. Objective 1 is that *"New Zealand has well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future"*.
44. Policy 1 explains the meaning of well-functioning urban environments. As a minimum, they must have or enable a variety of homes, have or enable a variety of sites that are suitable for different business sectors, have good accessibility between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, support the competitive operation of land and development markets, support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and be resilient to likely current and future effects of climate change.
45. Policy 6 sets out the matters that decision-makers must have particular regard to when making planning decisions that affect urban environments. They include the planned urban built form anticipated by RMA planning documents that have given effect to the NPS-UD, that the planned urban built form may involve significant changes to an area, the benefits of urban development that are consistent with well-functioning urban environments, any relevant contribution that will be made to meeting the NPS-UD to provide or realise development capacity and the likely current and future effects of climate change.
46. The Rangitahi Peninsula is part of the zoned urban area of Raglan and is subject to a comprehensive structure plan which has been designed to ensure the Rangitahi Peninsula positively contributes to well-functioning urban environments in Raglan, whilst also protecting the Peninsula's special values. Of note, the structure plan enables a variety of homes in locations which are accessible to the remainder of the Raglan urban area and accessible to high quality natural and open spaces. Development precincts are also sited to be resilient to climate change. A similar approach can be taken in future to development in Rangitahi South, which directly adjoins the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone, to ensure that it operates as a well-functioning urban environment.
47. Objective 2 relates to improving housing affordability by supporting competitive land and development markets. Policy 2 requires that Tier 1 local authorities must provide at least sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand for housing and for business land over the short term, medium term, and long term.

	<p>48. Rangitahi is an active developer and intends to continue to develop land to meet demand. Along with development of other zoned areas in Raglan, continued development of the Rangitahi Peninsula and future development of Rangitahi South would assist in achieving the competitive operation of land and development markets.</p> <p>49. Objective 4 is that “<i>New Zealand’s urban environments, including their amenity values, develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities, and future generations</i>”. This is directly relevant to the Rangitahi Peninsula and the current review of the master plan which is being undertaken to respond to opportunities with Rangitahi’s experience of demand, sales, and development. The ongoing learnings could also be applied to future development stages beyond the precincts in the current Rangitahi Structure Plan.</p> <p>50. Objective 5 and Policy 9 require local authorities to take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi when making planning decisions for urban environments. Policy 9 requires that local authorities must involve iwi and hapū in the preparation of RMA planning documents through effective consultation that is early and meaningful. Consultation undertaken by Rangitahi with Tainui Hapū has been extensive, meaningful, and ongoing with respect to the Rangitahi Peninsula and has more recently commenced with respect to Raglan’s wider growth. Rangitahi is committed to continuing to engage with Tainui Hapū in relation to future structure planning and development.</p> <p>51. Objective 6 requires that local authority decisions on urban development that affect urban environments are integrated with infrastructure planning and funding decisions, strategic over the medium term and long term, and responsive, particularly, in relation to proposals that would supply significant development capacity.</p> <p>52. Policy 8 requires that local authority decisions affecting urban environments must be responsive to plan changes that would add significantly to development capacity and contribute to well-functioning urban environments, even if they are unanticipated by RMA planning documents or out of sequence with planned land release.</p> <p>53. The proposed introduction of a FUZ into the PWDP is consistent with Objective 6 and Policy 8 because it allows for a responsive and strategic approach to long term development land in Raglan. It would improve certainty for landowners, infrastructure providers and the community regarding future land uses. Structure planning can be undertaken in future with better certainty that FUZ land is accepted ‘in principle’ as being suitable for urban development subject to detailed analysis and planning to inform a plan change for ‘live-zoning’.</p> <p>54. The proposed FUZ for Rangitahi South is unanticipated in the WRPS residential land allocations but it is anticipated in the more recent Waikato 2070 (which is not a RMA planning document). Rezoning land in a manner that is consistent with the outcomes of Waikato 2070 and recent demand projections represents a responsive approach. It is also aligned with infrastructure planning and funding decisions because part of the purpose of Waikato 2070 is to inform infrastructure</p>
--	--

	<p>planning for the identified growth cells<sup>5</sup>.</p> <p><b>New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS)</b></p> <p>55. Objective 6 of the NZCPS recognises that the protection of the values of the coastal environment does not preclude use and development in appropriate places and forms, and within appropriate limits.</p> <p>56. Policy 6 relates to activities in the coastal environment. Matters of particular relevance with respect to the urban built environment are:</p> <p><i>“(b) consider the rate at which built development and the associated public infrastructure should be enabled to provide for the reasonably foreseeable needs of population growth without compromising the other values of the coastal environment;</i>  <i>(c) encourage the consolidation of existing coastal settlements and urban areas where this will contribute to the avoidance or mitigation of sprawling or sporadic patterns of settlement and urban growth;</i>  <i>e) consider where and how built development on land should be controlled so that it does not compromise activities of national or regional importance that have a functional need to locate and operate in the coastal marine area;</i>  <i>(f) consider where development that maintains the character of the existing built environment should be encouraged, and where development resulting in a change in character would be acceptable;</i>  <i>(h) consider how adverse visual impacts of development can be avoided in areas sensitive to such effects, such as headlands and prominent ridgelines, and as far as practicable and reasonable apply controls or conditions to avoid those effects;</i>  <i>(i) set back development from the coastal marine area and other water bodies, where practicable and reasonable, to protect the natural character, open space, public access and amenity values of the coastal environment;”</i></p> <p>57. Policy 7 sets out that policy statements and plans must consider where, how and when to provide for urban development in the coastal environment and where areas of the coastal environment are inappropriate for development or may be inappropriate without consideration of effects through a resource consent application or Schedule 1 process. Where practicable, plans may specify applicable limits to change.</p> <p>58. The analysis which has been undertaken of the proposed FUZ in Rangitahi South identifies some sensitivities which will need to be subject to detailed consideration and potentially protection through future structure planning prior to ‘live-zoning’. The sensitivities include areas of significant natural values and some areas of coastal hazards around the harbour margins. The potential for cultural heritage sites also exists.</p> <p>59. The Rangitahi Structure Plan provides a good example of how development can be managed within a coastal area. The structure plan avoids sensitive areas through siting of development precincts in suitable locations and also enhances aspects of the coastal environment through approaches such as retiring areas from grazing, enhancement planting and creation of reserves for improved public access to coastal margins and important retained cultural heritage sites. A similar approach</p>
--	--

can be followed for development within the southern part of the Rangitahi Peninsula and Rangitahi South.

**Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS)**

Built Environment

60. Objective 3.12 directs development of the built environment to be undertaken in an integrated, sustainable, and planned manner to enable positive environmental, social, cultural and economic outcomes. It lists a range of matters which are important for development of the built environment. The following matters are particularly relevant to the proposed FUZ at Rangitahi South:
- “a) promoting positive indigenous biodiversity outcomes;*  
*b) preserving and protecting natural character, and protecting outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development;*  
*c) integrating land use and infrastructure planning, including by ensuring that development of the built environment does not compromise the safe, efficient and effective operation of infrastructure corridors;*  
*d) integrating land use and water planning, including to ensure that sufficient water is available to support future planned growth;*  
*g) minimising land use conflicts, including minimising potential for reverse sensitivity;*  
*j) promoting a viable and vibrant central business district in Hamilton city, with a supporting network of sub-regional and town centres.”*
61. The Rangitahi Structure Plan is an exemplar for integrated, sustainable, and planned development. The opportunity to extend the structure plan over the proposed FUZ in future will enable Rangitahi South to be developed in a manner which is consistent with Objective 3.12. For example, the current Rangitahi Structure Plan has significant focus on achieving positive outcomes for indigenous biodiversity and natural character through retiring of areas with important ecological values from grazing and through enhancement planting of indigenous vegetation. This approach also contributes to maintaining natural character. The proposed FUZ will enable existing infrastructure within the Rangitahi Peninsula to be used efficiently. Future live-zoning and development will be co-ordinated with provision of key growth infrastructure. Future development of Rangitahi South will also support the viability and vibrancy of the Raglan town centre.
62. Policy 6.1 relates to planned and co-ordinated subdivision, use, and development. Regard must be had to the principles in Section 6A, cumulative effects must be recognised and addressed, planning must be based on sufficient information to allow assessment of the potential long-term effects of subdivision, use and development and regard must be had to the existing built environment.
63. Method 6.1.6 supports growth strategies as tools in areas of significant growth and directs territorial authorities to develop and maintain growth strategies which identify a spatial pattern of land use and infrastructure development and staging for at least a 30-year period. WDC has recently addressed this requirement through the preparation of Waikato 2070 which has a 50-year timeframe. Waikato 2070 states that it has been prepared in accordance with the WRPS which is consistent with the approach required in Method 6.1.1.

	<p>64. Method 6.1.7 sets out that urban development planning mechanisms such as structure plans and town plans should be produced before land is rezoned for urban development. The proposed FUZ and the other recommended changes to the PWDP support this approach.</p> <p>65. Method 6.1.8 sets out the information that is required to support new urban development and subdivision. The information is required to be appropriate to the scale and potential effects of the development. The information requirements have been taken into account in the evidence prepared by Rangitahi seeking a FUZ for Rangitahi South, recognising that the information has been prepared to support a FUZ rather than a live-zone and more detailed information will need to be prepared as part of a plan change for a future live-zoning, including structure planning.</p> <p>66. Policy 6.2 is relevant to Raglan because it addresses planning for development in the coastal environment. The coastal environment is mapped in the WRPS and it includes all the land within the proposed FUZ at Rangitahi South (refer to Figure I).</p>
--	--



	<p>b) Development which increases natural hazard risk associated with coastal erosion and inundation must be avoided. This can be considered as part of future structure planning but the potential development areas within the FUZ are outside of areas which are impacted by the coastal hazard overlays in the notified PWDP.</p> <p>c) Ribbon development along coastal margins must be avoided. The opportunities for urban development being considered as part of the proposed FUZ involve an extension of the existing planned urban form for the Rangitahi Peninsula and do not constitute ribbon development.</p> <p>69. Method 6.2.1 identifies that the matters in Policy 6.2 should be given effect to when developing growth strategies, structure plans and other development planning mechanisms. They would be most effectively addressed through a future structure plan prior to live-zoning.</p> <p>70. Policy 6.3 addresses co-ordinating growth and infrastructure. Part (a) seeks that the nature, timing and sequencing of new development is co-ordinated with the development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure. This is to optimise provision of infrastructure and to ensure new development does not occur until provision for appropriate infrastructure necessary to service the development is in place.</p> <p>71. Method 6.3.1 sets out that district plans shall include provisions that provide for a long-term strategic approach to the integration of land use and infrastructure. The FUZ is an effective tool to assist with this long-term strategic approach.</p> <p>72. Policy 6.14 relates to adopting the Future Proof land use pattern. Part (a) of the policy sets out that new urban development within the named settlements shall occur within the Urban Limits on Map 6.2 'Future Proof Map (indicative only)'. Parts (b) and (c) refer to managing and locating new residential development in accordance with Table 6-1. Part (g) requires that where alternative residential land release patterns are promoted through district plan and structure plan processes, justification shall be provided to demonstrate consistency with the principles of the Future Proof land use pattern.</p> <p>73. The scale of Map 6.2 makes it very difficult to interpret the exact urban limits for Raglan. It appears that the Rangitahi Peninsula is not included within the urban limits, however, mapping of the urban limits at a high level rather than a property level is understood to be deliberate and reflects their indicative nature. The explanation to Policy 6.14 in the VRPS states that "<i>Method 6.14.1 recognises that although the Strategy has determined a settlement pattern for the Future Proof area, the detail of urban limit lines and future commercial and industrial development locations down to property level need to be determined through district plan processes</i>".</p> <p>74. The residential population allocations for Raglan and Whaingaroa in Table 6-1 are 4,340 in 2021, 5,025 in 2041 and 5,200 in 2061. These growth allocations are substantially less than recent assessments of demand by NIDEA and Dr Fairgray which the proposal to rezone land at Rangitahi South to FUZ responds to.</p> <p>75. Method 6.14.3 refers to the 'Criteria for alternative land release'. It states:</p>
--	---

	<p><i>“District plans and structure plans can only consider an alternative residential or industrial land release, or an alternative timing of that land release, than that indicated in Tables 6-1 and 6-2 in section 6D provided that:</i></p> <p><i>a) to do so will maintain or enhance the safe and efficient function of existing or planned infrastructure when compared to the release provided for within Tables 6-1 and 6-2;</i></p> <p><i>b) ...<sup>6</sup></i></p> <p><i>c) sufficient zoned land within the greenfield area or industrial node is available or could be made available in a timely and affordable manner; and making the land available will maintain the benefits of regionally significant committed infrastructure investments made to support other greenfield areas or industrial nodes; and</i></p> <p><i>d) the effects of the change are consistent with the development principles set out in Section 6A.”</i></p> <p>76. It could be considered that rezoning land to FUZ does not constitute ‘alternative land release’ in terms of Policy 6.14 because land is truly only ‘released’ for development upon live-zoning. The alternative land release provisions would certainly apply in the case of future rezoning from FUZ to a live-zone if the proposal was out of step with the residential growth allocation and staging in Table 6-1. Nevertheless, the proposed FUZ approach will ensure that infrastructure provision must be confirmed as part of a plan change process for live-zoning. The development principles in Section 6A are relevant to consider regardless in accordance with Policy 6.1 and regard is had to them below.</p> <p>77. Policy 6.15 relates to density targets for the Future Proof area. It requires that WDC (and other local authorities) shall seek to achieve compact urban environments that support existing commercial centres, multi-modal transport options, and allow people to live, work and play within their local area.</p> <p>78. The density targets for the Future Proof area are contained in Policy 6.15 and are 12-15 dwellings per hectare for greenfield development in towns including Raglan/Whaingaroa. It is important to note that these figures are average gross density targets, allowing for higher and lower densities in certain areas to reflect specific location and site characteristics. The analysis of the FUZ and southern part of the Rangitahi Peninsula has identified potential development areas which are expected to be suitable to meet these density targets and they have been used to calculate the potential development capacity.</p> <p><u>Section 6A Development Principles</u></p> <p>79. Section 6A contains the WRPS development principles for new development which are referred to in Policy 6.1 and Method 6.14.3(d). The Explanation to Policy 6.1 provides useful guidance on the principles in Section 6A. It states:</p> <p><i>“Section 6A includes a set of principles to guide future development of the built environment within the Waikato region. These principles are not absolutes and it is recognised that some developments will be able to support certain principles more than others. In some</i></p>
--	--

6

6.14.3(b) relates to industrial land and is not relevant.

*cases, certain principles may need to be traded off against others. It is important, however, that all principles are appropriately considered when councils are managing the built environment ...”*

80. Part (a) is to “*support existing urban areas in preference to creating new ones*”. The proposed FUZ will not create a new urban area because it directly adjoins the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone which is part of the existing Raglan urban area.
81. Part (c) is to “*make use of opportunities for urban intensification and redevelopment to minimise the need for urban development in greenfield areas*”. Rangitahi’s master planning review is currently considering opportunities for increased density in and around the current Rangitahi Structure Plan development precincts. Preliminary work indicates the potential to increase the total development yield from 500-550 lots to approximately 650 lots. The approach of intensifying development within the Rangitahi Peninsula is also consistent with part (i) which seeks to achieve a compact urban form.
82. However, there are topographical limits to intensification and there are also important character considerations for the Rangitahi Peninsula and the wider Raglan area. Waikato 2070 recognises that greenfield development will be a necessary part of the solution to meeting Raglan’s future housing demand and it identifies Afon Oporu (including the proposed FUZ in Rangitahi South) and Te Hutewai as the appropriate locations for that growth.
83. Part (d) sets out that new development should “*not compromise the safe, efficient and effective operation and use of existing and planned infrastructure, including transport infrastructure, and should allow for future infrastructure needs, including maintenance and upgrading, where these can be anticipated*”. Part (e) requires new development must “*connect well with existing and planned development and infrastructure*”. The proposed FUZ is well located adjacent to the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone to be serviced by infrastructure, including the new bridge which Rangitahi has built to the Rangitahi Peninsula, the upgraded Oporu Road, local roads within the peninsula and local water and wastewater mains. Confirmation that suitable bulk infrastructure is programmed or available will be a pre-requisite for a plan change for live-zoning.
84. Parts (f) and (g) relate to ensuring water requirements for new development and planning and design for efficient use of water. The FUZ is located near to the Raglan Water Treatment Plant and bulk mains have recently been installed through the Rangitahi Peninsula to service development. The FUZ will require that water infrastructure suitable to service the development must be available or programmed and planned to enable re-zoning to a ‘live-zone’.
85. Part (h) lists areas that new development should be directed away from, including significant mineral resources, natural hazard areas, energy and transmission corridors, likely renewable energy generation sites, regionally significant industry and high class soils and primary production activities on those high class soils. The proposed FUZ does not include any of these areas. The soils within the proposed FUZ consist of land use classes 4 and 6 which are not high-class soils.
86. Part (j) is that new development should “*maintain or enhance landscape values and provide for the protection of historic and cultural heritage*”. The Rangitahi Structure Plan places high importance on these outcomes. Consideration of culture and heritage has been closely informed by engagement with tangata whenua and responses include protection of important

	<p>sites within public reserves and pou on the new bridge to acknowledge the significance of the harbour and surrounding land to tangata whenua. The detailed response for Rangitahi South can be developed to consider these matters further through structure planning prior to 'live-zoning'.</p> <p>87. Part (k) recognises the potential for new development to promote positive indigenous biodiversity outcomes and protect significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of fauna and it sets out that development which can enhance ecological integrity should be encouraged. Part (t) is to “recognise and maintain or enhance ecosystem services”.</p> <p>88. The Rangitahi Peninsula provides excellent opportunities for a development approach which is strongly focused on ecological enhancement. This type of approach is already strongly reflected in the Rangitahi Structure Plan and the PWDP provisions for the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone. Objective 9.3.3 in the PWDP is that “<i>natural features of the Rangitahi Peninsula including landscape, ecology, habitat and the coastal environment are maintained and enhanced</i>”. The same approach can be developed and implemented for the FUZ through structure planning and suitable plan provisions.</p> <p>89. Part (l) sets out that new development should maintain and enhance public access to and along the coastal marine area. The Future Urban Zone is well sited to enable extensions of the ongoing improvements to access along the coast which are being made as part of development of the Rangitahi Peninsula.</p> <p>90. Part (m) seeks for new development to avoid as far as practicable adverse effects on natural hydrological characteristics and processes, soil stability, water quality and aquatic ecosystems. Low impact urban design and development is a suggested method. These outcomes can be achieved within the proposed FUZ through a precinct-based development approach which will enable avoidance of development within sensitive areas. Opportunities for low impact design can also be considered as part of future structure planning.</p> <p>91. Part (o) sets out that new development should avoid incompatible land uses. The proposed FUZ is predominantly surrounded by rural-residential and rural grazing land uses. A designated water treatment site is located to the north-west but that does not raise any incompatibility issues.</p> <p>92. Part (p) relates to the effects of climate change. Given the site’s location within the coastal environment, the key issue is the potential for inundation around the coastal margins. However, much of the proposed FUZ is elevated land which is outside of the locations mapped through the PWDP as coastal hazard areas.</p> <p>93. Part (q) is that effects on unique tangata whenua relationships, values, aspirations, roles and responsibilities should be considered, including opportunities to visually recognise tangata whenua connections with an area.</p> <p>94. Tangata whenua have been closely involved in planning for development of the Rangitahi Peninsula. This approach should continue, both with respect to ongoing implementation of the Rangitahi Structure Plan and with respect to the proposed FUZ and tangata whenua input into future structure planning.</p>
--	--

95. Parts (n) and (s) encourage sustainable design technologies and waste minimisation. These matters can be considered in future through structure planning and design of subdivision and development.

### ***Future Proof Sub-Regional Growth Strategy***

#### Background and Updates

96. Future Proof was originally completed in 2009. A review of Future Proof began in 2015 and a Phase 1 update was completed in November 2017. The focus of the Phase 1 update was on growth management principles. Updates to the strategy have failed to keep up with changes in national policy. A Phase 2 update to Future Proof was originally planned for 2018/2019 to address the NPS-UDC but it is now expected to be completed in 2021 to address the NPS-UD.

#### Settlement Pattern

97. The focus of the settlement pattern in Future Proof is to achieve more compact and concentrated urban form over time within key growth areas, including Raglan and other main settlements within the sub-region.

98. Raglan is identified as a location for growth emphasis in Section 6.1. The key features for each growth management area are set out in Section 6.2. For Raglan they are:

- Seaside settlement that maintains the established desirable character of the Raglan coastal environment.
- Destination town.
- High number of holiday houses.
- Residential growth is expected to occur due to coastal lifestyle, proximity to Hamilton and technological and transport improvements.
- Better public transport and improved opportunities for walking and cycling.

99. Within Waikato District, the settlement pattern aims to achieve 80% of growth in the townships of Pokeno, Tuakau, Te Kauwhata, Huntly, Ngaruawahia, Raglan and various villages over the 30-year period covered by the Strategy. This is predominantly to be achieved by managing growth through more intensive redevelopment of existing urban areas and through new residential development in areas adjacent to existing settlements.

#### Indicative Urban Limits

100. A guiding principle in Section 1.3 is to “recognise and provide for the growth of urban areas and villages within indicative urban and village limits”. The indicative urban limits for Waikato towns, including Raglan, are shown on Map 1 in Future Proof.

101. Section 6.4 explains that the urban limits make provision for future urban growth but they “...are still indicative and will remain so until further development analysis, for example structure planning, has been completed”. It goes on to state that “the indicative urban limits will not necessarily prevent changes to these limits if further development analysis determines such changes to

	<p><i>be appropriate”.</i></p> <p>102. The scale of Map 1 makes it difficult to interpret the indicative urban limits at a property level. It is understood that this is deliberate to reflect their indicative nature. At the time the Future Growth Area plan was prepared in 2017, a file for the indicative urban limits was obtained by Rangitahi from WDC and they are shown as a layer on the plan. In addition to the existing zoned greenfield areas, the bounds of the indicative urban limit also include an area of rural land in Raglan West between Te Hutewai Road and Wainui Road. This is part of the Future Growth Area identified in Rangitahi’s submission.</p> <p>103. The indicative urban limit for Raglan does not include Rangitahi, however, it is understood that they have been unchanged for Raglan since 2009, which is well before the Rangitahi Peninsula was rezoned through Plan Change 12 in 2015. Clearly in determining that Rangitahi Peninsula was suitable for rezoning through Plan Change 12, the development analysis satisfactorily demonstrated that zoning beyond the indicative urban limit was appropriate. The same consideration can be given now to the proposed rezoning of Rangitahi South to Future Urban.</p> <p>104. An important consideration with respect to the urban limits for Raglan being unchanged since 2009 is that they do not address the latest growth demand projections, nor do they address the requirements of the NPS-UD. It is therefore likely that the urban limits will need to be revised as part of the Phase 2 update of Future Proof in conjunction with the residential land allocations, both to reflect rezoning of areas such as Rangitahi Peninsula which has occurred since 2009, and also to reflect the increased supply that is required.</p> <p><u>Residential Growth Projections and Land Allocation</u></p> <p>105. Section 7.1 relates to residential growth projections. It explains that the projections in Future Proof were developed by the University of Waikato and are part of a wider dataset developed for the Waikato region. It also notes that the projections will be revisited as part of Phase 2 of the Strategy update. That is important because the current projections do not reflect the most recent projections by NIDEA, nor do they address the requirements of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>106. Section 7.2 of Future Proof relates to the allocation of residential land within the sub-region based on the residential growth projections. For Raglan, the strategy identifies demand for 386 households in 2016-2025, 122 households in 2026-2035 and -82 in 2036-2045. The total allocation for the 30-year period 2016-2035 is therefore 508 households.</p> <p>107. The residential growth allocations for Raglan in Future Proof are substantially lower than growth projections based on the more recent NIDEA population and household update (August 2020) which Dr Fairgray has considered in his evidence. While the time periods for assessment vary, a useful comparison is that Dr Fairgray’s EIC concludes the total assessed demand for Raglan in the 30-year period 2020-2050 is 1,220-1,620 dwellings. This is 712-1,112 dwellings more than the</p>
--	---

7 Future Proof, Table 3: Future Proof sub-region allocation and staging of residential household growth 2016 – 2045 (summary table).

8 2020 Update of Population and Family and Household Projections for Waikato District 2013-2063, August 2020.

	<p>residential growth allocation to 2045 in Future Proof.</p> <p>I08.Future Proof recognises that the numbers it uses are forecasts only and will need to be carefully monitored and adjusted if necessary. The next opportunity for this to happen is the Phase 2 Strategy update in mid-2021. Based on Dr Fairgray’s EIC, it is reasonable to expect that the residential land allocations for Raglan will be increased significantly. In the meantime, decisions on the PWDP should be made based on the most recent growth projections and Dr Fairgray’s evidence rather than the residential growth allocations in Section 7.2.</p> <p><u>Responsive Approach to Development</u></p> <p>I09.Section 7.5 is titled ‘A Responsive Approach to Development’. It recognises that predicting trends is inherently difficult, that unforeseen circumstances can influence the demand for land supply and that the Future Proof Settlement Pattern needs to be agile enough to respond to change in response to factors such as changes in markets, changes in migration, and central government interventions in urban land use policy. It states:</p> <p><i>“With so many factors potentially influencing growth, the Future Proof Settlement Pattern needs to be agile enough to respond to change. A settlement pattern that has some built-in responsiveness provides an ability to capitalise on previously unidentified or emerging opportunities that have potential to contribute significant economic, social or cultural benefits to our communities.”<sup>9</sup></i></p> <p>I10.The guiding principles that underpin the Strategy are important for decision making. Helpful direction for consideration of changes is provided further on in Section 7.5 which sets out that a robust evidential basis for changes will be needed in any given circumstance, including the implications for the sub-region.</p> <p>I11.In addition to the guiding principles in Section 1.3, any proposals for change are also expected to take into account consistency with other statutory documents, public and private sector investments in infrastructure, efficient and safe use of infrastructure, sustainable provision and funding of infrastructure, efficient use of local authority and central government financial resources, the ability for a developer to pay for necessary infrastructure and the compatibility of any proposed land use with adjacent land uses<sup>10</sup>.</p> <p>I12.The circumstances for decision-making on the PWDP provide a good example for when a responsive approach is important and necessary. There is a strong evidence base for changes to residential land allocation in Raglan as a result of the growth projections undertaken by NIDEA and Dr Fairgray’s EIC which are based on national direction in the form of the NPS-UD which Future Proof has not yet been updated to respond to. The other EIC presented on behalf of Rangitahi meets the requirements for a robust evidential basis on which decisions on the PWDP can be made.</p> <p>I13.Drawing on the findings of the evidence presented by Rangitahi, the following conclusions are made based on</p>
--	--

<sup>9</sup> Future Proof Strategy, November 2017, Section 7.5, pg 40.

<sup>10</sup> Future Proof Strategy, November 2017, Section 7.5, pg 40.

	<p>consideration of the proposed FUZ in terms of the guiding principles of Future Proof:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although Rangitahi South is not within the indicative urban limits identified in Future Proof, the urban limits for Raglan are indicative only and are also out of date. They require updating to include the existing Rangitahi Peninsula Zone as well as suitable areas to accommodate recent high growth projections. A responsive approach is required.</li> <li>• The opportunity to amend the Rangitahi Structure Plan in future and to extend its reach into the proposed FUZ in Rangitahi South will assist in promoting increased densities in new residential development and more intensive redevelopment of existing urban areas, whilst also encouraging development to locate adjacent to an existing urban area.</li> <li>• The proposed FUZ provides the opportunity to retain and enhance Raglan as a “<i>seaside settlement that maintains the established desirable character of the Raglan coastal environment</i>” whilst also recognising that the town is a location for growth emphasis.</li> <li>• The proposed FUZ enables Rangitahi to continue with an environmentally sensitive approach to development of the Rangitahi Peninsula, including appropriate protection of the natural environment and landscape through future structure planning.</li> <li>• Rangitahi remains committed to continuing to maintain and enhance cultural and heritage values through ongoing engagement with tangata whenua, including in future structure planning. This recognises their role as kaitiaki.</li> <li>• The proposed FUZ will support and enable efficient use of existing infrastructure, including planning for the provision of infrastructure to service growth. The availability of suitable infrastructure will need to be confirmed as part of ‘live-zoning’.</li> <li>• The proposed FUZ does not contain high-quality soil. Opportunities for ongoing productive use of rural balance areas which are unsuitable for urban development can be considered at structure planning stage by taking a similar approach to the existing Rangitahi Structure Plan which makes use of balance areas which are unsuitable for residential development for rural purposes.</li> </ul> <p>I 14. Overall, the proposed FUZ is considered to be consistent with the Future Proof settlement pattern.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Waikato 2070 Growth and Economic Development Strategy</i></b></p> <p>I 15. Waikato 2070 was prepared following the special consultative process under the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA), it was informed by the WRPS and the Waikato Regional Land Transport Strategy and it was prepared to help to deliver on the Future Proof strategy<sup>11</sup>.</p> <p>I 16. The strategy was adopted by WDC in May 2020 so it represents the most recent long-term plan for management of growth in Waikato District. Considerable weight should be afforded to Waikato 2070 in decision making on the PWDP because it is recent, the strategy is stated as being prepared in accordance with the WRPS, the WRPS recognises local authority growth strategies as important tools in areas of significant growth and it was prepared in accordance with the</p>
--	--

<sup>11</sup> Waikato 2070, section 1.2, pg 5.

	<p>LGA.</p> <p>I 17. Section 4 of Waikato 2070 explains that the strategy “<i>details spatially where and when development (residential and employment) can occur in the district</i>”. It does this through development plans for the main towns within the District, including Raglan. It explains that “<i>it is important to note that growth areas are subject to further investigations, which will analyse the funding servicing and infrastructure provision required to support the growth areas identified</i>”.</p> <p>I 18. The proposed FUZ at Rangitahi South is located within part of the Afon Oporu growth cell which has a 10-30 year timeframe. The proposed FUZ is consistent with this timeframe because it will provide for urbanisation within the next 20 years.</p> <p>I 19. Section 5.2 of Waikato 2070 explains that structure plans for growth cells within Waikato 2070 will be developed, that the development of a structure plan must be informed by consultation, particularly with tangata whenua, and that the development of a structure plan is required prior to rezoning of a site in a district plan. Structure planning is important but it is not considered to be a necessary requirement prior to rezoning an area to FUZ.</p> <p>I 20. Section 5.3 explains that “<i>structure plans and town centre plans will form the basis for amendments to the District Plan via Plan Changes (to the Operative District Plan) and Plan Variations (to the Proposed District Plan) to enable the development of these growth areas identified in Waikato 2070</i>”. The proposal for the FUZ is consistent with this approach because it allows for live-zoning in future through a plan change which will be informed by structure planning.</p>
<p><b>Other reasonably practicable options to achieve the objectives (alternative options)</b></p>	<p>I 21. Identification of alternative options follows. These alternatives are addressed in Table 3 in the evaluation of reasons for the selection of the preferred option.</p> <p><b>Alternative 1: Rezone Rangitahi South to Rangitahi Peninsula Zone</b></p> <p>I 22. Alternative 1 is to rezone Rangitahi South to Rangitahi Peninsula Zone.</p> <p><b>Alternative 2: Rezone Afon Oporu to Future Urban Zone</b></p> <p>I 23. Alternative 2 is to rezone the entire Afon Oporu area in Waikato 2070 to Future Urban Zone.</p> <p><b>Alternative 3: Rezone Future Growth Area to Future Urban Zone</b></p> <p>I 24. Alternative 3 is to rezone the entire Future Growth Area (which generally consists of the Afon Oporu and Te Hutewai growth areas in Waikato 2070) to Future Urban Zone.</p> <p><b>Alternative 4: Rezone Future Growth Area to Residential Zone</b></p> <p>I 25. Alternative 4 is to rezone the entire Future Growth Area to Residential Zone.</p>

<b>Alternative 5: Do nothing option</b>
126. The 'do nothing' option would retain the Rural zoning over the entire Future Growth Area.

**Table 2: Benefits and Costs Analysis of the Rezoning Proposal**

<b>Rezoning Proposal: Rangitahi South FUZ</b>		
	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Costs</b>
<b>General</b>	<p>The FUZ provides the opportunity for development at Rangitahi to be extended over additional areas of land in future in a manner which is Raglan-specific and which maintains and enhances the special character of the town.</p> <p>Zoning Rangitahi South as Future Urban would improve certainty for landowners, infrastructure providers and the community regarding future land uses. Structure planning could then be undertaken in future with better certainty that the land is accepted 'in principle' as being suitable for urban development subject to detailed analysis and planning to inform a plan change for 'live-zoning'.</p>	<p>There is potential for Raglan's special character to be eroded if future development is not managed through good planning which is Raglan-specific or if it is left to occur in an ad-hoc way.</p>
<b>Environmental</b>	<p>Environmental benefits could be achieved by adopting a similar approach to the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone and Rangitahi Structure Plan for the additional development precincts. Positive outcomes for indigenous biodiversity and natural character could be achieved through retiring areas with important ecological values from grazing and through enhancement planting of indigenous vegetation.</p>	<p>There would be impacts on the rural land resource due to provision of housing, albeit not land which is classified as high-class soils.</p> <p>Potential impacts on water quality will need to be managed through appropriate provision of servicing infrastructure prior to/as part of the development.</p>
<b>Social</b>	<p>Potential social benefits associated with growth of Raglan include housing affordability (particularly compared to a do-nothing scenario) and opportunities for new community services and facilities to service growth which may provide new opportunities for residents and visitors.</p> <p>There are opportunities with the FUZ to provide enhanced access to the coastal margin, including coastal walkways and reserves, with associated recreation benefits.</p>	<p>There is the potential for social costs to accrue if growth of housing is not undertaken in conjunction with provision of community services, facilities and open space by placing pressure on existing services.</p> <p>Some residents may not want growth to occur in Raglan.</p>

<b>Economic – General</b>	Major infrastructure upgrades are required in Raglan which are, in some cases, necessary irrespective of growth. For example, the upgrades to the wastewater treatment plant are required to address current environmental standards and the replacement or upgrading of the one-way bridge is necessary because the existing structure is nearing the end of its design life. The zoning of additional land provides opportunities for additional revenue from development to assist in funding the infrastructure upgrades, both through rates and development contributions. It also provides the opportunity for consideration of partnership approaches such as Development Agreements with developers.	Growth of housing may result in the need for investment in community services, facilities and open space by local and central government.
<b>Economic – Growth</b>	<p>The FUZ would assist in addressing the long-term demand for housing land in Raglan. Ensuring that there is adequate land supply to meet this projected demand is important for housing affordability in the long-term period.</p> <p>There has already been substantial private investment in infrastructure to service development on the Rangitahi Peninsula. The FUZ will make efficient use of this existing investment.</p>	There are costs to provide infrastructure to service new growth areas. Funding options include construction of local services by developers, development contributions and rates. Notwithstanding this, there are also potential benefits for funding of infrastructure (see economic – general).
<b>Employment</b>	<p>There will be ongoing local employment opportunities in Raglan associated with civil and housing construction and on the Rangitahi Peninsula and within the FUZ during the construction period.</p> <p>Additional employment opportunities will also arise in Raglan to service the growing population as a result of increased demand for retail, hospitality and services.</p>	There are no costs. Employment is not expected to reduce as a result of the proposal.
<b>Cultural</b>	<p>The involvement of tangata whenua in growth planning (such as structure planning) reflects their role as kaitiaki and could create opportunities, such as protection of sites of cultural value, improved access to sites of cultural value and improved access to the coast for fishing and recreation. There may also be opportunities to express historical narratives.</p> <p>Undertaking long term planning for growth will assist in providing certainty to tangata whenua regarding future growth</p>	There is the potential for loss of sites of cultural value if development is not appropriately planned with tangatata whenua input.

	plans and may avoid the risks of ad-hoc development detrimentally impacting on cultural values.	
--	---	--

**Table 3: Evaluation of the proposal**

<p><b>Reasons for the selection of the preferred option.</b></p>	<p><b>Preferred Option – Rezone Rangitahi South to FUZ</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rezoning Rangitahi South to FUZ is the preferred option because it will assist in addressing the long-term demand for housing land in Raglan based on the most recent housing demand projections. The most recent demand projections should inform decisions on the PWDP because the residential land allocations in Future Proof and the WRPS are out of date and are due to be reviewed to reflect the latest projections and to address the NPS-UD. Future Proof and the WRPS both contain indicative urban limits for towns in the Waikato District (including Raglan), however, it is understood that the limits for Raglan have not been updated since 2009 and they are inconsistent with the most recent demand projections. A responsive approach to development is required.</li> <li>2. The proposal is consistent with the Future Proof Strategy’s settlement pattern, including the guiding principles. It is also consistent with the development principles in Section 6A of the WRPS. The proposed FUZ is consistent with defined growth areas contained in the recent Waikato 2070 growth strategy. Waikato 2070 was prepared in accordance with the WRPS and to help to deliver on the Future Proof strategy. The Rangitahi South location is particularly well suited for growth because it enables efficient use of infrastructure which has been established for the Rangitahi Peninsula and the potential for the Rangitahi Structure Plan and Rangitahi Peninsula Zone to be extended so that development is subject to specific provisions which address the unique and special characteristics of Raglan and the Rangitahi Peninsula environment.</li> <li>3. The FUZ approach is most appropriate because economic analysis shows that the land is required for urbanization within 10-20 years. It will provide important certainty for landowners, infrastructure providers and the community regarding future land uses and to enable structure planning in future with confidence that the land is accepted ‘in principle’ as being suitable for urban development subject to detailed analysis and planning to inform a plan change for ‘live-zoning’.</li> </ol> <p><b>Alternative Options</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Alternative 1 (Rezone Rangitahi South to Rangitahi Peninsula Zone) is not the preferred option because a structure plan has not been prepared for Rangitahi South yet, there are infrastructure constraints to be addressed, economic analysis concludes there is suitable supply of ‘live’ zoned land to meet demand in accordance with the NPS-UD over the next 10 years and Waikato 2070 identifies Rangitahi South (and the wider Afon Opororu growth area) as having a 10-30 year development timeframe.</li> <li>5. Alternative 2 (Rezone Afon Opororu to Future Urban Zone) is not the preferred option because further investigations and spatial planning are considered necessary to determine the best approach to growth in the balance of the Afon Opororu area east of Rangitahi South and in turn the appropriate spatial extent for a FUZ.</li> </ol>
--	---

	<p>6. A particular matter that the investigations and spatial planning will need to consider is the feasibility and location of a potential link road to connect Rangitahi Peninsula with Te Hutewai Road. This will require detailed assessments of the associated engineering constraints, natural hazards, ecological effects and construction costs. A potential route which has previously been identified for a link road passes through an area which is designated by WDC (M90 Reservoir/Water Treatment - Springs) and areas which are subject to mapped overlays under the PWDP, including Significant Natural Area, Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation), Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area.</p> <p>7. Alternative 3 (Rezone Future Growth Area to Future Urban Zone) is not the preferred option because further investigations and spatial planning are considered necessary to determine the best approach to growth in the balance of the Future Growth Area east of Rangitahi South and in turn the appropriate spatial extent for a FUZ. It is also not preferred because the recommendation in the s42A Future Urban Zone Report is that areas with a development timeframe of 20 years or more should not be zoned Future Urban (or 'live' zoned) in the PWDP. The Te Hutewai growth area currently has a 30 year plus development timeframe.</p> <p>8. Alternative 4 (Rezone Future Growth Area to Residential Zone) is not the preferred option because a structure plan has not been prepared for the Future Growth Area yet, there are infrastructure constraints to be addressed, economic analysis concludes there is suitable supply of 'live' zoned land in the PWDP to meet demand in accordance with the NPS-UD over the next 10 years and Waikato 2070 identifies the Afon Oporu and Te Hutewai growth areas as having 10-30 year and 30 year plus development timeframes respectively.</p> <p>9. Further investigations and spatial planning are considered necessary to determine the best approach to growth in the balance of the Future Growth Area east of Rangitahi South and in turn the appropriate spatial extent for any 'live' zone which enables residential growth. A spatial plan which establishes a long-term vision for the area could inform more detailed structure planning and rezoning, including land release coordinated with demand and infrastructure availability.</p> <p>10. Alternative 5 (Do Nothing) is not preferred because it fails to address the shortfall for long-term residential land and it would not provide Rangitahi and stakeholders with the certainty that is important to enable planning for development of land which is likely to occur within the next 20 years, or potentially earlier depending on demand. If demand exceeds supply predictions then the FUZ approach allows a more responsive approach when 'live' zoning is required than a 'do nothing' alternative.</p>
<p><b>Extent to which the objectives of the proposal being evaluated are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA.</b></p>	<p>11. Section 5 of the RMA sets out the purpose of the RMA:</p> <p><i>(1) the purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.</i></p> <p><i>(2) In this Act, sustainable management means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while –</i></p>

	<p>(a) <i>sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and</i></p> <p>(b) <i>safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; and</i></p> <p>(c) <i>avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.</i></p> <p>12. Key matters in terms of Section 5 RMA are the need to plan for sufficient housing to meet demand to provide for the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and the Raglan community, sustainably managing the utilization of the land/soil resource surrounding the Raglan township and undertaking development in a way which avoids, remedies and mitigates adverse effects, recognizing the particular sensitivities and special character of Raglan.</p> <p>13. The FUZ will achieve the objective of meeting Raglan’s housing demand in a location which is consistent with recent growth planning (Waikato 2070) and which avoids impacting high-quality soils. The Rangitahi Peninsula Zone is a good example of how structure planning and specific planning provisions can avoid, remedy and mitigate adverse effects in the context of Raglan and a similar approach can be taken to future development of Rangitahi South. It is therefore consistent with the purpose of the RMA.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain information about the subject matter of the provisions.</b></p>	<p>14. The information which is presented in this evaluation and in the EIC for Rangitahi, including the analysis maps attached to Ms de Lambert’s EIC, is considered sufficient for the purpose of making an informed assessment on the proposal for a FUZ and at a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the changes. Additional information and analysis would be required in future as part of a plan change for a ‘live-zone’ including completion of structure planning.</p>
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p>	<p>15. The proposed provisions will be efficient and effective in achieving the objectives of the PWDP for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed FUZ is necessary to address the long-term demand for housing land in Raglan based on the most recent housing demand projections.</li> <li>• The proposed FUZ directly adjoins the zoned urban area of Raglan. Its location allows for the development of additional precincts within both the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone and within the FUZ.</li> <li>• The FUZ will ensure that the land is clearly identified for future growth to provide certainty to landowners, infrastructure providers and the community which will assist in planning for infrastructure services and growth planning processes, including structure planning</li> <li>• Rangitahi and WDC have put significant effort into establishing the special purpose Rangitahi Peninsula Zone which could be extended further south in future, in likelihood with very limited modification to the existing provisions.</li> <li>• The location allows for enhanced access to the coastal margin and environmental improvements as part of the future development response.</li> <li>• The location of the FUZ forms part of the Afon Oporu growth cell which is identified in Waikato 2070 as having a 10-30 year timeframe.</li> <li>• The land within the southern extent of the Rangitahi Peninsula and within Rangitahi South where the FUZ is proposed does not consist of high-class soils.</li> <li>• A FUZ is currently more appropriate than a ‘live-zone’ because the demand is forecast in 10-20 years and availability of</li> </ul>

	<p>infrastructure needs to be confirmed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There are significant infrastructure advantages because significant capital investment required to service growth in this area has already been made by Rangitahi, such as the new bridge to the Rangitahi Peninsula and local water and wastewater mains networks. The FUZ will make efficient use of that infrastructure.</li></ul>
--	--

## **Appendix 1: Key PWDP Objectives and Policies**

### **Chapter 1 - Introduction**

#### **1.5.1 Compact urban development**

(a) The Future Proof Strategy seeks a shift in the existing pattern of land use towards accommodating growth through a more compact urban form based on concentrating growth in and around Hamilton (67%) and the larger settlements of the district (21%). This involves a reduction in the relative share of the population outside of the subregion's existing major settlements through tighter control over rural-residential development and encouraging greater urban densities in existing settlements. Due to the time that has elapsed, and local government amalgamation in 2010, this strategy is being reviewed to address that part of the former Franklin district now in Waikato district.

(b) Urban forms of residential, industrial, and commercial growth in the district will be focused primarily into towns and villages, with rural-residential development occurring in Country Living Zones. Focusing urban forms of growth primarily into towns and villages, and encouraging a compact form of urban development, provides opportunity for residents to "live, work and play" in their local area, minimises the necessity to travel, and supports public transport opportunities, public facilities and services.

(c) An integrated approach to growth will have significant benefits in terms of planning for infrastructure, services, transport and facilities. It will ensure that provision is made when and where it will support the health and well-being of the wider community, and will provide certainty to landowners, developers and service providers for long-term investment decisions. A deliberate approach to the location and distribution of development will assist in safeguarding rural resources for productive use and the ability to accommodate rural activities that require a rural location. Non-rural industrial and commercial activities can only locate in rural areas if there is a functional need for a rural location. Country Living zones, where infrastructure and services can be efficiently and economically provided, will be the focus for rural residential development.

#### **1.5.2 Planning for urban growth and development**

(a) Defined growth areas have been zoned and their development will be guided through the application of objectives and policies and through processes such as the development of master plans, comprehensive structure plans, the district plan and any future changes to the district plan. The agreed Future Proof settlement pattern for urban growth and development is to avoid unplanned encroachment into rural land and is to be contained within defined urban areas to avoid rural residential fragmentation.

(b) As per the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, the district plan ensures that before land is rezoned for urban development, urban development planning mechanisms such as master plans or structure plans are produced, that will facilitate proactive decisions about the future location of urban development. Development which occurs in accordance with a master plan developed in consultation with the local community is one way of ensuring that valued elements of local character are respected as growth occurs. Structure plans are to be used to guide the staged provision of additional urban land and infrastructure to support areas experiencing growth or sustaining population and business growth pressures

#### **1.5.4 Urban growth**

(a) Located between Auckland in the north and Hamilton in the south, increasing demands are placed on the Waikato district for the development of transport corridors, water supply, waste disposal and community facilities. Waikato district also offers other facilities such as Hampton Downs Motorsport Park, Hampton Downs Landfill, Springhill Prison and Te Kowhai Airfield. It is important that there is coordination between land use and infrastructure planning by neighbouring councils to ensure harmonious cross-boundary development.

(b) Urban growth can result in unplanned urban expansion, increased rural land subdivision, rural lifestyle demands with associated reverse sensitivity issues and soil erosion compromising access to high quality soil and mineral resources that are of economic importance to the district and the region. The losses of rural land due to urban expansion can also compromise cultural and heritage values. Uncoordinated urban growth can adversely affect the quality, character and vitality of urban environments and undermine the efficient provision and utilisation of infrastructure and services.

(c) It is important that the district's settlement pattern is consistent with the Future Proof Strategy's settlement pattern, as set out in the (RPS), with the expectation that any growth within Waikato district is managed within the population and land allocation limits, as included within the WRPS or as addressed by the Future Proof Strategy and any subsequent changes made to the WRPS.

#### **1.5.7.5 The coast**

(b) The west coast is a wild and scenic coastline and limited road access has restricted development in the past. Raglan Harbour (Whaingaroa) and Aotea Harbour are more sheltered and are ecologically and culturally important ...

#### **1.12.1 Strategic direction**

(b) Master plans are an important method for establishing settlement patterns of land use and the transport and services network within a defined area. They can provide a detailed examination of the opportunities and constraints relating to the land including its suitability for various activities, infrastructure provision, geotechnical issues and natural hazards. They should identify, investigate and address the potential effects of urbanisation and development on natural and physical resources.

(c) Master plans should explain how future development will give effect to the regional policy statement and how any adverse effects of land use and development are to be avoided, remedied or mitigated by proposed plan provisions. This will ensure that all the effects of development are addressed in advance of development occurring. A master planning is an appropriate foundation for the plan change process required to rezone land.

### **1.12.3 Built environment**

(a) A district which provides a wide variety of housing forms which reflect the demands of its ageing population and increases the accessibility to employment and community facilities, while offering a range of affordable options.

(b) A district that encourages and celebrates quality design that enhances and reflects local character and the cultural and social needs of the community.

(c) A district that has compact urban environment that is focused in defined growth areas, and offers ease of movement, community wellbeing and economic growth.

### **1.12.7 Managing change**

(a) A district that effectively consults with and includes its community in decision making while co-operating with other authorities on regionally strategic policy, A district that manages development with master plans that matches the community, the capacity of the environment and infrastructure and avoids the adverse effects of that infrastructure on communities.

### **1.12.8 Strategic objectives**

(a) The matters set out in paragraphs 4.1.1 – 4.1.7 provide the overarching directions for the development of the objectives, policies and other provisions within the district plan.

(b) In summary, the overarching directions include the following:

(i) Urban development takes place within areas identified for the purpose in a manner which utilises land and infrastructure most efficiently.

(ii) Promote safe, compact sustainable, good quality urban environments that respond positively to their local context.

(iii) Focus urban growth in existing urban communities that have capacity for expansion. (iv) Plan for mixed-use development in suitable locations.

(v) Encourage community collaboration in urban growth decisions

(vi) Protect and enhance green open space, outstanding landscapes and areas of cultural, ecological, historic, and environmental significance.

(c) The objectives and policies that implement the strategic directions are included within Part B of the district plan (where they are relevant) at the beginning of each section. They also assist in providing an objective that encompasses more than one zone (such as Chapter 4 Urban Environment) or a range of matters (such as Chapter 6 Infrastructure).

## **Chapter 4 – Urban Environment**

### **4.1.1 Objective – Strategic**

(a) Liveable, thriving and connected communities that are sustainable, efficient and co-ordinated.

(b) National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity Minimum Targets The minimum targets for sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing in the Waikato District area are met, in accordance with the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016.

Area	Minimum Targets (number of dwellings)		
	Short to Medium	Long term	Total
	1-10 years (2017-2026)	11-30 years (2027-2046)	
Waikato District	7,100	12,300	19,400

### **4.1.2 Objective – Urban growth and development**

(a) Future settlement pattern is consolidated in and around existing towns and villages in the district.

### **4.1.3 Policy - Location of development**

(a) Subdivision and development of a residential, commercial and industrial nature is to occur within towns and villages where infrastructure and services can be efficiently and economically provided.

(b) Locate urban growth areas only where they are consistent with the Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth 2017.

#### **4.1.4 Policy – Staging of development**

(a) Ensure that subdivision, use and development in new urban areas is:

- (i) located, designed and staged to adequately support existing or planned infrastructure, community facilities, open space networks and local services; and
- (ii) efficiently and effectively integrated and staged to support infrastructure, stormwater management networks, parks, and open space networks.

#### **4.1.5 Policy – Density**

(a) Encourage higher density housing and retirement villages to be located near to and support commercial centres, community facilities, public transport and open space.

(b) Achieve a minimum density of 12-15 households per hectare in the Residential Zone.

(c) Achieve a minimum density of 8-10 households per hectare in the Village Zone where public reticulated services can be provided.

#### **4.1.7 Objective – Character of towns**

(a) Development in the Residential, Village, Industrial and Business zones is attractive, connected and reflects the existing character of towns.

#### **4.1.8 Policy – Integration and connectivity**

(a) Ensure effective integration within and between new developments and existing areas, including in relation to public open space networks and infrastructure by;

- (i) Providing good access to facilities and services by a range of transport modes through the provision of integrated networks of roads, public transport, cycle, and pedestrian routes;
- (ii) Providing a range of supporting local community facilities and services for residents' daily needs;
- (iii) Setting aside land for neighbourhood centres and parks identified in town specific Master Plans or Structure Plans, to enable their future development; and
- (iv) Applying the following design guidelines and town centre character statements to influence the manner in which development occurs;

A. Residential Subdivision Guidelines (Appendix 3.1);

B. Multi Unit Development Guide (Appendix 3.4);

C. Town Centre Guidelines (Appendix 3.3).

#### **4.1.9 Policy – Maintaining Landscape Characteristics**

(a) Ensure that the fundamental shape, contour and landscape characteristics are maintained during subdivision and development.

#### **4.1.18 Policy – Raglan**

(a) Raglan is developed to ensure:

(i) Infill and redevelopment of existing sites occurs;

(ii) A variety of housing densities is provided for;

(iii) Rangitahi is the only area that provides for the medium term future growth and is developed in a manner that connects to the existing town and maintains and enhances the natural environment; and

(iv) There are connections between the town centre, the Papahua Reserve and Raglan Wharf.

#### **4.5.12 Objective – Business Town Centre - Character**

(a) The commercial and mixed use character of Raglan, Huntly, Ngaruawahia, Te Kauwhata, Pokeno and Tuakau town centres is maintained and enhanced.

(b) The Business Town Centre Zone is promoted as a community focal point.

(c) Development of town centres is designed in a functional and attractive manner serving the needs of the community.

#### **4.5.14 Policy – Raglan Town Centre**

(a) Development maintains and enhances the role of the Raglan Town Centre by:

(i) Maintaining wide footpaths and high quality public space, prioritising and providing for pedestrian movement and safety;

(ii) Maintaining a pedestrian focus by discouraging vehicle access across footpaths;

(iii) Maintaining built form framing views towards Raglan Harbour;

(iv) Providing for a building scale appropriate to the town centre; and

(v) Protecting and enhancing the character of existing buildings through new built form being consistent with the outcomes of the Town Centre Character Statement for Raglan Town Centre (Appendix 10.1), in particular by:

A. Promoting traditional roof forms (hipped or gable ends) and symmetry through window design and placement;

B. Providing continuous post supported verandahs sheltering footpaths;

C. Promoting recessed shop fronts;

D. Providing parking, loading and storage where rear access to buildings exists;

E. Promoting active street frontages by developing up- to-the-street boundaries;

F. Reinforcing the street corners by ensuring the design is two storey and is transparent on both sides of the street corner; and

G. Encouraging the preservation and promotion of cultural features.

#### **4.7.1 Objective – Subdivision and Land Use Integration**

(a) facilitates the land use outcomes sought for the residential, business, industrial, reserve and specific purpose zones.

#### **4.7.2 Policy – Subdivision location and design**

(a) Ensure subdivision, is located and designed to:

(i) Be sympathetic to the natural and physical qualities and characteristics of the surrounding environment;

(ii) Establish boundaries that avoid buildings and structures dominating adjoining land or public places, the coast, or fresh waterbodies;

(iii) Arrange allotments to allow for view sharing, where possible;

(iv) Retain existing access to public space;

(v) Promote safe communities through quality urban design;

(vi) Accommodate building platforms and vehicle accesses that are safe and stable; and

(vii) Promote consistent grid layout.

#### **4.7.3 Policy – Residential subdivision**

(a) Development responds to the outcomes of Waikato District Council’s Urban Design Guidelines Residential Subdivision (Appendix 3.1), section 4 (Connectivity and Movement Networks), section 5 (Neighbourhood Character), section 6 (Residential Block and Street Layout), section 7 (Open Space and Landscape Treatment), and section 8 (Low Impact Urban Design), in particular by:

(i) Designs that promote walkability and pedestrian safety;

(ii) Promoting accessibility and connectivity of public spaces, employment areas, services, facilities, and amenities, both within the subdivision and wider context;

(iii) Integrating staging to ensure multi-modal connectivity;

(iv) Limiting the number and length of cul-de-sacs;

(v) Ensuring connection to existing and future public transport nodes;

(vi) Promoting connectivity and permeability by ensuring new connections to existing and future development, including green linkages.

(vii) Promoting the street layout to reflect the underlying topography;

(viii) Ensuring pedestrian access is consistent with the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED);

(ix) Discouraging the creation of rear lots;

(x) Promoting adequate lighting levels in publicly accessible spaces;

(xi) Ensuring design promotes local characteristics;

(xii) Ensuring lots are orientated in a way that:

A. Maximizes solar access; and

B. Addresses the street frontage and public places.

(xiii) Creating lots that can accommodate a variety of density with a mix of usable lot types;

- (xiv) Efficient design which enables the future connection to services and facilities;
- (xv) Ensuring public open space is distributed, located and sized to reflect its context and provides for a range of different activities and users; and
- (xvi) Ensuring infrastructure is designed to manage stormwater in a sustainable manner by:
  - A. Minimising environmental impacts and maintenance costs, and reducing stormwater discharging to existing reticulated networks; and
  - B. Promoting and maintaining riparian margins.

#### **4.7.4 Policy – Lot sizes**

- (a) Minimum lot size and dimension of lots enables the achievement of the character and density outcomes of each zone; and
- (b) Avoid undersized lots in the Village Zone.

#### **4.7.5 Policy – Servicing requirements**

- (a) Require urban subdivision and development to be serviced to a level that will provide for the anticipated activities approved in a structure plan, or otherwise anticipated within the zone, including through the provision of:
  - (i) Reserves for community, active and passive recreation;
  - (ii) Pedestrian and cycle connections;
  - (iii) Roads;
  - (iv) Public transport infrastructure, e.g. bus stops;
  - (v) Telecommunications;
  - (vi) Electricity;
  - (vii) Stormwater collection, treatment and disposal;
  - (viii) Wastewater treatment and reticulation, water provision for domestic and fire fighting purposes; and
  - (ix) Connections to identified adjacent future growth areas.

#### **4.7.6 Policy – Co-ordination between servicing and development and subdivision**

(a) Ensure development and subdivision:

(i) Is located in areas where infrastructural capacity has been planned and funded;

(ii) Is located in areas subject to an approved structure plan and provide sufficient infrastructure capacity to meet the demand identified in the structure plan;

(iii) Achieves the lot yield anticipated in an approved structure plan; and

(iv) Includes infrastructure provision for both the strategic infrastructure network and local infrastructure connections.

#### **4.7.7 Policy – Achieving sufficient development density to support the provision of infrastructure services**

(a) In areas where there is no structure plan, ensure that the maximum potential yield for the zone is achieved to support infrastructure provision.

(b) Recognise that the minimum potential yield may not be achieved where there are proven geotechnical constraints.

#### **4.7.8 Policy – Staging of subdivision**

(a) Require any staging of subdivision to be undertaken in a manner that promotes efficient development and integration of infrastructure and community facilities.

#### **4.7.9 Policy – Connected neighbourhoods**

(a) Require subdivision to provide street and block patterns that support the concepts of a liveable, walkable and connected neighbourhood including:

(i) A road network that achieves all of the following:

A. Easy and safe to use for pedestrians and cyclists;

B. Connected with a variety of routes within the immediate neighbourhood and between adjacent land areas; and

C. Connected to public transport, shops, schools, employment, open spaces and other amenities; and

(ii) Vehicle crossings and associated access designed and located to provide for safe and efficient movement to and from sites and minimising potential conflict between vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists on the adjacent road network.

**4.7.10 Policy – Recreation and access**

- (a) Subdivision provides for the recreation and amenity needs of residents by:
- (i) Encouraging open spaces which are prominent and accessible by pedestrians;
  - (ii) Requiring the number and size of open spaces in proportion to the future density of the neighbourhood; and
  - (iii) Enabling for pedestrian and/or cycle linkages.

**4.7.11 Policy – Reverse sensitivity**

- (a) Development and subdivision design minimises reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent sites, adjacent activities, or the wider environment; and
- (b) Avoid potential reverse sensitivity effects of locating new dwellings in the vicinity of an intensive farming, extraction industry or industrial activity.

**4.7.14 Policy – Structure and master planning**

- (a) Ensure that development and subdivision within approved structure or master plan areas is integrated with the development pattern and infrastructure requirements specified in an approved structure or master plan.

**Chapter 5 – Rural Environment**

Objective 5.1.1 is the strategic objective for the rural environment and has primacy over all other objectives in Chapter 5.

**5.1.1 Objective – The rural environment**

- (a) Subdivision, use and development within the rural environment where:
- (i) high class soils are protected for productive rural activities;
  - (ii) productive rural activities are supported, while maintaining or enhancing the rural environment;
  - (iii) urban subdivision, use and development in the rural environment is avoided.

### **5.2.1 Objective - Rural resources**

(a) Maintain or enhance the:

- (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;
- (ii) The health and wellbeing of rural land and natural ecosystems;
- (iii) The quality of surface fresh water and ground water, including their catchments and connections;
- (iv) Life-supporting and intrinsic natural characteristics of water bodies and coastal waters and the catchments between them.

### **5.2.2 Policy - High class soils**

- (a) Soils, in particular high class soils, are retained for their primary productive value.
- (b) Ensure the adverse effects of activities do not compromise the physical, chemical and biological properties of high class soils.

### **5.2.3 Policy - Effects of subdivision and development on soils**

- (a) Subdivision, use and development minimises the fragmentation of productive rural land, particularly where high class soils are located.
- (b) Subdivision which provides a range of lifestyle options is directed away from high class soils and/ or where indigenous biodiversity is being protected.

## **Chapter 6 - Infrastructure**

### **6.1.1 Objective – Development, operation and maintenance of infrastructure**

- (a) Infrastructure is developed, operated and maintained to benefit the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of the district.

### **6.1.13 Policy – Future growth areas**

- (a) Require infrastructure services to be developed to a standard that enables the service to be extended to future growth areas where appropriate.

### **6.4.1 Objective – Integration of infrastructure with subdivision, land use and development**

- (a) Infrastructure is provided for, and integrated with, subdivision, use and development.

**6.4.2 Policy – Provide adequate infrastructure**

(a) Ensure adequate provision of infrastructure, including land transport networks, where land is subdivided or its use intensified.

**6.4.3 Policy – Infrastructure Location and Services**

(a) Ensure subdivision, use and development are provided with infrastructure and services to a level that is appropriate to its location and intended use including:

- (i) Three waters (water, wastewater and stormwater supply);
- (ii) Telecommunication services;
- (iii) Electricity services; and
- (iv) Adequate water supply within urban areas for firefighting purposes.

**6.4.5 Policy – Roading infrastructure**

(a) Ensure that roading infrastructure is developed so that:

- (i) The design, location, alignment and dimensions of new roads provide safe vehicle, pedestrian and cycling access and manoeuvring to every site;
- (ii) The roading pattern provides good connectivity to the site and integrates with adjacent land identified as future growth areas including public transport such as bus stops;
- (iii) There is adequate provision of on-site parking and manoeuvring for land use activities; and
- (iv) Contaminants generated are appropriately mitigated.