

Your Comment on the Waikanae North Development

Please include all the contact details listed below with your comments and indicate whether you can receive further communications from us by email to substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz.

1. Contact Details			
Please ensure that you have authority to comment on the application on behalf of those named on this form.			
Organisation name (if relevant)			
First name	Glynn and Jennifer		
Last name	Cowley		
Postal address	[REDACTED]		
Home phone / Mobile phone	[REDACTED]	Work phone	
Email (a valid email address enables us to communicate efficiently with you)	[REDACTED]		

2. We will email you draft conditions of consent for your comment			
☒	I can receive emails and my email address is correct	☐	I cannot receive emails and my postal address is correct

We take this opportunity to comment on the proposed Waikanae North Development application.

We own and live at [REDACTED]. We have owned our property for 12 years in which time we have been through the process of developing and landscaping the land sympathetically in terms of the area and in the last four years designed and built a home,

We are not against housing development and appreciate there needs to be a mix of options that satisfy a range of practical needs and affordability.

We understand that the WND project as proposed is designed to meet several criteria including and likely primarily economic viability.

We also understand that a project such as this affects immediate neighbours differently to the wider community and there is a balance in the mix of close range

versus the longer-range effects, plus the pros and cons such a project imposes that must be considered.

We therefore take our opportunity to comment seriously and intend it to be from a balanced perspective that consider the wider implications of this proposal rather than just what directly affects us and our property which of course are still important.

We do not support the proposed WND development in its current format.

The development design is more aligned with an intensified residential – urban model rather than something more aspirational for this unique semi-rural area.

We consider the project in its current form will impose significant negative impacts on the character of the land specifically the sand dunes designated in that area that make up most of the site.

Excluding the wetland areas the volume and extent of the earthworks intended are huge. Encompassing approximately 90% of the site. This seems at odds with statements in the Building Block planning document 3.4.1.2.1 Rural Dunes Precinct which states that ‘land use and development in the rural dunes precinct are anticipated to be carried out in a manner that retains the sensitive landscape and ecological character of the area including the wetlands’

The size and scale of these earth works will be disruptive and must have a negative effect on surrounding properties for the period of construction.

The visual impacts are significant rather than low or moderate and specifically where the development is proposed to build on sand dunes on the Western boundary adjacent the Te Harakeke wetland, building on these higher levels will have a significant and adverse effect on the visual outcome. The building Block planning report 3.4.1.2.1 also states “The rural character of the zone can be adversely affected by the presence of highly visible development and changes to dune landforms which cause disturbance to the natural contours and any significant cultural features of the area” It also states that “The overall density of development should be very low so as to retain the areas sense of openness”

The current Waikanae/Kapiti area fresh water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure does not have the current additional capacity to cope. All the surrounding properties must have their own sewage systems, storm water mitigation and significant water storage for firefighting. Some have potable water storage if the limited trickle supply is not suitable. From information available in the Formative report fresh water supply for the WND needs to be considered additional to current KCDC network capacity and planning. The Formative report states that it is its understanding that the “WND development is not anticipated in KCDC’s

infrastructure strategy and as such is an unanticipated development that will come with an “additional” unanticipated cost”.

Stormwater/Flood management. In this area some properties have been impacted in periods of heavy rain. It would be a major concern if the significant ground works intended for this site together with increased hard surface areas in an already flood risk zone will pose additional risk for surrounding properties especially the lower lying.

Alternatively, or as well as - creates a problem that the ratepayer must fund to resolve.

The proposal sights a business case that caters for a range of housing needs from ‘affordable’ to a more upmarket offering. Suggesting that as a greenfield development may offer lower building cost, provide additional employment opportunity, filter significant value into the local and regional economy and concludes that current traffic mitigation for local roads is adequate.

Whilst being convenient much of the analysis is contestable.

The Bal Mathieson Legal Opinion regarding the peer review was commissioned in support of the WND proposal. There would likely be different or alternative interpretations from a different source.

Whilst there will undoubtedly be some positive GDP benefit, upside for the local economy and employment opportunities created from a development such as what WND propose. There are differing opinions in the Formative and UE reports that cast doubt on some the basic assumptions that feed into the robustness of the possible economic outcomes.

In terms of housing supply which feeds into affordability, WND contends its development will be accretive in terms of supply. The Formative Report highlights data in the UE report that should be challenged or is missing or not considered. Changing the way this data is considered or included could show or result in a different outcome. In fact, the Formative Report states that in their opinion the sufficiency analysis is critically flawed.

In terms of affordability, I don’t have knowledge of what land within the proposed WND might or will sell for. Whilst such a development would potentially increase the opportunity to increase housing supply the developers intend to sell land packages and therefore, I assume will have no influence over what quality or the cost of any house that is built. The Formative report comments on this. Perhaps there is the hope that competitive tension will keep pricing down “possibly affordable” but history suggests that competitive tension is constrained by capacity.

More sections being available on the market does not necessarily translate to lower build costs.

The Traffic assessment indicates an increase of up to 8000 vehicles per day across the two local roads being Paetawa Road and Pekapeka Road. Apart from the access to 7 sites off Paetawa Road all the rest of the traffic accessing the proposed development will use the Pekapeka Road access point. There is opinion offered as to which way traffic will travel to access the expressway to travel South or access the development from the South. The impacts on Rutherford Drive – TeMonana Road and the capacity of the South bound access point to the expressway at TeMoana Road must also be considered. The reality is the traffic volumes across the two roads will result in an adverse effect including increased visual effect, noise and safety.

Although some targeted widening work has recently been carried out on Pekapeka Road there are no footpaths. Paetawa road has some provision for foot traffic. Both Pekapeka Road and Paetawa Road are heavily used by cyclists and being semi-rural horses are often ridden in these areas. Increases in traffic volumes of this magnitude must significantly increase the risk to those using the roads without further mitigation. There is a walking access shown across the wetlands on the western side one assumes to allow pedestrian access to the beach. This will add additional foot traffic to this area with probably a high proportion being children.

For a large development on this scale, it is uncomprehensible to think that with such a significant increase in traffic volumes the status quo would be allowed to remain. At a bare minimum it should be a condition that WND negotiate with NZTA to build a North entry and South exit to Pekapeka Road. Extension to Ngarara Road to allow access to Waikanae township should be included.

Public transport or provision of should also be a part of the conditions of the proposed development.

In our view the substantive application must be declined as currently proposed.

At the very least substantial additional conditions must be added before it could be recessed.

Glynn & Jenni Cowley.

Thank you for your comments