



**Kawerau District Plan - Plan Change 4**

**Recommendations on Submissions 12 July 2023**

**For the Stoneham Park Residential Development**

## Recommendations on Submissions- 12 July 2023

### Notes

- The table below responds to each submitter in numerical order and provides reasons for either accepting or declining a submission.
- Submitters 12, 15, 32, 36 and 39 did not submit on Proposed Plan Change 4 and are not included in this report.
- Plan Change 4 is referred to as PC4 in the table.

Submitter number	Name	Support/ Support in Part / Oppose	Summary of submission	Relief sought	Decision	Reason
1	Sheryl Hiha	Oppose	Why build more houses? Why not build a park, or tables for picnics. This town needs to focus on the children and their upbringing before building houses they can't even live in.	[no relief specified]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	Kawerau District Council has committed to the residential development of Roy Stoneham Park through its Long- Term Plan 2021-2031, and PC4 is part of the process to achieve that development. PC4 provides for new housing; smaller housing types and sections such as town houses, flats and units; smaller section sizes, duplex housing, and additional dwellings on a property. These factors provide for a wider range of housing within the District, including affordable housing and multi-generational housing.
2	Irma Hoani	Oppose	I strongly oppose District Plan Change 4.	I offer the alternative for consideration:	Decline	Kawerau District Council has committed to the residential development of Roy

			<p>The social impact of higher population density on this parcel of land is a recipe for disaster having lived in an area such as this. Therefore, I strongly oppose urban intensification as specified in the proposed plan changes.</p>	<p>Allocating a portion of Prideaux Park to build nice townhouses. This will create a more vibrant "downtown" space and will offer units for people who prefer to live within walking distance to shops and work. Units such as these would fall into a more affordable housing space. Alternative spaces such as Boyce Park could also be considered.</p>		<p>Stoneham Park through its Long- Term Plan 2021-2031, and PC4 is part of the process to achieve that development. Roy Stoneham Park was selected because it is currently an underutilised reserve. The flat and reportedly free draining nature of the land, as well as its proximity to schools and amenities, makes an ideal location for urban growth.</p> <p>While Plan Change 4 provides for a 'higher density' in the Residential Growth Precinct that will apply to Roy Stoneham Park, it is not to the urban density in Papamoa (as an example). The car parking requirements in section C10 Traffic Management of the District Plan are not changed by PC4. All residential dwellings must provide 2 car parking spaces (including in the Residential Growth Precinct).</p>
3	Allan Clarke	Support	I support District plan change 4 as proposed by KDC.	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.

4	Gabrielle Brown	Oppose	Could some of the Roy Stoneham reserve be kept while some get developed?	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	<p>This submission point is addressed by the structure plan for the residential development, which includes provision for public space.</p> <p>There are several linear and pocket parks that form part of the concept design, that will fulfil roles of active recreation and passive open spaces. The green spaces in the concept design will be detailed through a subsequent subdivision and land use consent, with the green spaces ultimately forming part of Council's open space network.</p>
5	Jan Pullin	<b>Support in Part</b>	That's all good.	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.
6	Allie Curran	<b>Support</b>	My partner and I are hoping to move to Kawerau; we have had trouble finding a quality small house. We fully support this proposal.	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.
7	Chris Reynolds	<b>Support</b>	I like the idea of providing a wider	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.

			<p>range of types of accommodation than is generally available in the current parts of town.</p> <p>I also support the changes proposed to the rules governing Setbacks, Site Coverage, Height, Additional Minor Dwellings. They seem practical for enabling more extensive use of the land.</p>			
7	Chris Reynolds	Support	<p>In addition, I would like to see these changes made available to all existing house sites in Kawerau. I cannot see any physical or mechanical reason why some sites should have one set of Rules and other sites have a different set of Rules.</p>	<p>Apply Residential Growth Precinct standards to the Residential Zone.</p>	<p>Decline – no change to Plan Change 4</p>	<p>Changes to the Residential Zone (outside the Residential Growth Precinct) are not within the scope of Plan Change 4, which is limited to the rezoning of Roy Stoneham Park and application of a new Residential Growth Precinct. However, whether the Residential Growth Precinct standards or similar should be applied in other parts of the Kawerau urban area should be discussed as part of the upcoming District Plan review process.</p>
7	Chris Reynolds	Support in part	<p>And, taking this to its logical extension,</p>	<p>Apply the same setback</p>	<p>Decline – no change to Plan Change 4</p>	<p>The difference in minimum distance for a front façade (3 metres) versus the front</p>

			<p>I see no real reason for the difference in Set-Back rules for front of house and front of garage. A number of houses have garages built into them these days and I fail to see any point in different setbacks depending on whether there is a garage or a rumpus room behind the front wall. And if one is going to quote "aesthetics" as the reason for having the difference, I would respond that with the proliferation of 6-foot-high front fences, you cannot see an awful lot of what is behind them anyway</p>	<p>distances for front of house and garages.</p>		<p>of a garage (5 metres) is to provide for an average utility vehicle (ute) to park in front of a garage door without overhanging onto the footpath. Reducing the front setback to a minimum of 3 metres could result in vehicles being parked (at least partly) on the footpath and impeding pedestrian access and safety. Where a garage is parallel to the front boundary, vehicles can be parked in the area provided in the turning area into the garage. This avoids the need to park over the footpath. For this reason it is recommended that the submission be declined.</p>
8	Tapara Reid-Hiakita	<b>Oppose</b>	The worry is who will benefit from turning Roy Stoneham Park	[no relief specified]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	Kawerau District Council has committed to the residential development of Roy Stoneham Park through its Long- Term

			reserve into residential land? Will the locals that have been part of our community for more than 20yrs be able to afford the homes that are proposed?			Plan 2021-2031, and PC4 is part of the process to achieve that development. PC4 provides for additional housing choice and typologies as permitted activities in the Residential Growth Precinct to meet the changing demand for housing in the area. PC4 provides for new housing; smaller housing types and sections such as town houses, flats and units; smaller section sizes, duplex housing, and additional dwellings on a property. These factors provide for a wider range of housing within the District, including affordable housing and multi-generational housing.
9	Shaun Wright	<b>Oppose</b>	I'm against the council's intention to exchange the reserve status of Roy Stoneham Park.	[no relief specified]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	Kawerau District Council has committed to the residential development of Roy Stoneham Park through its Long- Term Plan 2021-2031, and PC4 is part of the process to achieve that development.

10	Huia and Rongo MacDonald	<b>Support</b>	We <b>SUPPORT</b> the proposed Roy Stoneham Park Residential Development currently being progressed by Council as part of the March 2023 Consultation and Engagement Meetings process with the Kawerau community.	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.
10	Huia and Rongo MacDonald	<b>Support</b>	We <b>SUPPORT</b> and appreciate the inclusion of the following design aspects; a) Green Pedestrian Walkway backing onto Valley Road Homes; b) Planting For Visual Amenity; c) Interconnected Green Park Spaces for sustained community wellbeing;	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The design aspects supported in the submission point are outside the scope of Plan Change 4. However, support for those matters in the structure plan is noted.

			d) Existing Secondary Pedestrian Access/Connection.			
10	Huia and Rongo MacDonald	<b>Support</b>	We <b>SUPPORT</b> the private owners of Kowhai Park Land Parcel that should an agreed purchase of the 'said' Kowhai Park Land Parcel eventuate, that a Through road only be approved.	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The matter of concern in the submission point is outside the scope of Plan Change 4. However, it is noted that there will be only one vehicle access point into the residential development at Roy Stoneham Park at Peter Lippa Drive. Council has taken into consideration the traffic movements in Fenton Mill Road and the scope of the existing access way into Kowhai Park Residential Development and does not have any plans to put in a through-road into the main area of the development at this location.
10	Huia and Rongo MacDonald	<b>Oppose</b>	We <b>DO NOT SUPPORT</b> 'through road' access that may enable road users to 'speed' on entry from Fenton Mill road to Peter Lippa Drive and vice versa. Reduced vehicle noise levels at all times for residents, and road user and	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The matter of concern in the submission point is outside the scope of Plan Change 4. It is noted that Council agreed with residents in prior to the submission period that only having access via Fenton Mill Road to the Kowhai Park area and to the Stoneham Park development via Peter Lippa would help prevent speeding and excessive joy riding through the area ensuring the safety of residents and pedestrian and cyclists in the area.

			pedestrian safety should remain a traffic management priority.			
11	Herenga a Nuku	<b>Oppose</b>	Herenga ā Nuku recognises that the current Roy Stoneham reserve has many access points and connects the surrounding community and the Kawerau township. The park and the accessways to the park provide connection to roads, public spaces and housing areas. We request that this connectivity be retained within the new proposed residential development so that public access through this area remains and connection corridors allow for continued access.	1. We recommend maintaining the connectivity and public access currently afforded by the Roy Stoneham reserve. Specifically, we would like to see the roading within the new development kept as public roads, not private. We would encourage a connection corridor to and through the new development to	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	This matter is addressed by the structure plan for the residential development, which includes connectivity of the site to the wider neighbourhood. The structure plan will ensure two access ways allowing pedestrian and cycle access ways from Peter Lippa Drive and Two from Valley Road all linking to Fenton Mill Road. This will allow easy and safe access to Pūtauaki School and on to the new reserve at the Stock Pound and Stoneham Walk.

				<p>maintain connectivity and ensure public access to the outdoors is not reduced or affected in this area.</p> <p>2. Herenga ā Nuku recommends creating a walking and cycling track between the current recreation reserve at Roy Stoneham Park and the new proposed recreation reserve at the Stock Pound. This track/access route will provide an important access corridor and a link between the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				two spaces (that is, between the existing Roy Stoneham Park and the proposed new reserve).		
11	Herenga a Nuku	<b>Oppose</b>	<p>We support these access routes and connectivity and would like these to be included in Plan Change 4 so the community has a sense of what the Growth Precinct will look like.</p> <p>Plan Change 4 offers no certainty or plan of what access there will be into and through the Growth Precinct but instead offers a concept that is open to change and has no legal status. Similarly, the Growth Precinct's conditions do not include access through or into</p>	<p>We suggest that the Residential Growth Precinct Provisions include a direct reference to providing for active transport and connectivity to and through the site.</p>	Accept in part	<p>Including reference to active transport modes and connectivity is included in an amendment to Objective C3.2.1.2 relating to the Residential Growth Precincts. There is no need to amend Policy C3.2.2.4 as that policy is specifically about the housing types in the Precinct.</p>

			the precinct. Therefore Herenga ā Nuku opposes Plan Change 4 based on accessibility.			
13	Peter John Cowley Industrial Symbiosis Kawerau (ISK)	<b>Support</b>	We support this change as it will facilitate the Residential Development as proposed.	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.
14	Lester Murfitt	<b>Support</b>	I support the proposed District Plan Change 4. Changing the plan to allow slight change in building/land ratio makes housing more accessible to people who are currently blocked from having a place to make home. If the development provides for mix of ages and stages in life the neighbourhood	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.

			will develop and reflect our community. Rather than isolating different groups into their own separated spaces.			
16	Elaine Florence McGlinchey	<b>Support</b>	Needed to get this much needed housing development going.	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.
17	Jacob Kajavala Kajavala Forestry Ltd (KFL)	<b>Support</b>	I strongly support the initiative to grow residential options for the community. Efforts to grow & enhance this community will only be effective if we can house the growth.	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.
18	Hendrik Westeneng	<b>Support</b>	(No comment)	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.
19	Roxane Prescott	<b>Oppose</b>	Not sure but leave the horses alone.	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	This matter is outside the scope of PC4. The current lease to graze horses in the 5.44ha operated as the stock pound in

						<p>Fenton Mill Road was enacted around 2018 on an 'as needed' basis and unfortunately, this lease is not tenable with the Intention to Exchange the Reserve Status. Currently, residents can only see the horses from the road frontage. While Council appreciates that people enjoy seeing the horses, Council believes that a greater proportion of the community will gain higher recreational benefits from the Fenton Mill Road land when it is opened up as a recreational reserve with enhanced features. This area is close to the town centre but away from the geothermal area that flanks the current BMX track. The opportunity to utilise the Fenton Mill land for recreation for children, youth and whānau will maximise this available land and offer a unique reserve.</p>
20	Angelique Nicoll	<b>Support</b>	I believe this is a positive initiative by the council to further provide affordable homes for members within our	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.

			community, who may be disadvantaged financially due to rental prices and home ownership.			
21	Peter Wright Taurus Electrical	<b>Support in Part</b>	To change the district plan I feel there are other areas that could be used within the district for housing that already has all amenities around them so cost would not be high and a burden on rate payers.	[no relief specified]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	Council has previously investigated other areas for housing and decided that Roy Stoneham Park is appropriate for residential development. Other areas in Kawerau township are privately owned and development is dependent on landowner interest and external funding arrangements.
22	Kawerau and Districts Grey Power Association	<b>Support</b>	Kawerau Grey Power supports the District Plan Change 4.	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.
23	Maria Mitchell	<b>Support</b>	(no comment provided)	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.
24	Kirsten Brown	<b>Oppose</b>	(no comment provided)	[no relief specified]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The submission does not specify the reason for opposition or request amendments to

						Plan Change 4. Therefore no changes are made.
25	Raewyn Morgan	<b>Support</b>	I support this.	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.
26	Christine Borlase	<b>Support in part</b>	(no comment provided)	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.
27	Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ)	Support in part	C7.7.6 Subdivision Design (d) Layout of Allotments Amend to include: vi Within the Residential Growth Precinct, the location of fire hydrants in relation to proposed building platforms and whether compliance is achieved with the requirements of New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.	[as per summary of submission]	Accept	The change to C7.7.6 Subdivision design, to include (d)(vi) in relation to Residential Growth Precincts, has been made as requested. The submission point is accepted for the reasons set out in the submission. The reference to the most relevant Code of Practice is noted and accepted.

27	FENZ	Support in part	<p>C7.7.6 Subdivision Design (e) Access to rear sites Amend to include: New line measurement in relation to the Residential Growth Precinct with subsequent amendments as follows: 2. Residential Growth Precinct Minimum Width: a. up to 3 dwellings: 3.5m b. more than 3 dwellings: 6m Minimum Clearance Height: 4m Minimum Formation Width: 3.5m</p>	[as per summary of submission]	Accept	<p>A change to C7.7.6 (e) has been made to include a new row under 1. Residential Zones. This is a new (c) which relates to Residential Growth Precincts, and includes the standards requested in the submission. The submission point is accepted for the reasons set out in the submission.</p>
27	FENZ	Support in part	<p>C7.7.6 Subdivision Design (f) Provision for Access to Rear Lots Amend to include: In the Residential Growth precinct, where an access</p>	[as per summary of submission]	Accept	<p>The change to C7.7.6 Subdivision design, to include wording at the end of (f) in relation to Residential Growth Precincts has been made. The submission point is accepted for the reasons set out in the submission.</p>

			exceeds 50m in length, the minimum access width must be 4m with a vertical clearance no less than 4m.			
27	FENZ	Support in part	Add new rule: C7.8.12 Servicing or C3.4.13 Servicing Any development within the Residential Growth Precinct shall demonstrate compliance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.	[as per summary of submission]	Accept	The addition of new C3.4.13 Servicing in the Residential Zone rules has been made as requested. The submission point is accepted for the reasons set out in the submission.
28	Tracy Wilson	<b>Support in part</b>	I support if comments made in sections 1 and 3 are acted upon.  [note – Section 1 relates to submission on revocation of Reserve status, Section 2 relates	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The matters of concern relating to the revocation of Reserve status and development of the stock pound are not issues that can be addressed in Plan Change 4. It is noted that the s42A report contains a full response from Council in relation to the wider matters.

			ideas for the Development of the Stock Pound]			
29	Savage Papakāinga Land Trust	<b>Support in Part</b>	<p>We would like to raise a few important points for consideration before we can support this project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tripartite relationship</li> <li>• Absence of a strong strategy</li> <li>• Maori land and Papakainga Strategy</li> <li>• Maori perspective</li> <li>• Naming conventions</li> <li>• Cultural significance of a house</li> </ul> <p>[refer to full submission for detail on the matters above]</p>	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The matters of concern listed in the submission cannot be addressed in Plan Change 4 as those are matters relating to Council’s relationship and ongoing consultation with tangata whenua organisations, Council strategies, and cultural perspectives. It is noted that the s42A report contains a full response from Council in relation to the submission points.

30	Nasaire Karauria	<b>Oppose</b>	Not sure more houses will be a good replacement for a beautiful place to walk your dogs, exercise or even just to look at.	[no relief specified]	Decline	Kawerau District Council has committed to the residential development of Roy Stoneham Park through its Long- Term Plan 2021-2031, and PC4 is part of the process to achieve that development. PC4 provides for additional housing choice and typologies as permitted activities in the Residential Growth Precinct to meet the changing demand for housing in the area. PC4 provides for new housing; smaller housing types and sections such as town houses, flats and units; smaller section sizes, duplex housing, and additional dwellings on a property. These factors provide for a wider range of housing within the District, including affordable housing and multi-generational housing.
31	Vicky Mitchell	<b>Support</b>	I support the district plan change 4.	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.
33	Waka Kotahi	<b>Support</b>	The Roy Stoneham Park Residential Development area is well suited to residential growth and is part of the contiguous urban area. It is well placed	Waka Kotahi seeks that the plan change is approved.	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.

		<p>for land use and transport integration meeting Waka Kotahi objectives of enabling people to live, work, learn and enjoy recreation locally without having to solely rely on private vehicles.</p> <p>3. The plan change is also aligned with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Policy 1 (a), (c) and (e). Giving people the ability to access housing, jobs, and community spaces without relying on private vehicles and reducing vehicle kilometres travelled.</p> <p>4. The proposal includes cycle and pedestrian access to allow for active</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

			modes of transport to be used.			
33	Waka Kotahi	<b>Support in part</b>	It appears that the intersection of Valley Road and State Highway 34 will have adequate capacity as well as adequate form to accommodate the additional traffic associated with the plan change safely and efficiently. However, Waka Kotahi note that the traffic impact assessment does not include a specific assessment of this intersection.	Waka Kotahi consider that a specific assessment of the Valley Road and State Highway 34 intersection should be undertaken.	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The traffic assessment for the residential development is outside the intent of Plan Change 4. However, it is noted that a transportation assessment has been undertaken for the intersection of concern as part of the structure planning and investigation process.
34	Phil Kilroy	<b>Support</b>	No problem as long it is for this for this new subdivision only. With up to 50% coverage for building maybe have a green space allocation as we	50% building coverage for the new subdivision only (Roy Stoneham Park)	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.

			don't want 100% coverage in building and hard surfaces, as this could affect drainage issues.			
35	Alison Marshall	<b>Support</b>	I support the District Plan Change 4 Reasons Roy Stoneham Park Residential Development Vision It is a bit difficult to oppose the vision upon which the changes to the District Plan have been based, as these plan changes plan have been made in response to public requests for more housing supply in Kawerau, to accommodate the growing need and from public feedback on the types and models of housing required.	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.

35	Alison Marshall	Support in part	Consider different building materials - wood is coming back into fashion, concrete raw materials are finite resources, building houses off the ground instead of all of them on concrete pads – where does the rain go when there's not enough ground around the concrete pads to absorb heavy rainfalls, the park is flat so can't build a downhill water run off (as seen on the TV news in Auckland during the recent January flooding)	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The control of building materials is outside the scope of Plan Change 4. However, the intention is to use a design guideline for the residential development that will set out standards, including for construction materials. The guideline is a non-statutory document that will set out minimum standards for quality of home design, construction materials and fencing outcomes. The site coverage for the Residential Growth Precinct has been increased to 50%, but this consistent with national and international best practice for low to medium housing density. There will also be open space and other stormwater attenuation and management within the development.
35	Alison Marshall	Support in part	– no gated retirement village concept, seniors can live independently in	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The matter of concern is outside the scope of Plan Change 4. It is noted that it is not intended for the Roy Stoneham Park to be a gated community. The concept design provided for a traditional

			smaller homes within the multigenerational community pedestrian walkways to be accessible to wheelchairs, bicycles, prams and pushchairs			sub-division with public roads and open spaces.
35	Alison Marshall	Support in Part	If existing trees have to be felled, could you please plant tall trees and not seedling sized – incentives for home owners to plant greenery – we all know how important trees are for our wellbeing	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The matter of concern is outside the scope of Plan Change 4. It is noted that the landscape planting for the development will form part of the detailed design for the sub-division consent stage. It is intended for the planting scheme to use species at a suitable size
35	Alison Marshall	Support in Part	Traffic Management Concerns – Increased traffic volume – more vehicles, noise and vehicle headlights Unfortunately the most logical place for the only two-way vehicular entry and	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The matter of concern is outside the scope of Plan Change 4. It is noted that Council has identified that there will be no vehicle access from Fenton Mill Road due to traffic concerns, but a roundabout is planned at the junction with Peter Lippa Drive. A transportation report has identified that the existing roading network around the development is

			<p>exit point is at the T-junction of Peter Lipa Drive and Windley Place. The T-junction will become a crossroads, or even a roundabout! I would prefer this intersection to remain a T-junction and not become a roundabout – and please, NO MORE shudder, judder bars (speed humps). The April 2021 Stapleton Elliott vision document (page 07) showed a one-way vehicle access point turning into Stoneham Park from Fenton Mill Road. Council told us that Veros deemed this turning in point would add to traffic congestion in Fenton Mill Road, being too close to the Putauaki School,</p>			<p>capable of supporting the additional traffic movements generated by the subdivision.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

			<p>Kowhai Park and Ballantrae 7-Day Store entry and exit points into and out of Fenton Mill Road. However there would be no congestion if the one-way vehicle access was a left-turning only exit point from Stoneham Park out into Fenton Mill Road.</p>			
35	Alison Marshall	Support in Part	<p>Main entrance into the development from Peter Lippa Drive. The April 2021 Stapleton Elliott vision document Spatial Analysis &amp; Response Diagrams (page 07) suggests the primary vehicular entry point be via “a bespoke landscaped gateway to provide a sense of destination and interpretive</p>	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	<p>The matter of concern is outside the scope of Plan Change 4. It is noted that the intention is for the design of the main entrance to the development is to be consistent with Kawerau’s current streetscapes.</p>

		<p>signage”!! and (page 14) Urban Design Key Qualities – 7 C's Creativity – suggests the main entrance to the development “be defined by considered signage and sculpture that will have cultural and place meaning”!! IMHO (in my humble opinion) I suggest that if this looks and feels too different from the rest of the neighbourhood then it may feel too much like a gated community or enclave within to the rest of us, and we may feel discouraged from, and uncomfortable when, walking through the park, around the streets and using the “enhanced green</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

			space and recreational areas” within the housing area. No fancy entrance, just an ordinary road with a street sign and attractive planting would suffice.			
35	Alison Marshall	Support in Part	Lighting Concerns – the increased street lighting at the Peter Lipka/Windley intersection – more light pollution in the night sky in the area from the all the extra street and house lighting. ALAN – artificial light at night – widespread negative impact on night time species – health impacts and sleep deprivation on humans – ruins our view of the stars in the night sky	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The matter of concern is outside the scope of Plan Change 4. It is noted the Council’s intention is for street lighting to be used in a way that balances neighbourhood safety, energy efficiency and minimising impact.

			<p>We have a semi-rural outlook and a dark night sky. I'm pleased that Council has assured us "it's not going to be stadium lighting". At one of the consultation meetings Council said "plan changes are an ideal testing ground for new ideas." May I suggest Council explore all street lighting ideas ie dimmable, solar powered.</p>			
35	Alison Marshall	Support	<p>Funding Model I support and commend the Council's decision to use the timely 3 Waters grant to fully fund the stages of the development at no cost to the ratepayer – and that the original grant money will be available at the completion of</p>	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The matter of concern is outside the scope of Plan Change 4. However, support for the funding model is noted.

			the project for further community projects.			
35	Alison Marshall	Support in part	Concerns – greater density residential development, number of sections 80 – greater site coverage from 35% to 50%, let's hope not every house is built to 50% coverage as it could look like Papamoa - “all house and no trees”	[relief not specified]	Accept in part	The 50% site coverage in Plan Change 4 only applies to the Residential Growth Precinct and is necessary to provide for construction of a dwelling on the smaller section sizes provided for in the Precinct. Also refer to comments in response to the submission point on construction materials.
37	Te Atawhai Karauria	<b>Oppose</b>	I believe this development will disrupt our household and all households that neighbour the Reserve. I also believe the road that is planned to run parallel to our boundaries will bring noise pollution from increased	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The matter of concern is outside the scope of Plan Change 4. It is noted that the structure plan and roading layout have been amended to include wider separation between the road and the households along Valley Road.

			traffic and the high possibility of increased crime.			
38	Kristine Windle	<b>Support in part</b>	(no comment provided)	[no relief specified]	Accept	Submissions supporting PC4 are noted and accepted.
40	Moana Hale	<b>[not specified]</b>	I'm writing to make a suggestion concerning the traffic flow for the new proposed Stoneham Park Development. The farm area between Hardie Ave and Stoneham Park I've walked before and I reckon to make a road through will speed the traffic flow ease onto to Valley Road. It will also allow people an option to River Road and further from there. I think this is a great suggestion.	[refer to summary of submission]	Decline – no change to Plan Change 4	The matter of concern is outside the scope of Plan Change 4. The farm area between Hardie Ave and Roy Stoneham Park is privately owned by Ngati Tuwharetoa and currently farmed. As such, it is not appropriate to consider this land for road access.

ENDS