

Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan

Decision Report pursuant to Clause 10 of the First Schedule

of the Resource Management Act 1991

Subject: Variation 1 Greytown Future Development Area

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
GV1	Tomlinson & Carruthers Surveyors Ltd	FS 18 David McLean FS 22 Neil Galbreath	Support Support
GV2	Robert Upton and Mark Hinton on behalf of Elmcourt Trust	-	-
GV3	Adamson Land Surveyors	FS 19 David J McLean FS 21 Neil Galbreath	Support Support in part
GV4	Kevyn Rendell & Michael Allen (Molewood Trust)	-	-
GV5	Mike Gray	-	-
GV6	Douglas Coley	-	-
GV7	David & Catherine Smith	-	-
GV8	Andrew & Heather Murphy	-	-
GV9	Jill Thomas	-	-
GV10	Wendy Young	-	-
GV11	David Cullen	-	-
GV12	A Innes	-	-
GV13	Gerard & Eileen Van Trigt	-	-
GV14	Arthur & Sandra Small	-	-
GV15	Geoffrey Major	-	-
GV16	Alyson DeBoer	-	-
GV17	Barry Silvester – Registered Surveyor	FS 20 Neil Galbreath	Support

261.1	Smallwood Family Trust	FS 23 J McLennan	Support
-------	------------------------	------------------	---------

Discussion

Tomlinson & Carruthers Surveyors Ltd (GV1) expressed concern about the absence of a Structure Plan, and the uncertainty this created for landowners in the Greytown Future Development Area. However, they supported in principle the Structure Plan approach. **David McLean** and **Neil Galbreath** support this submission.

Elmcourt Trust (GV2) requested that the majority of the Variation be declined (amendments 1-9), and that the definition of a Structure Plan be approved (amendment 10).

Adamson Land Surveyors (GV3) support the Variation, and requested clarification of the method for compensating landowners for providing open space and transport links. In addition, they sought a timeframe within which a Structure Plan would be prepared for a Future Development Area. **David McLean** and **Neil Galbreath** support this submission.

K Rendell & M Allen (Molewood Trust) (GV4) requested the Variation be declined.

M Gray (GV5) supported the Variation, and requested adequate consultation as part of the preparation of the Structure Plan. They also requested a reference be added to the definition of Structure Plan on design principles and guidelines.

D Coley (GV6) requested the Variation be declined.

D & C Smith (GV7) requested the area covered by the Variation be rezoned back to Rural.

A & H Murphy (GV8) requested the area covered by the Variation be rezoned back to Rural.

J Thomas (GV9) supports the Variation.

W Young (GV10) sought clarification of the status of the driveway between 74 and 80 West Street. They also requested the wider involvement of Greytown residents in the preparation of the Structure Plan.

D Cullen (GV11) requested deletion of the shared entrance drive to 76, 76A and 76B from the Future Development Area.

A Innes (GV12) requests deletion of the shared entrance drive to 76, 76A and 76B from the Future Development Area.

G & E van Trigt (GV13) supports the Variation, and request the protection of views to the Tararua Ranges and the existing stand of oak trees.

A & S Small (GV14) supports the Variation, and request the protection of views to the Tararua Ranges and the existing stand of oak trees.

G Major (GV15) requests the removal of the accessway between Hs094 and Hs095 from the Future Development Area.

A DeBoer (GV16) supports the Variation.

B Silvester (GV17) requests that the existing water races be recognised. **Neil Galbreath** support this submission.

A further submission was received from **J McLennan** supporting the original submission from the Smallwood Family Trust in relation to the Proposed Plan, and not the Variation.

Evidence Heard

Tomlinson & Carruthers Surveyors Ltd presented evidence contending there were a range of issues with the proposed Future Development Area, including traffic on Mole Street,

potential contamination of water races, ability to service the area without pumping wastewater, and stormwater disposal in an area with elevated ground water levels. They also questioned whether other alternatives sites for growth of Greytown could be found.

Molewood Trust represented by Ed Cooke presented evidence reiterating their submission that only Amendment 10 should be approved, and not Amendments 1-9. They contended that the wording around restricting development could be ultra vires. They also contended that the area contained some of the highest fertility soil type in New Zealand. Suggested other areas around Greytown may be more appropriate for development.

M Gray represented by Peter Werry supported the Proposed Variation. Requested consultation be part of the preparation of the Structure Plan, and that the effects of development should be managed.

A & H Murphy and **D & C Smith** presented evidence contending the Future Development area had two major issues, being access from West Street and stormwater flowing into the Moroa water race. Believed there was alternative land available for future development, and that a whole plan be prepared for Greytown.

B Silvester presented evidence expressing concern about the water races in the Future Development Area. He contended that the management of the water races needed to be recognised in rezoning the land. He also contended that if the water races were to be piped, the downstream impact on the existing pipes would be significant and would need upgrading.

Commissioners Deliberations

The matter of rezoning this land from Rural to Residential, as well as rezoning other areas around Greytown Residential has been deliberated and confirmed in respect of submissions on the Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan. For the reasons outlined in the Decision Reports for the Proposed Combined Plan, we consider the proposed Future Development Area is the most appropriate growth area for Greytown.

These deliberations specifically relate to the matters in the Proposed Variation, which identified an area in Greytown as a 'Future Development Area', requiring a Structure Plan for this Future Development Area, and making any subdivision or land use activity in this Future Development Area a discretionary activity if it is not consistent with the Structure Plan.

We concur with the Section 42A Report that identifying this area as a 'Future Development Area' and managing subdivision and development in this area based on a Structure Plan to be the most effective and efficient approach. The 'Future Development Area' delineation recognises this is an area for land use change, going from rural land use to residential. Given the existing fragmented land ownership and land use pattern, a Structure Plan provides an effective tool for ensuring an integrated and structured pattern of urban development occurs as the area is developed.

We concur with many of the submitters, in that the Structure Plan must be developed by Council working with the landowners in this area. South Wairarapa District Council would need to determine the appropriate process for the preparation of the Structure Plan, as well as the timing for when it is to be prepared.

Some submitters raised specific issues that are more appropriately addressed as part of the detailed preparation of the Structure Plan. These issues include access points, road alignments and connections, infrastructure alignments and capacities, stormwater management and disposal, water races, views of the Tararua Ranges, protection of Oak Trees and compensation for provision of open space and transport infrastructure. We consider the list of matters in the definition of Structure Plan provides for all the above matters to be addressed in the preparation of the Structure Plan for this Future Development Area. In addition, we consider the existing definition of the Structure Plan already

encompasses the matter of native and exotic trees, and the use of design principles and guidelines.

We concur with the submitters and the Section 42A report about the inferred access points with the proposed boundaries of the Future Development Area, and accordingly agree with the recommendation in the Section 42A report to amend the boundaries of the Future Development Area to remove the inferred access points.

Based on the above, we approve the Variation in full, with a minor amendment to the delineation of the Future Development Area.

Decision: Variation 1

Submission Reference: GV1	Accept in part
FS 18	Accept in part
FS 22	Accept in part
GV2	Accept in part
GV3	Accept in part
FS 19	Accept in part
FS 21	Accept in part
GV4	Reject
GV5	Accept in part
GV6	Reject
GV7	Reject
GV8	Reject
GV9	Accept
GV10	Accept
GV11	Accept
GV12	Accept
GV13	Accept in part
GV14	Accept in part
GV15	Accept
GV16	Accept in part
GV17	Accept in part
FS 20	Accept in part
FS 23	Reject

Decision Amendment:

Amend Map 59 by removing the indicative accessways from the area marked as the Greytown Future Development Area (GFDA) (refer annotated Planning Maps).

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The residential zoning on the western side of Greytown provides for the efficient and effective use of the natural and physical resources of the local area, including transportation networks, infrastructure and community facilities.

- Applying the Future Development Area to this area of Greytown is effective in managing subdivision and development while a Structure Plan is being prepared, as well as for implementing the Structure Plan.
- Specific issues, such as provision of infrastructure, stormwater management, open space and access would be effectively managed in the preparation of the Structure Plan.