

Summary of Decisions Requested

Welhom Developments Limited Private Plan Change to the Operative Wairarapa Combined District Plan

Prepared for

Masterton District Council

By

4Sight Consulting Limited

Part of SLR

October 2022

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Guide to the Summary	1
1.2	Making a Further Submission	1
2	List of Submitters and Addresses for Service	3
3	Submissions in Order of Receipt.....	4
4	Submissions in Order of Plan Provision or Matter	25

Appendices

Appendix A – Further Submission Form (Form 6 Resource Management (Forms, Fees and Procedure) Regulations 2003)

1 Introduction

1.1 Guide to the Summary

This summary is divided into two parts. The first part summarises the decisions requested under each submitter's name. The second part summarises the decisions requested in order of the proposed plan change provision or matter to which they relate.

The following format is used for the summary of submissions in order of receipt:

Submission Number		Submitter Name
Decision requested	Plan provision or matter	Explanation or relief sought
(Reference number of request by submitter)	(Part of the plan change to which the submission is related)	(Explanation as to what the submitter has either commented on, or has specifically requested as an outcome within the Plan Change)

The following format is used for the summary of submissions in order of plan provision or matter:

Plan Provision		
Decision requested	Submitter name	Explanation or relief sought
(Reference number of request by submitter)	(Name of the person, people or organisation that made the submission)	(Explanation as to what the submitter has either commented on, or has specifically requested as an outcome within the Plan Change)

The decision requested is based on the information provided by the submitter in their submission on the Welhom Developments Limited Private Plan Change.

The full text of the Welhom Developments Limited Private Plan Change is available to be viewed at:

- Masterton District Council's public offices at 161 Queen Street, Masterton, and Waiata House, 27 Lincoln Road, Masterton.
- Masterton District Library at 54 Queen Street, Masterton.
- Masterton District Council's website www.mstn.govt.nz under the 'Public Notices' section on the following webpage link [Public Notices – Masterton District Council \(mstn.govt.nz\)](#). Place the link into your web browser and scroll down to Public Notices and click on the link for **Welhom Developments Limited Private Plan Change**.

The accompanying volume "Submissions on Welhom Developments Limited Private Plan Change" contains full copies of all submissions received. These submissions are ordered by submitter number.

1.2 Making a Further Submission

The following persons may make a further submission, in the prescribed form (Form 6):

- (a) any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; and
- (b) any person that has an interest in the proposed policy statement or plan greater than the interest that the general public has; and

(c) the local authority itself.

A further submission must be limited to a matter in support of or in opposition to the relevant submission made and summarised in the Summary of Decisions Requested document. Submissions should be made in writing, in general accordance with Form 6 of the Resource Management (Forms Fees, and Procedure) Regulations 2003. Full copies of all 10 submissions are available to inspect at:

- Masterton District Council's public offices at 161 Queen Street, Masterton, and Waiata House, 27 Lincoln Road, Masterton.
- Masterton District Library at 54 Queen Street, Masterton.
- Masterton District Council's website www.mstn.govt.nz under the 'Public Notices' section on the following webpage link [Public Notices – Masterton District Council \(mstn.govt.nz\)](http://www.mstn.govt.nz/public-notices). Place the link into your web browser and scroll down to Public Notices and click on the link for **Welhom Developments Limited Private Plan Change**.

This document contains the Summary of Decisions Requested. Appendix A contains a copy of Form 6. The private plan change request and related documentation can be viewed on Masterton District Council's website.

Further submitters are required to serve a copy of their further submission on the person who made the original submission within 5 days of lodging the further submission with Council. Addresses for service of all submitters are available in the Summary of Decisions Requested document.

Further submissions may be made by sending a written or electronic further submission, and any supporting documents, to Masterton District Council at:

Postal address

Planning
Masterton District Council
PO Box 444
Masterton

Email address

planningadmin@mstn.govt.nz

The closing time and date for further submissions is 4:00pm Wednesday 17 November 2022.

Service of Further Submission on Original Submitter

Within 5 working days of making the further submission to Council, the further submitter must serve a copy of the further submission on the person who made the original submission to which the further submission relates. An address for service for each submitter is listed in Section 2 of this document.

Questions and Queries

For further information regarding the Summary of Decisions Requested or making a further submission, please contact Megan Barr of 4Sight Consulting Limited who is assisting the Council (by phone: 021 468 108 or email: megan.barr@4sight.co.nz).

2 List of Submitters and Addresses for Service

Submissions Received Within Statutory Timeframe				
Submitter number	Submitter name	Address for service	Wishes to be heard	Would consider a joint case
01	John & Kate Remfry	64A Herbert Street, Masterton 5810 (jkr1984@xtra.co.nz)	Yes	Yes
02	Kevin Lionel & Treacy Marie Galbraith	247A State Highway 2, RDII Masterton (kevin.gal@xtra.co.nz)	Yes	Yes
03	Debbie van Zyl	16A Roger Renall Avenue, Masterton 5810 (jdvz@xtra.co.nz)	No	Yes
04	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	mika.zollner@gw.govt.nz	Yes	Yes
05	Bryce & Emma Keane	1 Cashmere Oaks Drive, Lansdowne, Masterton 5810 (bwkeane@hotmail.co.nz)	Yes	Yes
06	Heather May & John Carl Sexton	PO Box 599, Masterton 5840 (john@sexton.co.nz)	Yes	Yes
07	Albert Edward (Ted) Taylor	3 Sir Herbert Hart Avenue, Lansdowne, Masterton 5810 (ted@taybiz.co.nz)	Yes	Not stated
08	Wayne Skipage	12 Coralie Place, Lansdowne, Masterton 5810 (w.skipage@xtra.co.nz)	Yes	Yes
09	Shane Hart	11 McDonald Way, Lansdowne, Masterton 5810 (shanehart1989@outlook.com)	Yes	Yes
10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Level 7, Majestic Centre, 100 Willis Street, Wellington (kathryn.stamand@nzta.govt.nz) & (environmentalplanning@nzta.govt.nz)	Yes	Yes

3 Submissions in Order of Receipt

Submission Number: 01		Submitter Name: John & Kate Remfry
Decision requested	Plan provision or matter	Explanation or relief sought
1.1	Traffic effects State Highway 2 / Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of Cashmere Oaks entrance will substantially increase traffic load and adversely affect existing residents of Cashmere Oaks. ▪ Residents of Cashmere Oaks would not have expected this increase in traffic when they purchased their properties. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Significantly improve the entry to Cashmere Oaks Drive from State Highway 2 to <i>“take into account the vastly increased number of elderly residents who would be turning right onto SH2 to go to town”</i>. ▪ Extend the current 30km/h zone, consider installing traffic lights or a roundabout for the safety of residents and road users.
1.2	Traffic effects State Highway 2 / Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection Alternative access	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access through Cashmere Oaks between State Highway 2 and the retirement village will result in disruption from heavy vehicle movements passing through the residential neighbourhood over a period of many years. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide alternative access to the retirement village from State Highway 2 (not via Cashmere Oaks). ▪ Consider temporary access (not via Cashmere Oaks) during building phase so Cashmere Oaks residents are not bothered by heavy vehicles for years.

Submission Number: 2		Submitter Name: Kevin Lionel & Treacy Marie Galbraith
Decision requested	Plan provision or matter	Explanation or relief sought
2.1	Landscape / visual amenity / character effects	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about proximity (within 3m) and height of buildings in relation to external boundaries of Plan Change site with residential properties in Cashmere Oaks.

	<p>Building height</p> <p>New standard 5.5.2(n)(2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed setback distances and building heights will adversely affect the rural amenity / lifestyle of owners of adjoining residential properties. Adjoining landowners bought their properties to live rurally, not next to tall buildings. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limit building heights to single storey along external boundaries of Plan Change site.
--	--	---

Submission Number: 3		Submitter Name: Debbie van Zyl
Decision requested	Plan provision or matter	Explanation or relief sought
3.1	<p>Landscape / visual amenity / character effects</p> <p>Rural amenity</p> <p>Residential zoning</p> <p>Density</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cashmere Oaks is attractive due to its rural amenity and low-density housing. Rezoning the adjoining rural land for residential development with proposed lots of 400m² will detract from the value (financial) of the existing properties in Cashmere Oaks and detrimentally affect current residents of Cashmere Oaks. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Amend lot sizes to a minimum of 800m².
3.2	<p>Traffic effects</p> <p>State Highway 2 / Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Already dangerous to exit Cashmere Drive onto a 100km/h section of State Highway 2. ▪ Existing traffic volumes result in wait times of up to 8 minutes to safely turn right onto State Highway 2 towards Masterton from Cashmere Oaks Drive. ▪ Current access into Cashmere Oaks from State Highway 2 is dangerous due to 'tailgating' of slower vehicles turning left into Cashmere Oaks Drive and following vehicles overtaking across double yellow lines. Cars exiting Cashmere Oaks Drive and turning right towards Masterton may not see these vehicles, increasing the risk of accidents at this intersection. ▪ Application indicates no accidents have happened yet, but this is incorrect as there have been some minor accidents. ▪ Using the intersection of State Highway 2 and Cashmere Oaks Drive to provide access for the Plan Change will result in traffic safety issues. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Work with Waka Kotahi to extend 50km/h speed limit past 'Welcome to Masterton' sign north of the Arvida Lansdowne Park extension.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide dedicated left turn lane into Cashmere Oaks Drive from State Highway 2. Could pipe and cover over existing drainage ditch to make space for a dedicated left turn lane. ▪ Consider other options for improving intersection of State Highway 2 and Cashmere Oaks Drive, including a roundabout or the installation of traffic lights at the intersection. ▪ As an alternative to reducing the speed limit of State Highway 2 and improving the intersection of State Highway 2 and Cashmere Oaks Drive, provide a separate access to the Plan Change site (separate from Cashmere Oaks' roading).
--	--	---

Submission Number: 4		Submitter Name: Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)
Decision requested	Plan provision or matter	Explanation or relief sought
4.1	Whole Plan Change Proposed RPS Change 1: <i>Objective 22</i> <i>Policy 55</i> <i>UD.3</i> <i>Policy 57</i>	Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GWRC supports intent of plan change to provide housing / housing choices to the district, but Plan Change must have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support with amendments. ▪ Ensure plan change provisions have regard to qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments (Objective 22 of RPS Change 1) by including objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristics. ▪ Ensure the plan change provisions and development have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 policies 55, UD.3 and 57.
4.2	Whole Plan Change Traffic effects Multi-modal transport Connectivity GWRC Proposed RPS Change 1	Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current approach to connecting development to town centre does not have regard to RPS Change 1 direction on climate change emissions, ensuring transport infrastructure is in place prior to development and providing for multi-modal transport. ▪ Providing access through Cashmere Oaks will cause development to be poorly connected to State Highway 2 and Masterton town centre. ▪ Integrated Transport Assessment recognises likely to be low uptake of cycling, pedestrian activity and public transport by future residents of Plan Change site. Relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose. ▪ Provide for greater multi-modal transport links through the development and consider whether development will provide good connections to Masterton town centre.

4.3	<p>NPS-HPL clause 3.6(4) LUC Class 3 Land</p> <p>Operative District Plan & Masterton Urban Growth Strategy 2019 (MUGS)</p> <p>Identified future development area</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plan Change site is LUC (Land Use Capability) Class 3 land. ▪ Proposal is not located in a future development area identified in the Operative District Plan. ▪ The applicant's Integrated Transport Assessment refers to the Masterton Urban Growth Strategy 2019 (MUGS), which identified the Plan Change site as a 'potential future urban expansion area'. But MUGS was not adopted or published by Masterton District Council, so the site does not meet the definition of 'identified for future development'. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose. ▪ Consider direction provided by National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 (NPS-HPL). Specifically, direction to avoid urban zoning in rural land with LUC classes of 1, 2 or 3 until the Regional Policy Statement has mapped highly productive land. ▪ Give effect to clause 3.6(4) of NPS-HPL by assessing whether Plan Change meets all criteria for urban re-zoning of highly productive land to be allowed.
-----	--	--

Submission Number: 5		Submitter Name: Bryce & Emma Keane
Decision requested	Plan provision or matter	Explanation or relief sought
5.1	<p>Traffic effects</p> <p>State Highway 2 / Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submission relates to the proposed entrance to the site and other concerns. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant Plan Change with conditions.
5.2	<p>Density effects</p> <p>Lot size, minimum lot size</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed amount, land size and availability of sections indicates a target market outside of elderly / retirement village. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant Plan Change with conditions.
5.3	<p>Rural productivity effects</p> <p>Proposed residential zoning</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rezoning flat farmable land. ▪ Not looking to rezone land between Plan Change site and the State Highway 2. Will result in inconsistent, piecemeal zoning.

		Relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant Plan Change with conditions.
5.4	Infrastructure effects	Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of infrastructure. Water pressure in Cashmere Oaks is already in dire need of a water pumping station. Relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant Plan Change with conditions.

Submission Number: 6		Submitter Name: Heather May & John Carl Sexton
Decision requested	Plan provision or matter	Explanation or relief sought
6.1	Traffic effects Access (existing) 3.2 Site Description (AEE)	Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application states access to Plan Change site will be through Cashmere Oaks. ▪ Site description in AEE includes Lot 36 DP 429991, which is subject to several right of way easements. ▪ Lot 36 DP 429991 currently provides access to Plan Change site. ▪ Understand from applicant that it is not intended for Plan Change site to have use of, or an easement over, Lot 36 DP 429991. Application doesn't reflect this. Relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approval of Plan Change should be conditional on alternative access to Plan Change site being made available, and no further easements being granted over Lot 36 DP 429991 to provide access to Plan Change site.
6.2	Landscape / visual amenity / character effects ODP (Residential Zone Standards) 4.1 Proposed Changes	Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applying existing District Plan rules and standards to site inappropriate. ▪ Existing rules and standards of the District Plan are not sympathetic to character of Cashmere Oaks. ▪ Cashmere Oaks is a premium subdivision with wide streets, footpaths on both sides of roadway, wide berms and planting, thoughtful use of covenants. Relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approval of Plan Change should be subject to the same type and style of development as Cashmere Oaks subdivision.
6.3	Landscape / visual amenity / character effects	Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about section sizes. ▪ The application refers to mix of one and two storey standalone dwellings on a lot size of 400m².

	<p>Density</p> <p>Resultant development form, minimum lot size</p> <p>Section 5.1 (AEE)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 5.1 of the application refers to a minimum lot size of 350m² with an average lot size of 400m². ▪ Cashmere Oaks subdivision average lot size is greater than 400m². <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section sizes and covenants should follow those of the Cashmere Oaks subdivision.
6.4	<p>Landscape / visual amenity / character effects</p> <p>Resultant development form, building height</p> <p>AEE</p> <p>New standard 5.5.2(n)(1)</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about building heights. ▪ The application refers to mix of one and two storey standalone dwellings with a maximum height of 10m. ▪ Application contains request for higher building height of 14m. Understand from applicant this will be a building for rest home / hospital care. Note when new local hospital was built in 2005, went from multi-level building to single level building. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All retirement village buildings, including rest home and hospital, should be single storey.
6.5	<p>Landscape / visual amenity / character effects</p> <p>5.1.b Landscape and Visual Amenity Effects</p> <p>Rural building height</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Baseline visibility of site contains statement listed under section 5.1.b “<i>Private locations – open to no views of site from dwellings located to the north, east and south of the site...</i>”. This statement is incorrect. Multiple properties within Cashmere Oaks currently have views of Plan Change site from several rooms within their homes, including main living areas. ▪ It is disingenuous to compare maximum permitted building height under current rural zoning (15m) with the proposed multi-storey retirement village. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approval of Plan Change conditional on buildings being limited to single storey.

Submission Number: 7		Submitter Name: Albert Edward (Ted) Taylor
Decision requested	Plan provision or matter	Explanation or relief sought
7.1	Masterton Urban Growth Strategy 2019 (MUGS)	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application references MUGS and states “<i>Urban development of the Site will be consistent with the Council’s urban growth strategy which identifies the Site as a possible future urban development area</i>”. ▪ The Plan Change is not part of any formal structure plan or similar planning document that guides extension

	Page 67 AEE	<p>of the Masterton residential area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MUGS only exists to aid decision making in relation to urban planning, not intended as support for Plan Change. ▪ Area identified as C03 (Map 5, Page 56, AEE) encompasses the Plan Change site and balance land bordering on Opaki Road. ▪ Plan Change makes no provision for access to Opaki Road and integrating this with future re-zoning of all of area C03. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ If MUGS is to guide urban growth this should be decided in total for area C03 (Map 5, Page 56, MUGS) and not piecemeal. ▪ Oppose poor integration of Plan Change. ▪ Disagree with application regarding environmental benefits that relate to urban development and MUGS and the relationship with adjoining property (Cashmere Oaks and area C03).
7.2	<p>Connectivity</p> <p>Relationship to Cashmere Oaks subdivision</p> <p>Page 67 AEE</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application refers to Plan Change as “<i>a logical extension of a neighbouring site</i>” in reference to the Cashmere Oaks subdivision. ▪ Plans for final stage of the Cashmere Oaks subdivision (currently being constructed) show a complete and fully integrated layout of roads, properties and reserve. No indication “<i>there was any thought when this was envisaged that it would ultimately extend to the north</i>”. ▪ Plan Change is not a logical extension of Cashmere Oaks. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ Oppose poor integration of Plan Change. ▪ Disagree with application regarding environmental benefits that relate to urban development and MUGS and the relationship with adjoining property (Cashmere Oaks and area C03).
7.3	<p>Traffic effects</p> <p>Access</p> <p>Relationship to Cashmere Oaks subdivision</p> <p>Page 11 of Appendix 6, Figure 6-1</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application (Figure 6-1, page 11, Appendix 6) shows access to Plan Change site from Cashmere Oaks by converting cul-de-sac adjacent to Lots 102 and 103 and the reserve to a through road. This is an ad hoc approach and not a logical extension of Cashmere Oaks. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ Oppose poor integration of Plan Change and ad hoc approach to access and connectivity.

	(AEE)	
7.4	<p>Landscape / visual amenity / character effects</p> <p>Viewshafts from Cashmere Oaks</p> <p>Landscape and Visual Assessment (Appendix 3)</p> <p>New standard 5.5.2(n)(1)</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application states that “<i>the site is suitable for urban development given its negligible environmental values in terms of landscape...</i>”. ▪ Landscape and Visual Assessment states views of Plan Change site from private locations “<i>Open to no views of the Site from dwellings located to the north, east and south of the site</i>”. Statement is incorrect, large parts of the site are able to be viewed from the west side of Sir Herbert Hart Avenue. ▪ If development goes ahead it would have significant visual effect on dwellings on west side of Sir Herbert Hart Avenue, particularly views of 14m high building. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ Disagree with statement that there are negligible landscape effects.
7.5	<p>Ecological effects</p> <p>Ecological Assessment – Appendix 4</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application states “<i>the Site is suitable for urban development given its negligible environmental values in terms of...Ecology...</i>”. ▪ Assessment is limited as it does not consider bird life that will lose their habitat. Birds frequently observed in this rural area include Harrier Hawks, Spur-winged Plovers, Paradise Shelducks, Skylarks, Sparrows and Finches. These birds are already losing habitat because of Cashmere Oaks extension. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ Disagree with statement in application that the site has negligible environmental values in terms of ecology.
7.6	<p>Traffic effects</p> <p>AEE</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application states “<i>the Site is suitable for urban development given its negligible environmental values in terms of the ability for it to be appropriately serviced....</i>”. ▪ Refers to transport under Environmental Costs as it is considered that the benefits proposed are outweighed by the costs. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change.
7.7	<p>Hazards</p> <p>Contaminated land</p> <p>Preliminary and Detailed Site</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application states the site is absent of hazards based on the Preliminary and Detailed Site Investigation. ▪ The site has been used for agricultural purposes in the past. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change.

	Investigation – Appendix 9 AEE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preliminary and Detailed Site Investigation deficient because having identified agricultural use, tests for organic compounds listed under ‘soil contaminant standards for health for organic compounds’, specifically DDT and dieldrin, should have been carried out. ▪ Without appropriate testing cannot support the statement that the site is absent of hazards.
7.8	Traffic effects State Highway 2 / Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection Integrated Transport Assessment – Appendix 6	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plan Change is completely dependent on using Cashmere Oaks Drive for access to the site. ▪ Integrated Transport Assessment notes the intersection with State Highway 2 will require improvements. ▪ The recommended improvements would benefit existing traffic that uses the intersection but would not be sufficient to accommodate additional traffic resulting from Plan Change. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ Disagree that improvements to intersection will be sufficient for Plan Change.
7.9	Traffic effects Cashmere Oaks internal roading Integrated Transport Assessment – Appendix 6	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intersection of Cashmere Oaks Drive, Coralie Place and Sir Herbert Hart Avenue has unconventional layout and was not designed to service more than the Cashmere Oaks subdivision. ▪ Noted on page 20 of Appendix 6 that 4.85m lane widths would be available to accommodate additional traffic generated by development of Plan Change site. This would allow room to pass cyclists at slow speed but “<i>on street parking would not be expected</i>”. ▪ This statement is incorrect as on-street parking is more likely to occur based on use of existing roads in Cashmere Oaks – diminishing the ability of Cashmere Oaks to accommodate additional traffic. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ The costs of extending Cashmere Oaks Drive to service the Plan Change site will adversely affect the residents of Cashmere Oaks. The extension of the road cannot be supported.

Submission Number: 8		Submitter Name: Wayne Skipage
Decision requested	Plan provision or matter	Explanation or relief sought
8.1	Traffic effects	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Although streets in Cashmere Oaks are wide, they are not laned and do not have controlled intersections or marked parking. ▪ Traffic volume projections are light and increased traffic will have significant impact on entrance to and

		<p>egress from Cashmere Oaks.</p> <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Better road marking and signage. ▪ Reduce speed limit within Cashmere Oaks and Plan Change site to 30km/h.
8.2	<p>Traffic effects</p> <p>Provision of car parking within Plan Change site</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inadequate staff and visitor parking provided on Plan Change site. ▪ Preferable for this to be within boundaries of site to limit significant day long parking by staff and visitors in residential streets off Cashmere Oaks. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Better provision of onsite staff and visitor car parking for retirement village.
8.3	<p>Traffic effects</p> <p>State Highway 2 / Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Moving the 50km/h zone on State Highway 2 insufficient to manage traffic. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Roundabout at intersection to reduce the chance of accidents.
8.4	<p>Urban growth</p> <p>Ancillary services</p> <p>Reliance on use of private cars</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Convenience stores within Cashmere Downs would reduce car usage of residents. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify locations for potential convenience stores.
8.5	<p>Infrastructure effects</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Already considerable demand on existing Lansdowne infrastructure, with water pressure a problem for many Cashmere Oaks residents. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reassurance that Plan Change isn't going to worsen peoples' experiences with infrastructure going forward.
8.6	<p>Urban growth</p> <p>Supporting services</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multiple retirement villages in this area of Masterton, with new Arvida village being developed at northern end of town. Is this a result of Council analysis supporting retirement village locations in this part of Masterton? <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consideration of what supporting services for older people need to be planned / provided in this part of town in near future.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider this in terms of practicality and impact before approving another retirement village in this area.
--	--	---

Submission Number: 9		Submitter Name: Shane Hart
Decision requested	Plan provision or matter	Explanation or relief sought
9.1	<p>Infrastructure effects</p> <p>Wastewater</p> <p>AEE Section 5.5.5</p> <p>The Riley Report (Section 5.4.1)</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 5.5.5 of application states “<i>The assessment considers wastewater demand from the Request, the capacity of the existing network and planned upgrades, and considers that the Site can be suitably serviced</i>” yet details are not provided on the scope of the planned upgrades, nor are confirmed designs of services in Cashmere Oaks Stage 2. ▪ The Riley Report (Section 5.4.1) notes final design and RL of new proposed Cashmere Oaks Wastewater Reticulation and Pump Station yet to be confirmed. ▪ The Riley Report (Section 5.4.1) notes proposed PS discharges to a gravity main that connects to a 150mm-diameter main in Opaki Road (State Highway 2). ▪ Not clear from Request or any of the civil reports how existing system will take the main flow from the PS to State Highway 2. ▪ Concerns with capacity of system if connection is to be via 150mm-diameter main which runs down centre of McDonald Way and via easement through east side of 12 McDonald Way (joining on a manhole located on the rear property of 12 McDonald Way) before flows toward Opaki Road via easements on 11, 13 and 15 McDonald Way. ▪ Have been recurring blockages of sewer between McDonald Way and State Highway 2, and WaterCare have informed that the fall on the wastewater main in McDonald Way and via the easement appears to be insufficient and less than the required 1:200 fall. ▪ Council planned upgrades for the Opaki Road main (noted in the Riley report (section 5.4.1) from 150mm diameter to 225mm or 300mm) will not address the limitations of the existing wastewater main between McDonald Way and State Highway 2 due to insufficient size and fall, if this is part of the intended route. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The developer should confirm final design and RL of the new proposed Cashmere Oaks Wastewater Reticulation and Pump Station and confirm the wastewater connection to State Highway 2. ▪ More information should be provided on the state and suitability of the existing or planned wastewater mains affected by the Request. ▪ Not to approve the plan change request until appropriate upgrades to civil engineering (namely potable water and wastewater) are confirmed and agreed on, or an alternative plan submitted and agreed upon, and an outcome found where the Plan Change will not place any property at risk due to insufficient water

		<p>pressures for firefighting demands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A binding requirement to install booster pumps on potable water supply should be made before the plan change is granted.
9.2	<p>Infrastructure effects</p> <p>Potable water / water for firefighting</p> <p>AEE Section 5.5.6</p> <p>The Riley Report (Section 5.5.1, Section 5.5.2)</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ McDonald Way water pressure is poor especially during peak times. ▪ The following assessment is included in the Request: <i>“the potable water supply demands for a mixed use of residential and retirement village activities at the site can be accommodated within these estimated demands”</i>. The assessment also indicates Council should consider installation of booster pumps as part of already planned upgrade works to a local reservoir to ensure optimal performance of the network. ▪ This statement appears to be made on the assumption that Council is upgrading the network with booster pumps. It is not confirmed at any point of the Request or consultant reports if booster pumps are going to be installed. ▪ Future planned reservoir upgrades mentioned in the report do not have any mention of booster pumps (only of storage volume). ▪ The Riley Report (see Section 5.5.1) assumes an existing feed to the subdivision of 200mm; however Council records indicate the feed is only 150mm in Opaki Road further reducing to 100mm in Cashmere Oaks Drive. ▪ Section 5.5.2 of the Riley Report considers firefighting water supply. It is noted that sufficient pressure in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 would be <i>“unlikely to achieve as the current static pressures are no greater than 200kPa”</i> and a booster pump <i>“will likely be required to maintain pressure to the hydrant and reticulated supply around the site”</i>. ▪ Clear from the aforementioned points that the potable water supply demands for a mixed use of residential and retirement village activities at the site can NOT be accommodated within the current network, and effects have not been sufficiently explored or addressed. ▪ I note a current condition to the Cashmere Oaks subdivision (see Consent Notice issued pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991 in respect of the Fee Simple subdivision of Lots 14-60 being subdivided of Lots 1-7 DP 386783, Lot 9 DP 386783, Lot 12 DP 386783 and Lot 13 DP 386783 and lodged for deposit under Plan No 429991) that <i>“Cashmere specific potable water supply network upgrades will be carried out at future stages of development when required when capacity becomes an issue within the Future Development Area. The cost of this work will be borne by the developer, regardless of the infrastructure being owned by the Masterton District Council”</i>. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Upgrade work including installation of booster pumps at the reservoir needs to be carried out before further developments are approved (upgrades should be funded either by the Cashmere Oaks developer or Council; but it appears this should be on the developer to fund). ▪ It should be confirmed if the current existing water feed to the subdivision is 100mm, 150mm or 200mm as

		<p>there appears to be some inconsistency between the reports, the developer and Council records.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Request should include an independent report including detailed analysis and design of the firefighting water requirements for the development including how these may affect flows in the current subdivision, to ensure future firefighting needs can be satisfied. ▪ Not to approve the Plan Change until appropriate upgrades to civil engineering (namely potable water and wastewater) are confirmed and agreed on, or an alternative plan submitted and agreed upon, and an outcome found where the private plan change will not place any property at risk due to insufficient water pressures for firefighting demands. ▪ A binding requirement to install booster pumps on potable water supply should be made before the plan change is granted.
--	--	---

Submission Number: 10		Submitter Name: Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency
Decision requested	Plan provision or matter	Explanation or relief sought
10.1	Entire Plan Change Waka Kotahi interests Submission scope	Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interests of Waka Kotahi: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Manager of State Highway system ○ Transport investor ○ Planner of land transport system ○ Provider of access to and use of land transport system. ▪ This submission relates to the entire plan change request and all and any objectives, policies, rules and standards within the operative Wairarapa Combined District Plan that would apply to the land if it were rezoned urban, per the request. Relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.2	Entire Plan Change Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS)	Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Waka Kotahi has interest in giving effect to GPS. This includes 'Road-to-Zero Strategy' where no loss of life is acceptable. Relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.3	Traffic effects	Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plan Change site can only be accessed via intersection of Cashmere Oaks Drive and State Highway 2 (the

	<p>Traffic hazards</p> <p>State Highway 2 / Cashmere Oaks intersection</p> <p>Land Transport Rules: Setting of Speed Limits 2022 https://www.nzta.govt.nz/resources/rules/setting-of-speed-limits-2022/</p> <p>Land use intensification, minimum lot size</p>	<p>intersection).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant has not adequately assessed traffic effects with particular respect to the intersection, and the integration of land use and urban expansion with the existing transport network. ▪ Crash prediction modelling undertaken by Waka Kotahi indicates there would be increase in deaths and serious injuries (DSI) at this intersection following development of Plan Change site. ▪ <i>The intersection</i> was initially approved by Waka Kotahi in early 2000s. During this period traffic volumes on State Highway 2 were lower and the District Plan anticipated an average lot size of 1,200m². The low-density lot size controls the traffic flow from <i>the intersection</i> – with approval from Waka Kotahi conditional on the retention of the low-density development anticipated in the area. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Consider whether <i>the intersection</i> in its current form is suitable for additional volumes of traffic generated from higher intensity land use in the immediate locality. A different intersection type (a roundabout) would remedy this and provide a safer outcome. ▪ Crossing facilities on SH2 are warranted, which would require infrastructure upgrades in line with the ability to reduce speeds under the ‘Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2022’. ▪ Waka Kotahi considers that, without investment at the SH2 intersection, intensification at this locality through the Plan Change is not supportable.
10.4	<p>Traffic effects</p> <p>Multi-modal transport</p> <p>Connectivity</p> <p>Recreation Trail Network https://mstn.govt.nz/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/RecBrochureMap.jpg</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Waka Kotahi is concerned that applicant has not given due consideration to cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, along with place function and a roading layout (by way of a structure plan) that would facilitate public transport in the future. ▪ Within vicinity of Plan Change site, the area is used for the Recreation Trail Network. Strava Global Heat Mapping indicated local residents have desire to connect to this network by crossing State Highway 2 (100 km/h area) rather than taking footpath south to Forth Street (50km/h area). ▪ These people movements exemplify the need for place making at this locality in any urban expansion scenario. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.5	<p>Traffic effects</p> <p>State Highway 2</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environment of State Highway 2 in this location: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The annual average daily traffic count of vehicles on this section of road are increasing, by an estimated 3% per annum (including 6% heavy vehicle traffic). This is unlikely in our view to change given that just immediately north are pockets of developing rural residential activities. ○ The measured 85th percentile speed of the road past the Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection in 2019

		<p>(measured over the course of 1 week) was 82km/h. We also know from these measurements that some motorists are travelling faster, at or above the 100km/h speed limit all throughout the day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is a footpath from Cashmere Oaks Drive, along the western side of SH2 into Masterton which upon observation in the field is being used by residents, Strava global heat mapping also shows good use of this footpath. That portion of footpath within the 100km/h road speed environment is the responsibility of Waka Kotahi, whilst the portion of footpath in the 50km/hr threshold road speed environment is the responsibility of Masterton District Council. ○ During morning and afternoon/evening peak times, most vehicle movements at the Cashmere Oaks/SH2 intersection are right out in the morning and left in during the evening. ○ People already living at this locality have a desire to connect with the Recreational Trail Network on the eastern side of the state highway. ○ The current posted speed limit is 100km/h, and the safe and appropriate speed (SaAS) for this section of state highway (as it is now with no change) has been assessed at 80km/h, based on current infrastructure. ○ Cycling along SH2 is common and Strava global heat mapping shows a reasonable level of cycle use. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.6	<p>Traffic effects</p> <p>Integrated Transport Assessment</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant's Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) does not adequately address effects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The SIDRA modelling analysis in the ITA uses traffic generation rates and state highway traffic volumes that are too low and does not appear to consider the future 5 or 10 years. The full Level of Service loss and the resulting traffic safety issues are therefore underestimated in the ITA. ○ The ITA only provides peak hour traffic analysis. Overall traffic volumes at various times throughout the day and year (traffic volumes vary throughout the year and are considered to peak in summer months), have not been considered. ○ The future traffic scenario has not been sufficiently considered; growth of traffic volumes on SH2 are underrepresented and do not consider local circumstances including traffic growth from rural residential land uses establishing upstream. ○ Insufficient assessment of traffic safety issues for cyclists and pedestrians, and no traffic safety considerations have been made on crossing places for cyclists and pedestrians. ▪ The receiving road environment, including the intersection, is not designed or developed to cater for this volume of traffic. The traffic safety effects resulting from this increase in vehicle generation will undermine the safe and efficient functioning of the transport network and increase the DSI rate at the intersection over time. The traffic safety effects from development of the Plan Change site are not anticipated nor identified by the Plan Change assessments and reports. ▪ The ITA report puts the onus on road controlling authorities to address the impacts of traffic generation from

		<p>development through speed management review. While Waka Kotahi acknowledges its role in ensuring the safety of the state highway network, an applicant is still required to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the effects stemming from its proposed activity.</p> <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.7	<p>Connectivity</p> <p>Rural / urban interface</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Plan Change site is at the current rural / urban interface. This context has not fully or appropriately been considered in the s32 analysis; including the implications of a lack of road, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure to serve the needs of future residents of the Plan Change site. The Plan Change would create a residential zone in a location where there is insufficient connection between the proposed urban area and local recreational opportunities and amenities and is therefore at odds with Part 2 of the RMA. ▪ Introducing more residents in this locality on the western side of State Highway 2 (SH2) without the necessary infrastructure (crossing places) to support people moving between their homes and local amenities in the recreation trail network on the eastern side of SH2, will frustrate future communities and exacerbate existing poor connectivity leading to poor safety outcomes (pedestrians and cyclists crossing a fast section of state highway). <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Development of the Plan Change site will ultimately put pressure on road controlling authorities to invest to fix the problems and, in the interim, will create real safety concerns for the community. Overall, Waka Kotahi considers that the Plan Change does not provide for the social and economic wellbeing of the community.
10.8	<p>Traffic effects</p> <p>State Highway 2 (upgrades)</p> <p>Integrated Transport Assessment</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Waka Kotahi disagrees that speed management review of this section of State Highway 2 (SH2) is the primary mechanism for addressing the adverse traffic effects of the Plan Change. The current SH2 road environment at the Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection has a posted speed limit of 100km/h, and whilst most motorists are travelling slower than that, it is acceptable for motorists to drive to the speed limit, and many do. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Waka Kotahi has undertaken a Safe System Assessment of the Cashmere Oaks / State Highway 2 intersection, under the loads of the traffic generation anticipated in the Plan Change site, including consideration of a retirement village land use. The results indicated that a roundabout intersection would be the most appropriate to serve the needs of future residents and road users.
10.9	Traffic Effects	Explanation:

	State Highway 2 (lowering speed limit)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The SaAS has been assessed as 80km/h, and whilst Waka Kotahi is in the process of reviewing the speed limit for this section of State Highway 2 (SH2) to reduce it to 80km/h under the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2022, the results of that process could not yet be relied upon. ▪ Waka Kotahi could not (under speed management regulations), consider any further lowering of the speed limit without an infrastructure upgrade. To lower the road speed or move the urban 50km/h threshold out beyond the Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection, the road infrastructure must be upgraded to look and feel urban so to drive to the speed limit is intuitive for motorists. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Where development is the instigator for the need for such change and related investment, through remedying or mitigating effects, the cost for such investment should be borne by the development. In this case that need is generated primarily from land uses that would be facilitated by the Plan Change, being the highest contributor to traffic generation in the area, and at the intersection.
10.10	Traffic effects State Highway 2 (upgrades) Access	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If the traffic effects of the Plan Change are required to be remedied or mitigated with speed management, Waka Kotahi considers that the posted speed limit reduction from 100km/h to the assessed SaAS of 80km/h would be insufficient alone. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Waka Kotahi has undertaken a Safe System Assessment of the Cashmere Oaks Drive / SH2 intersection, under the loads of the traffic generation anticipated in the plan change area, including consideration of a retirement village land use. The results indicated that a roundabout intersection would be the most appropriate to serve the needs of future residents and road users.
10.11	State Highway 2 (upgrades) 2024-2027 National Land Transport Plan	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At present there are no public projects, strategic investments or improvements proposed to alter or upgrade the receiving road environment to provide for the further urbanisation of land at this locality. Waka Kotahi and Masterton District Council are in the very early stages of a Point of Entry, which will lead into consideration of the need for investment and improvements, with the aim for any such investment to be considered for funding in the 2024-2027 National Land Transport Plan. However, until that work is complete and funding decisions are made, there is no planning framework in place by which any future developer could make a financial or development contribution to public works that could mitigate the adverse effects of development in the plan change area on the wider transport network. This includes works that would instigate the ability to lower the speed limit of SH2 below the assessed SaAS of 80km/h. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.

10.12	<p>Traffic effects</p> <p>Traffic effects resulting from development (Plan Change stage)</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At this stage of the planning process (i.e., the Plan Change application), the additional traffic generated by development from land use activities provided for within the proposed urban zone must be considered to generate more than minor adverse traffic safety effects on the receiving road environment (specifically State Highway 2 and the intersection with Cashmere Oaks Drive), from the quantum of additional traffic anticipated. ▪ These effects could not be addressed (avoided, remedied, or mitigated) within the policy framework or rules proposed to apply to the plan change area. ▪ There is no rule in the District Plan at present, nor any proposed in the Plan Change, that would provide for the consideration of traffic safety effects at the Cashmere Oaks Drive / State Highway 2 intersection in any resource consent application scenario. ▪ The Plan Change is therefore not in keeping with Part 2 of the Resource Management Act, as it will not achieve a policy framework that will provide for the future communities' social and economic wellbeing; nor their health and safety when it comes to transport safety. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.13	<p>Traffic effects</p> <p>Traffic effects resulting from development (resource consent stage)</p> <p>Proposed activity status of future development</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The effect of the Plan Change is to make development of the Plan Change site a controlled activity under the District Plan. Any resource consent application to ultimately develop the Plan Change site would therefore not be required to assess the traffic effects of the proposed development on the Cashmere Oaks Drive / State Highway 2 intersection, nor would Waka Kotahi be required to be notified as an affected party. ▪ The Cashmere Oaks Drive / State Highway 2 intersection is the only route by which to access the Plan Change site. It is therefore reasonable that Waka Kotahi be notified of development for which consent is ultimately sought. ▪ The consent application would contain a more detailed description of a proposed activity / development, and therefore more detailed estimates of traffic volumes. ▪ The consent application could be assessed against the existing road environment at that time (including any speed management reviews, and further urbanisation of 'look and feel' of the road corridor). <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Waka Kotahi considers that the traffic effects of any proposed development must be assessed as part of any resource consent application.
10.14	Traffic effects	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Plan Change does not adequately consider Objective TT1 17.3.1 managing the road network; and

	<p>Traffic effects resulting from development</p> <p>Objective TT1 17.3.1, Policies under 17.3.2 TT1, Operative District Plan</p>	<p>related policies under 17.3.2 TT1 of the Operative District Plan which future development should be in keeping with.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development of either residential properties or a retirement village within the Plan Change site would be contrary to this policy framework because the function of the State Highway (being a strategic arterial road) is not recognised and protected from the traffic generation that would result; no controls or standards for land use and subdivision are proposed that would avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects of future land use on the safe and efficient functioning and operation of the road network (in this case Opaki Road / State Highway 2); and there is nothing in the proposed plan provisions that would support and encourage the safe provision of non-vehicular (cycling and walking) forms of transport to and around the locality. A sound integrated transport and land use system should result from development however, the plan change as proposed will not deliver this outcome. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.15	<p>NPS-UD 2020</p> <p>Transport Linkages</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, which promotes urban development that reduces travel distances and lowers reliance on private vehicles. ▪ The Plan Change introduces nothing that would be in keeping with this direction, it does not propose any changes to the existing road environment to promote mode shift in transport options, including public transport, cycling and walking; and does not seek to introduce district plan provisions that would require this outcome. ▪ The structure plan proposed is extremely limited and does not consider these matters. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.16	<p>Traffic Effects</p> <p>State Highway 2 / Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection</p> <p>DSI (deaths and serious injuries)</p>	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic generation from development within the Plan Change site will result in a higher rate of deaths and serious injuries (DSI) at the intersection of Cashmere Oaks Drive and State Highway 2 (SH2), unless the road infrastructure is upgraded. ▪ Furthermore, it is noteworthy that statistically DSI crashes are more severe for older demographics; therefore, development of a retirement village at this location without an upgrade to the road infrastructure is of significant concern to Waka Kotahi. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Installation of a rural roundabout is considered an acceptable option to reduce DSIs, otherwise significant alterations (upgrades) to the look and feel of the road over at least 400m, would need to be made to reduce the speed limit to support the vehicle generation and people movements anticipated from development of

		the Plan Change site.
10.17	Overall decision requested for Plan Change	<p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change; OR ▪ Grant the alternative relief sought. <p>Alternative relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should the local authority be mindful to confirm the plan change request, Waka Kotahi seeks significant amendments to the Plan Change to require consideration of the following outcomes (See two following outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Traffic safety: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduce policy and rules that require an upgrade of roading infrastructure to support vehicle generation from activities within the plan change area, ensuring this could apply at either subdivision or land use application stages (Waka Kotahi would like to be involved in discussion of what a trigger may look like). ▪ Consider changes to development contributions policy and rules to ensure there is the ability to remedy or mitigate traffic safety effects via such means and that the trigger for such contributions is agreed between Waka Kotahi and Masterton District Council. ▪ Amend the activity status of any future subdivision or land use to discretionary. ▪ Seek further information from the applicant with respect to the adverse traffic safety effects that traffic generation from the Plan Change site will have on the Cashmere Oaks Drive / State Highway 2 intersection. ▪ Seek further information from the applicant on the ways in which the adverse traffic safety effects, for all users, can be avoided, remedied, or mitigated. ▪ Amend the Plan Change to require those traffic safety effects to be avoided, remedied, or mitigated in a way that is acceptable to Waka Kotahi and Masterton District Council, including by ensuring the traffic effects are included as a matter of discretion within the proposed policy and rule framework. ▪ Restrict development within the Plan Change site until roading infrastructure upon which it relies has been upgraded to cater for the development the Plan Change would facilitate, either by way of public works, private investment or through development / financial contributions. ○ Walking, cycling and place function: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seek inclusion of, and require adherence to a more detailed structure plan that has details on how public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure will connect future communities with the rest of Masterton and the existing recreational opportunities in the immediate vicinity, specifically the reserve areas on the eastern side of State Highway 2. ▪ Introduce policy that requires an upgrade of roading infrastructure to support all people movements from activities within the Plan Change site, ensuring this could apply at either

Masterton District Council: Welhom Developments Limited Private Plan Change
Summary of Submissions and Decisions Requested

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">subdivision or land use application stages.▪ Restrict development within the Plan Change site until the roading infrastructure has been upgraded to cater for the development the Plan Change would facilitate, either by way of public works, private investment or through development / financial contributions.▪ Any other relief that would provide for the adequate consideration of potential effects on the state highway environment and all its users.
--	--	--

4 Submissions in Order of Plan Provision or Matter

Plan Provision: Welhom Developments Limited Private Plan Change in its entirety		
Decision requested	Submitters name	Explanation or relief sought
3.1 & 3.2	Debbie van Zyl	Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
4.1	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support Plan Change with amendments.
4.2 & 4.3	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose Plan Change due to lack of provision for multi-modal transport and NPS-HPL.
7.1-7.9	Albert Edward (Ted) Taylor	Decline the Plan Change.
10.1-10.17	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.

Plan Provision: Proposed new standard 5.5.2(n)		
Decision requested	Submitters name	Explanation or relief sought
2.1	Kevin Lionel & Treacy Marie Galbraith	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about proximity (within 3m) and height of buildings in relation to external boundaries of Plan Change site with residential properties in Cashmere Oaks. ▪ Proposed setback distances and building heights will adversely affect the rural amenity / lifestyle of owners of adjoining residential properties. Adjoining landowners bought their properties to live rurally, not next to tall buildings. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limit building heights to single storey along external boundaries of Plan Change site.
6.3 & 6.4	Heather May & John Carl Sexton	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about section sizes and building heights. ▪ The application refers to mix of one and two storey standalone dwellings with a maximum height of 10m on a lot size of 400m². ▪ Section 5.1 of the application refers to a minimum lot size of 350m² with an average lot size of 400m².

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cashmere Oaks subdivision average lot size is greater than 400m². ▪ The application refers to mix of one and two storey standalone dwellings. ▪ Application contains request for higher building height of 14m. Understand from applicant this will be a building for rest home / hospital care. Note when new local hospital was built in 2005, went from multi-level building to single level building. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section sizes and covenants should follow those of the Cashmere Oaks subdivision. ▪ All retirement village buildings, including rest home and hospital, should be single storey.
7.4	Albert Edward (Ted) Taylor	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application states that “<i>the site is suitable for urban development given its negligible environmental values in terms of landscape...</i>”. ▪ Landscape and Visual Assessment states views of Plan Change site from private locations “<i>Open to no views of the Site from dwellings located to the north, east and south of the site</i>”. Statement is incorrect, large parts of the site are able viewed from the west side of Sir Herbert Hart Avenue. ▪ If development goes ahead would have significant visual effect on dwellings on west side of Sir Herbert Hart Avenue, particularly views of 14m high building. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ Disagree with statement that there are negligible landscape effects.

Plan Provision: Proposed Change 1 to Wellington Regional Policy Statement

Decision requested	Submitters name	Explanation or relief sought
4.1	Greater Wellington Regional Council	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GWRC supports intent of plan change to provide housing / housing choices to the district, but Plan Change must have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support with amendments. ▪ Ensure plan change provisions have regard to qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments (Objective 22 of RPS Change 1) by including objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristics. ▪ Ensure the plan change provisions and development have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 policies 55,

		UD.3 and 57.
4.2	Greater Wellington Regional Council	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current approach to connecting development to town centre does not have regard to RPS Change 1 direction on climate change emissions, ensuring transport infrastructure is in place prior to development and providing for multi-modal transport. ▪ Providing access through Cashmere Oaks will cause development to be poorly connected to State Highway 2 and Masterton town centre. ▪ Integrated Transport Assessment recognises likely to be low uptake of cycling, pedestrian activity and public transport by future residents of Plan Change site. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose. ▪ Provide for greater multi-modal transport links through the development and consider whether development will provide good connections to Masterton town centre.

Plan Provision: NPS-HPL / Rural productivity effects

Decision requested	Submitters name	Explanation or relief sought
4.3	Greater Wellington Regional Council	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plan Change site is LUC (Land Use Capability) Class 3 land. ▪ Proposal is not located in a future development area identified in the Operative District Plan. ▪ The applicant's Integrated Transport Assessment refers to the Masterton Urban Growth Strategy 2019 (MUGS), which identified the Plan Change site as a 'potential future urban expansion area'. But MUGS was not adopted or published by Masterton District Council, so the site does not meet the definition of 'identified for future development'. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose. ▪ Consider direction provided by National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 (NPS-HPL). Specifically, direction to avoid urban zoning in rural land with LUC classes of 1, 2 or 3 until the Regional Policy Statement has mapped highly productive land. ▪ Give effect to clause 3.6(4) of NPS-HPL by assessing whether Plan Change meets all criteria for urban re-zoning of highly productive land to be allowed.
5.3	Bryce & Emma Keane	Explanation:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rezoning flat farmable land. ▪ Not looking to rezone land between Plan Change site and the State Highway 2. Will result in inconsistent, piecemeal zoning. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant Plan Change with conditions.
--	--	--

Plan Provision: NPS-UD / MUGS / Urban growth

Decision requested	Submitters name	Explanation or relief sought
4.3	Greater Wellington Regional Council	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plan Change site is LUC (Land Use Capability) Class 3 land. ▪ Proposal is not located in a future development area identified in the Operative District Plan. ▪ The applicant's Integrated Transport Assessment refers to the Masterton Urban Growth Strategy 2019 (MUGS), which identified the Plan Change site as a 'potential future urban expansion area'. But MUGS was not adopted or published by Masterton District Council, so the site does not meet the definition of 'identified for future development'. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose. ▪ Consider direction provided by National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 (NPS-HPL). Specifically, direction to avoid urban zoning in rural land with LUC classes of 1, 2 or 3 until the Regional Policy Statement has mapped highly productive land. ▪ Give effect to clause 3.6(4) of NPS-HPL by assessing whether Plan Change meets all criteria for urban re-zoning of highly productive land to be allowed.
7.1	Albert Edward (Ted) Taylor	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application references MUGS and states "<i>Urban development of the Site will be consistent with the Council's urban growth strategy which identifies the Site as a possible future urban development area</i>". ▪ The Plan Change is not part of any formal structure plan or similar planning document that guides extension of the Masterton residential area. ▪ MUGS only exists to aid decision making in relation to urban planning, not intended as support for Plan Change. ▪ Area identified as C03 (Map 5, Page 56, AEE) encompasses the Plan Change site and balance land bordering on Opaki Road. ▪ Plan Change makes no provision for access to Opaki Road and integrating this with future re-zoning of all of

		<p style="text-align: center;">area C03.</p> <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ If MUGS is to guide urban growth this should be decided in total for area C03 (Map 5, Page 56, MUGS) and not piecemeal. ▪ Oppose poor integration of Plan Change. ▪ Disagree with application regarding environmental benefits that relate to urban development and MUGS and the relationship with adjoining property (Cashmere Oaks and area C03).
8.4	Wayne Skipage	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Convenience stores within Cashmere Downs would reduce car usage of residents. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify locations for potential convenience stores.
8.6	Wayne Skipage	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multiple retirement villages in this area of Masterton, with new Arvida village being developed at northern end of town. Is this a result of Council analysis supporting retirement village locations in this part of Masterton? <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consideration of what supporting services for older people need to be planned / provided in this part of town in near future. ▪ Consider this in terms of practicality and impact before approving another retirement village in this area.
10.15	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, which promotes urban development that reduces travel distances and lowers reliance on private vehicles. ▪ The Plan Change introduces nothing that would be in keeping with this direction, it does not propose any changes to the existing road environment to promote mode shift in transport options, including public transport, cycling and walking; and does not seek to introduce district plan provisions that would require this outcome. ▪ The structure plan proposed is extremely limited and does not consider these matters. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline Plan Change or grant alternative relief sought.

Plan Provision: Traffic effects		
Decision requested	Submitters name	Explanation or relief sought
1.1	John & Kate Remfry	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of Cashmere Oaks entrance will substantially increase traffic load and adversely affect existing residents of Cashmere Oaks. ▪ Residents of Cashmere Oaks would not have expected this increase in traffic when they purchased their properties. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Significantly improve the entry to Cashmere Oaks Drive from State Highway 2 to “<i>take into account the vastly increased number of elderly residents who would be turning right onto SH2 to go to town</i>”. ▪ Extend the current 30km/h zone, consider installing traffic lights or a roundabout for the safety of residents and road users.
1.2	John & Kate Remfry	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access through Cashmere Oaks between State Highway 2 and the retirement village will result in disruption from heavy vehicle movements passing through the residential neighbourhood over a period of many years. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide alternative access to the retirement village from State Highway 2 (not via Cashmere Oaks). ▪ Consider temporary access (not via Cashmere Oaks) during building phase so Cashmere Oaks residents are not bothered by heavy vehicles for years.
3.2	Debbie van Zyl	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Already dangerous to exit Cashmere Drive onto a 100km/h section of State Highway 2. ▪ Existing traffic volumes result in wait times of up to 8 minutes to safely turn right onto State Highway 2 towards Masterton from Cashmere Oaks Drive. ▪ Current access into Cashmere Oaks from State Highway 2 is dangerous due to ‘tailgating’ of slower vehicles turning left into Cashmere Oaks Drive and following vehicles overtaking across double yellow lines. Cars exiting Cashmere Oaks Drive and turning right towards Masterton may not see these vehicles, increasing the risk of accidents at this intersection. ▪ Application indicates no accidents have happened yet, but this is incorrect as there have been some minor accidents. ▪ Using the intersection of State Highway 2 and Cashmere Oaks Drive to provide access for the Plan Change will result in traffic safety issues. <p>Relief sought:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Work with Waka Kotahi to extend 50km/h speed limit past 'Welcome to Masterton' sign north of the Arvida Lansdowne Park extension. ▪ Provide dedicated left turn lane into Cashmere Oaks Drive from State Highway 2. Could pipe and cover over existing drainage ditch to make space for a dedicated left turn lane. ▪ Consider other options for improving intersection of State Highway 2 and Cashmere Oaks Drive, including a roundabout or the installation of traffic lights at the intersection. ▪ As an alternative to reducing the speed limit of State Highway 2 and improving the intersection of State Highway 2 and Cashmere Oaks Drive, provide a separate access to the Plan Change site (separate from Cashmere Oaks' roading).
4.2	Greater Wellington Regional Council	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current approach to connecting development to town centre does not have regard to RPS Change 1 direction on climate change emissions, ensuring transport infrastructure is in place prior to development and providing for multi-modal transport. ▪ Providing access through Cashmere Oaks will cause development to be poorly connected to State Highway 2 and Masterton town centre. ▪ Integrated Transport Assessment recognises likely to be low uptake of cycling, pedestrian activity and public transport by future residents of Plan Change site. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose. ▪ Provide for greater multi-modal transport links through the development and consider whether development will provide good connections to Masterton town centre.
5.1	Bryce & Emma Keane	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submission relates to the proposed entrance to the site and other concerns. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant Plan Change with conditions.
6.1	Heather May & John Carl Sexton	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application states access to Plan Change site will be through Cashmere Oaks. ▪ Site description in AEE includes Lot 36 DP 429991, which is subject to several right of way easements. ▪ Lot 36 DP 429991 currently provides access to Plan Change site. ▪ Understand from applicant that it is not intended for Plan Change site to have use of, or an easement over, Lot 36 DP 429991. Application doesn't reflect this. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approval of Plan Change should be conditional on alternative access to Plan Change site being made

		available, and no further easements being granted over Lot 36 DP 429991 to provide access to Plan Change site.
7.3	Albert Edward (Ted) Taylor	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application (Figure 6-1, page 11, Appendix 6) shows access to Plan Change site from Cashmere Oaks by converting cul-de-sac adjacent to Lots 102 and 103 and the reserve to a through road. This is an ad hoc approach and not a logical extension of Cashmere Oaks. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ Oppose poor integration of Plan Change and ad hoc approach to access and connectivity.
7.6	Albert Edward (Ted) Taylor	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application states “<i>the Site is suitable for urban development given its negligible environmental values in terms of the ability for it to be appropriately serviced....</i>”. ▪ Refers to transport under Environmental Costs as it is considered that the benefits proposed are outweighed by the costs. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change.
7.8	Albert Edward (Ted) Taylor	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plan Change is completely dependent on using Cashmere Oaks Drive for access to the site. ▪ Integrated Transport Assessment notes the intersection with State Highway 2 will require improvements. ▪ The recommended improvements would benefit existing traffic that uses the intersection but would not be sufficient to accommodate additional traffic resulting from Plan Change. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ Disagree that improvements to intersection will be sufficient for Plan Change.
7.9	Albert Edward (Ted) Taylor	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intersection of Cashmere Oaks Drive, Coralie Place and Sir Herbert Hart Avenue has unconventional layout and was not designed to service more than the Cashmere Oaks subdivision. ▪ Noted on page 20 of Appendix 6 that 4.85m lane widths would be available to accommodate additional traffic generated by development of Plan Change site. This would allow room to pass cyclists at slow speed but “<i>on street parking would not be expected</i>”. ▪ This statement is incorrect as on-street parking is more likely to occur based on use of existing roads in Cashmere Oaks – diminishing the ability of Cashmere Oaks to accommodate additional traffic. <p>Relief sought:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ The costs of extending Cashmere Oaks Drive to service the Plan Change site will adversely affect the residents of Cashmere Oaks. The extension of the road cannot be supported.
8.1	Wayne Skipage	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Although streets in Cashmere Oaks are wide, they are not laned and do not have controlled intersections or marked parking. ▪ Traffic volume projections are light and increased traffic will have significant impact on entrance to and egress from Cashmere Oaks. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Better road marking and signage. ▪ Reduce speed limit within Cashmere Oaks and Plan Change site to 30km/h.
8.2	Wayne Skipage	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inadequate staff and visitor parking provided on Plan Change site. ▪ Preferable for this to be within boundaries of site to limit significant day long parking by staff and visitors in residential streets of Cashmere Oaks. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Better provision of onsite staff and visitor car parking for retirement village.
8.3	Wayne Skipage	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Moving the 50km/h zone on State Highway 2 insufficient to manage traffic. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Roundabout at intersection to reduce the chance of accidents.
10.1	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interests of Waka Kotahi: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Manager of State Highway system ○ Transport investor ○ Planner of land transport system ○ Provider of access to and use of land transport system. ▪ This submission relates to the entire plan change request and all and any objectives, policies, rules and standards within the operative Wairarapa Combined District Plan that would apply to the land if it were rezoned urban, per the request. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.

10.2	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Waka Kotahi has interest in giving effect to GPS. This includes 'Road-to-Zero Strategy' where no loss of life is acceptable. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.3	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plan Change site can only be accessed via intersection of Cashmere Oaks Drive and State Highway 2 (the intersection). ▪ Applicant has not adequately assessed traffic effects with particular respect to the intersection, and the integration of land use and urban expansion with the existing transport network. ▪ Crash prediction modelling undertaken by Waka Kotahi indicates there would be increase in deaths and serious injuries (DSI) at this intersection following development of Plan Change site. ▪ <i>The intersection</i> was initially approved by Waka Kotahi in early 2000s. During this period traffic volumes on State Highway 2 were lower and the District Plan anticipated an average lot size of 1,200m². The low-density lot size controls the traffic flow from <i>the intersection</i> – with approval from Waka Kotahi conditional on the retention of the low-density development anticipated in the area. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Consider whether <i>the intersection</i> in its current form is suitable for additional volumes of traffic generated from higher intensity land use in the immediate locality. A different intersection type (a roundabout) would remedy this and provide a safer outcome. ▪ Crossing facilities on SH2 are warranted, which would require infrastructure upgrades in line with the ability to reduce speeds under the 'Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2022'. ▪ Waka Kotahi considers that, without investment at the SH2 intersection, intensification at this locality through the Plan Change is not supportable.
10.4	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Waka Kotahi is concerned that applicant has not given due consideration to cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, along with place function and a roading layout (by way of a structure plan) that would facilitate public transport in the future. ▪ Within vicinity of Plan Change site, area is used for the Recreation Trail Network. Strava Global Heat Mapping indicated local residents have desire to connect to this network by crossing State Highway 2 (100 km/h area) rather than taking footpath south to Forth Street (50km/h area). ▪ These people movements exemplify the need for place making at this locality in any urban expansion scenario.

		<p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.5	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environment of State Highway 2 in this location: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The annual average daily traffic count of vehicles on this section of road are increasing, by an estimated 3% per annum (including 6% heavy vehicle traffic). This is unlikely in our view to change given that just immediately north are pockets of developing rural residential activities. ○ The measured 85th percentile speed of the road past the Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection in 2019 (measured over the course of 1 week) was 82km/h. We also know from these measurements that some motorists are travelling faster, at or above the 100km/h speed limit all throughout the day. ○ There is a footpath from Cashmere Oaks Drive, along the western side of SH2 into Masterton which upon observation in the field is being used by residents, Strava global heat mapping also shows good use of this footpath. That portion footpath within the 100km/h road speed environment is the responsibility of Waka Kotahi, whilst the portion of footpath in the 50km/hr threshold road speed environment is the responsibility of Masterton District Council. ○ During morning and afternoon/evening peak times, most vehicle movements at the Cashmere Oaks/SH2 intersection are right out in the morning and left in during the evening ○ People already living at this locality have a desire to connect with the Recreational Trail Network on the eastern side of the state highway. ○ The current posted speed limit is 100km/h, and the safe and appropriate speed (SaAS) for this section of state highway (as it is now with no change) has been assessed at 80km/h, based on current infrastructure. ○ Cycling along SH2 is common and Strava global heat mapping shows a reasonable level of cycle use. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.6	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant's Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) does not adequately address effects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The SIDRA modelling analysis in the ITA uses traffic generation rates and state highway traffic volumes that are too low and does not appear to consider the future 5 or 10 years. The full Level of Service loss and the resulting traffic safety issues are therefore underestimated in the ITA. ○ The ITA only provides peak hour traffic analysis. Overall traffic volumes at various times throughout the day and year (traffic volumes vary throughout the year and are considered to peak in summer months), have not been considered. ○ The future traffic scenario has not been sufficiently considered; growth of traffic volumes on SH2 are

		<p style="text-align: center;">underrepresented and do not consider local circumstances including traffic growth from rural residential land uses establishing upstream.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Insufficient assessment of traffic safety issues for cyclists and pedestrians, and no traffic safety considerations have been made on crossing places for cyclists and pedestrians. ▪ The receiving road environment, including the intersection, is not designed or developed to cater for this volume of traffic. The traffic safety effects resulting from this increase in vehicle generation will undermine the safe and efficient functioning of the transport network and increase the DSI rate at the intersection over time. The traffic safety effects from development of the Plan Change site are not anticipated nor identified by the Plan Change assessments and reports. ▪ The ITA report puts the onus on road controlling authorities to address the impacts of traffic generation from development through speed management review. While Waka Kotahi acknowledges its role in ensuring the safety of the state highway network, an applicant is still required to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the effects stemming from its proposed activity. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.7	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Plan Change site is at the current rural / urban interface. This context has not fully or appropriately been considered in the s32 analysis; including the implications of a lack of road, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure to serve the needs of future residents of the Plan Change site. The Plan Change would create a residential zone in a location where there is insufficient connection between the proposed urban area and local recreational opportunities and amenities and is therefore at odds with Part 2 of the RMA. ▪ Introducing more residents in this locality on the western side of State Highway 2 (SH2) without the necessary infrastructure (crossing places) to support people moving between their homes and local amenities in the recreation trail network on the eastern side of SH2, will frustrate future communities and exacerbate existing poor connectivity leading to poor safety outcomes (pedestrians and cyclists crossing a fast section of state highway). <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Development of the Plan Change site will ultimately put pressure on road controlling authorities to invest to fix the problems and, in the interim, will create real safety concerns for the community. Overall, Waka Kotahi considers that the Plan Change does not provide for the social and economic wellbeing of the community.
10.8	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Waka Kotahi disagrees that speed management review of this section of State Highway 2 (SH2) is the primary mechanism for addressing the adverse traffic effects of the Plan Change. The current SH2 road environment at the Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection has a posted speed limit of 100km/h, and whilst most

		<p>motorists are travelling slower than that, it is acceptable for motorists to drive to the speed limit, and many do.</p> <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Waka Kotahi has undertaken a Safe System Assessment of the Cashmere Oaks / State Highway 2 intersection, under the loads of the traffic generation anticipated in the Plan Change site, including consideration of a retirement village land use. The results indicated that a roundabout intersection would be the most appropriate to serve the needs of future residents and road users.
10.9	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The SaAS has been assessed as 80km/h, and whilst Waka Kotahi is in the process of reviewing the speed limit for this section of State Highway 2 (SH2) to reduce it to 80km/h under the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2022, the results of that process could not yet be relied upon. ▪ Waka Kotahi could not (under speed management regulations), consider any further lowering of the speed limit without an infrastructure upgrade. To lower the road speed or move the urban 50km/h threshold out beyond the Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection, the road infrastructure must be upgraded to look and feel urban so to drive to the speed limit is intuitive for motorists. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Where development is the instigator for the need for such change and related investment, through remedying or mitigating effects, the cost for such investment should be borne by the development. In this case that need is generated primarily from land uses that would be facilitated by the Plan Change, being the highest contributor to traffic generation in the area, and at the intersection.
10.10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If the traffic effects of the Plan Change are required to be remedied or mitigated with speed management, Waka Kotahi considers that the posted speed limit reduction from 100km/h to the assessed SaAS of 80km/h would be insufficient alone. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Waka Kotahi has undertaken a Safe System Assessment of the Cashmere Oaks Drive / SH2 intersection, under the loads of the traffic generation anticipated in the plan change area, including consideration of a retirement village land use. The results indicated that a roundabout intersection would be the most appropriate to serve the needs of future residents and road users.
10.11	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At present there are no public projects, strategic investments or improvements proposed to alter or upgrade

		<p>the receiving road environment to provide for the further urbanisation of land at this locality. Waka Kotahi and Masterton District Council are in the very early stages of a Point of Entry, which will lead into consideration of the need for investment and improvements, with the aim for any such investment to be considered for funding in the 2024-2027 National Land Transport Plan. However, until that work is complete and funding decisions are made, there is no planning framework in place by which any future developer could make a financial or development contribution to public works that could mitigate the adverse effects of development in the plan change area on the wider transport network. This includes works that would instigate the ability to lower the speed limit of SH2 below the assessed SaAS of 80km/h.</p> <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.12	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At this stage of the planning process (i.e., the Plan Change application), the additional traffic generated by development from land use activities provided for within the proposed urban zone must be considered to generate more than minor adverse traffic safety effects on the receiving road environment (specifically State Highway 2 and the intersection with Cashmere Oaks Drive), from the quantum of additional traffic anticipated. ▪ These effects could not be addressed (avoided, remedied, or mitigated) within the policy framework or rules proposed to apply to the plan change area. ▪ There is no rule in the District Plan at present, nor any proposed in the Plan Change, that would provide for the consideration of traffic safety effects at the Cashmere Oaks Drive / State Highway 2 intersection in any resource consent application scenario. ▪ The Plan Change is therefore not in keeping with Part 2 of the Resource Management Act, as it will not achieve a policy framework that will provide for the future communities' social and economic wellbeing; nor their health and safety when it comes to transport safety. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.13	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The effect of the Plan Change is to make development of the Plan Change site a controlled activity under the District Plan. Any resource consent application to ultimately develop the Plan Change site would therefore not be required to assess the traffic effects of the proposed development on the Cashmere Oaks Drive / State Highway 2 intersection, nor would Waka Kotahi be required to be notified as an affected party. ▪ The Cashmere Oaks Drive / State Highway 2 intersection is the only route by which to access the Plan Change site. It is therefore reasonable that Waka Kotahi be notified of development for which consent is ultimately sought. ▪ The consent application would contain a more detailed description of a proposed activity / development, and

		<p>therefore more detailed estimates of traffic volumes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The consent application could be assessed against the existing road environment at that time (including any speed management reviews, and further urbanisation of 'look and feel' of the road corridor). <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Waka Kotahi considers that the traffic effects of any proposed development must be assessed as part of any resource consent application.
10.14	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Plan Change does not adequately consider Objective TT1 17.3.1 managing the road network; and related policies under 17.3.2 TT1 of the Operative District Plan which future development should be in keeping with. ▪ Development of either residential properties or a retirement village within the Plan Change site would be contrary to this policy framework because the function of the State Highway (being a strategic arterial road) is not recognised and protected from the traffic generation that would result; no controls or standards for land use and subdivision are proposed that would avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects of future land use on the safe and efficient functioning and operation of the road network (in this case Opaki Road / State Highway 2); and there is nothing in the proposed plan provisions that would support and encourage the safe provision of non-vehicular (cycling and walking) forms of transport to and around the locality. A sound integrated transport and land use system should result from development however, the plan change as proposed will not deliver this outcome. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.15	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, which promotes urban development that reduces travel distances and lowers reliance on private vehicles. ▪ The Plan Change introduces nothing that would be in keeping with this direction, it does not propose any changes to the existing road environment to promote mode shift in transport options, including public transport, cycling and walking; and does not seek to introduce district plan provisions that would require this outcome. ▪ The structure plan proposed is extremely limited and does not consider these matters. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.16	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic generation from development within the Plan Change site will result in a higher rate of deaths and

		<p>serious injuries (DSI) at the intersection of Cashmere Oaks Drive and State Highway 2 (SH2), unless the road infrastructure is upgraded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Furthermore, it is noteworthy that statistically DSI crashes are more severe for older demographics; therefore, development of a retirement village at this location without an upgrade to the road infrastructure is of significant concern to Waka Kotahi. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Installation of a rural roundabout is considered an acceptable option to reduce DSIs, otherwise significant alterations (upgrades) to the look and feel of the road over at least 400m, would need to be made to reduce the speed limit to support the vehicle generation and people movements anticipated from development of the Plan Change site.
10.17	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change; OR ▪ Grant the alternative relief sought. <p>Alternative relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should the local authority be mindful to confirm the plan change request, Waka Kotahi seeks significant amendments to the Plan Change to require consideration of the following outcomes (See two following outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Traffic safety: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduce policy and rules that require an upgrade of roading infrastructure to support vehicle generation from activities within the plan change area, ensuring this could apply at either subdivision or land use application stages (Waka Kotahi would like to be involved in discussion of what a trigger may look like). ▪ Consider changes to development contributions policy and rules to ensure there is the ability to remedy or mitigate traffic safety effects via such means and that the trigger for such contributions is agreed between Waka Kotahi and Masterton District Council. ▪ Amend the activity status of any future subdivision or land use to discretionary. ▪ Seek further information from the applicant with respect to the adverse traffic safety effects that traffic generation from the Plan Change site will have on the Cashmere Oaks Drive / State Highway 2 intersection. ▪ Seek further information from the applicant on the ways in which the adverse traffic safety effects, for all users, can be avoided, remedied, or mitigated. ▪ Amend the Plan Change to require those traffic safety effects to be avoided, remedied, or mitigated in a way that is acceptable to Waka Kotahi and Masterton District Council, including by ensuring the traffic effects are included as a matter of discretion within the proposed policy and rule framework. ▪ Restrict development within the Plan Change site until roading infrastructure upon which it

		<p>relies has been upgraded to cater for the development the Plan Change would facilitate, either by way of public works, private investment or through development / financial contributions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Walking, cycling and place function: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seek inclusion of, and require adherence to a more detailed structure plan that has details on how public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure will connect future communities with the rest of Masterton and the existing recreational opportunities in the immediate vicinity, specifically the reserve areas on the eastern side of State Highway 2. ▪ Introduce policy that requires an upgrade of roading infrastructure to support all people movements from activities within the Plan Change site, ensuring this could apply at either subdivision or land use application stages. ▪ Restrict development within the Plan Change site until the roading infrastructure has been upgraded to cater for the development the Plan Change would facilitate, either by way of public works, private investment or through development / financial contributions. ▪ Any other relief that would provide for the adequate consideration of potential effects on the state highway environment and all its users.
--	--	--

Plan Provision: Landscape / visual amenity / character effects

Decision requested	Submitters name	Explanation or relief sought
2.1	Kevin Lionel & Treacy Marie Galbraith	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about proximity (within 3m) and height of buildings in relation to external boundaries of Plan Change site with residential properties in Cashmere Oaks. ▪ Proposed setback distances and building heights will adversely affect the rural amenity / lifestyle of owners of adjoining residential properties. Adjoining landowners bought their properties to live rurally, not next to tall buildings. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limit building heights to single storey along external boundaries of Plan Change site.
3.1	Debbie van Zyl	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cashmere Oaks is attractive due to its rural amenity and low-density housing. Rezoning the adjoining rural land for residential development with proposed lots of 400m² will detract from the value (financial) of the existing properties in Cashmere Oaks and detrimentally affect current residents of Cashmere Oaks. <p>Relief sought:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Amend lot sizes to a minimum of 800m².
6.2	Heather May & John Carl Sexton	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applying existing District Plan rules and standards to site inappropriate. ▪ Existing rules and standards of the District Plan are not sympathetic to character of Cashmere Oaks. ▪ Cashmere Oaks is a premium subdivision with wide streets, footpaths on both sides of roadway, wide berms and planting, thoughtful use of covenants. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approval of Plan Change should be subject to the same type and style of development as Cashmere Oaks subdivision.
6.3	Heather May & John Carl Sexton	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about section sizes. ▪ The application refers to mix of one and two storey standalone dwellings on a lot size of 400m². ▪ Section 5.1 of the application refers to a minimum lot size of 350m² with an average lot size of 400m². ▪ Cashmere Oaks subdivision average lot size is greater than 400m². <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section sizes and covenants should follow those of the Cashmere Oaks subdivision.
6.4	Heather May & John Carl Sexton	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about building heights. ▪ The application refers to mix of one and two storey standalone dwellings with a maximum height of 10m. ▪ Application contains request for higher building height of 14m. Understand from applicant this will be a building for rest home / hospital care. Note when new local hospital was built in 2005, went from multi-level building to single level building. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All retirement village buildings, including rest home and hospital, should be single storey.
6.5	Heather May & John Carl Sexton	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Baseline visibility of site contains statement listed under section 5.1.b “<i>Private locations – open to no views of site from dwellings located to the north, east and south of the site...</i>”. This statement is incorrect. Multiple properties within Cashmere Oaks currently have views of Plan Change site from several rooms within their homes, including main living areas. ▪ It is disingenuous to compare maximum permitted building height under current rural zoning (15m) with the proposed multi-storey retirement village.

		Relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of Plan Change conditional on buildings being limited to single storey.
7.4	Albert Edward (Ted) Taylor	Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application states that “<i>the site is suitable for urban development given its negligible environmental values in terms of landscape...</i>”. Landscape and Visual Assessment states views of Plan Change site from private locations “<i>Open to no views of the Site from dwellings located to the north, east and south of the site</i>”. Statement is incorrect, large parts of the site are able to be viewed from the west side of Sir Herbert Hart Avenue. If development goes ahead it would have significant visual effect on dwellings on west side of Sir Herbert Hart Avenue, particularly views of 14m high building. Relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decline the Plan Change. Disagree with statement that there are negligible landscape effects.

Plan Provision: Density effects		
Decision requested	Submitters name	Explanation or relief sought
3.1	Debbie van Zyl	Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cashmere Oaks is attractive due to its rural amenity and low-density housing. Rezoning the adjoining rural land for residential development with proposed lots of 400m² will detract from the value (financial) of the existing properties in Cashmere Oaks and detrimentally affect current residents of Cashmere Oaks. Relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. Amend lot sizes to a minimum of 800m².
5.2	Bryce & Emma Keane	Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed amount, land size and availability of sections indicates a target market outside of elderly / retirement village. Relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grant Plan Change with conditions.
6.3	Heather May & John Carl Sexton	Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about section sizes.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The application refers to mix of one and two storey standalone dwellings on a lot size of 400m². ▪ Section 5.1 of the application refers to a minimum lot size of 350m² with an average lot size of 400m². ▪ Cashmere Oaks subdivision average lot size is greater than 400m². <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section sizes and covenants should follow those of the Cashmere Oaks subdivision.
--	--	--

Plan Provision: Connectivity		
Decision requested	Submitters name	Explanation or relief sought
4.2	Greater Wellington Regional Council	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current approach to connecting development to town centre does not have regard to RPS Change 1 direction on climate change emissions, ensuring transport infrastructure is in place prior to development and providing for multi-modal transport. ▪ Providing access through Cashmere Oaks will cause development to be poorly connected to State Highway 2 and Masterton town centre. ▪ Integrated Transport Assessment recognises likely to be low uptake of cycling, pedestrian activity and public transport by future residents of Plan Change site. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose. ▪ Provide for greater multi-modal transport links through the development and consider whether development will provide good connections to Masterton town centre.
7.2	Albert Edward (Ted) Taylor	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application refers to Plan Change as “<i>a logical extension of a neighbouring site</i>” in reference to the Cashmere Oaks subdivision. ▪ Plans for final stage of the Cashmere Oaks subdivision (currently being constructed) show a complete and fully integrated layout of roads, properties and reserve. No indication “<i>there was any thought when this was envisaged that it would ultimately extend to the north</i>”. ▪ Plan Change is not a logical extension of Cashmere Oaks. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ Oppose poor integration of Plan Change. ▪ Disagree with application regarding environmental benefits that relate to urban development and MUGS and the relationship with adjoining property (Cashmere Oaks and area C03).

7.3	Albert Edward (Ted) Taylor	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application (Figure 6-1, page 11, Appendix 6) shows access to Plan Change site from Cashmere Oaks by converting cul-de-sac adjacent to Lots 102 and 103 and the reserve to a through road. This is an ad hoc approach and not a logical extension of Cashmere Oaks. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ Oppose poor integration of Plan Change and ad hoc approach to access and connectivity.
10.4	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Waka Kotahi is concerned that applicant has not given due consideration to cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, along with place function and a roading layout (by way of a structure plan) that would facilitate public transport in the future. ▪ Within vicinity of Plan Change site, area is used for the Recreation Trail Network. Strava Global Heat Mapping indicated local residents have desire to connect to this network by crossing State Highway 2 (100 km/h area) rather than taking footpath south to Forth Street (50km/h area). ▪ These people movements exemplify the need for place making at this locality in any urban expansion scenario. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
10.7	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Plan Change site is at the current rural / urban interface. This context has not fully or appropriately been considered in the s32 analysis; including the implications of a lack of road, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure to serve the needs of future residents of the Plan Change site. The Plan Change would create a residential zone in a location where there is insufficient connection between the proposed urban area and local recreational opportunities and amenities and is therefore at odds with Part 2 of the RMA. ▪ Introducing more residents in this locality on the western side of State Highway 2 (SH2) without the necessary infrastructure (crossing places) to support people moving between their homes and local amenities in the recreation trail network on the eastern side of SH2, will frustrate future communities and exacerbate existing poor connectivity leading to poor safety outcomes (pedestrians and cyclists crossing a fast section of state highway). <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought. ▪ Development of the Plan Change site will ultimately put pressure on road controlling authorities to invest to fix the problems and, in the interim, will create real safety concerns for the community. Overall, Waka Kotahi considers that the Plan Change does not provide for the social and economic wellbeing of the community.

10.15	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, which promotes urban development that reduces travel distances and lowers reliance on private vehicles. ▪ The Plan Change introduces nothing that would be in keeping with this direction, it does not propose any changes to the existing road environment to promote mode shift in transport options, including public transport, cycling and walking; and does not seek to introduce district plan provisions that would require this outcome. ▪ The structure plan proposed is extremely limited and does not consider these matters. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change or grant the alternative relief sought.
-------	---------------------------------	--

Plan Provision: Ecological effects

Decision requested	Submitters name	Explanation or relief sought
7.5	Albert Edward (Ted) Taylor	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application states “<i>the Site is suitable for urban development given its negligible environmental values in terms of...Ecology...</i>”. ▪ Assessment is limited as it does not consider bird life that will lose their habitat. Birds frequently observed in this rural area include Harrier Hawks, Spur-winged Plovers, Paradise Shelducks, Skylarks, Sparrows, and Finches. These birds are already losing habitat because of Cashmere Oaks extension. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ Disagree with statement in application that the site has negligible environmental values in terms of ecology.

Plan Provision: Hazards / contaminated land

Decision requested	Submitters name	Explanation or relief sought
7.7	Albert Edward (Ted) Taylor	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application states the site is absent of hazards based on the Preliminary and Detailed Site Investigation. ▪ The site has been used for agricultural purposes in the past.

		<p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decline the Plan Change. ▪ Preliminary and Detailed Site Investigation deficient because having identified agricultural use, tests for organic compounds listed under 'soil contaminant standards for health for organic compounds', specifically DDT and dieldrin, should have been carried out. ▪ Without appropriate testing cannot support the statement that the site is absent of hazards.
--	--	--

Plan Provision: Infrastructure effects		
Decision requested	Submitters name	Explanation or relief sought
5.4	Bryce & Emma Keane	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of infrastructure. Water pressure in Cashmere Oaks is already in dire need of a water pumping station. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant Plan Change with conditions.
8.5	Wayne Skipage	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Already considerable demand on existing Lansdowne infrastructure, with water pressure a problem for many Cashmere Oaks residents. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reassurance that Plan Change isn't going to worsen peoples' experiences with infrastructure going forward.
9.1	Shane Hart	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 5.5.5 of application states "<i>The assessment considers wastewater demand from the Request, the capacity of the existing network and planned upgrades, and considers that the Site can be suitably serviced</i>" yet details are not provided on the scope of the planned upgrades, nor are confirmed designs of services in Cashmere Oaks Stage 2. ▪ The Riley Report (Section 5.4.1) notes final design and RL of new proposed Cashmere Oaks Wastewater Reticulation and Pump Station yet to be confirmed. ▪ The Riley Report (Section 5.4.1) notes proposed PS discharges to a gravity main that connects to a 150mm-diameter main in Opaki Road (State Highway 2). ▪ Not clear from Request or any of the civil reports how existing system will take the main flow from the PS to State Highway 2. ▪ Concerns with capacity of system if connection is to be via 150mm-diameter main which runs down centre of McDonald Way and via easement through east side of 12 McDonald Way (joining on a manhole located on

		<p>the rear property of 12 McDonald Way) before flows toward Opaki Road via easements on 11, 13 and 15 McDonald Way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have been recurring blockages of sewer between McDonald Way and State Highway 2, and WaterCare have informed that the fall on the wastewater main in McDonald Way and via the easement appears to be insufficient and less than the required 1:200 fall. ▪ Council planned upgrades for the Opaki Road main (noted in the Riley report (section 5.4.1) from 150mm diameter to 225mm or 300mm) will not address the limitations of the existing wastewater main between McDonald Way and State Highway 2 due to insufficient size and fall, if this is part of the intended route. <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The developer should confirm final design and RL of the new proposed Cashmere Oaks Wastewater Reticulation and Pump Station and confirm the wastewater connection to State Highway 2. ▪ More information should be provided on the state and suitability of the existing or planned wastewater mains affected by the Request. ▪ Not to approve the plan change request until appropriate upgrades to civil engineering (namely potable water and wastewater) are confirmed and agreed on, or an alternative plan submitted and agreed upon, and an outcome found where the Plan Change will not place any property at risk due to insufficient water pressures for firefighting demands. ▪ A binding requirement to install booster pumps on potable water supply should be made before the plan change be granted.
9.2	Shane Hart	<p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ McDonald Way water pressure is poor especially during peak times. ▪ The following assessment is included in the Request: <i>“the potable water supply demands for a mixed use of residential and retirement village activities at the site can be accommodated within these estimated demands”</i>. The assessment also indicates Council should consider installation of booster pumps as part of already planned upgrade works to a local reservoir to ensure optimal performance of the network. ▪ This statement appears to be made on the assumption that Council is upgrading the network with booster pumps. It is not confirmed at any point of the Request or consultant reports if booster pumps are going to be installed. ▪ Future planned reservoir upgrades mentioned in the report do not have any mention of booster pumps (only of storage volume). ▪ The Riley Report (see Section 5.5.1) assumes an existing feed to the subdivision of 200mm; however Council records indicate the feed is only 150mm in Opaki Road further reducing to 100mm in Cashmere Oaks Drive. ▪ Section 5.5.2 of the Riley Report considers firefighting water supply. It is noted that sufficient pressure in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 would be <i>“unlikely to achieve as the current static pressures are no greater than 200kPa”</i> and a booster pump <i>“will likely be required to maintain pressure to the hydrant and</i>

		<p><i>reticulated supply around the site”.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear from the aforementioned points that the potable water supply demands for a mixed use of residential and retirement village activities at the site can NOT be accommodated with the current network, and effects have not been sufficiently explored or addressed. ▪ I note a current condition to the Cashmere Oaks subdivision (see Consent Notice issued pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991 in respect of the Fee Simple subdivision of Lots 14-60 being subdivided of Lots 1-7 DP 386783, Lot 9 DP 386783, Lot 12 DP 386783 and Lot 13 DP 386783 and lodged for deposit under Plan No 429991) that <i>“Cashmere specific potable water supply network upgrades will be carried out at future stages of development when required when capacity becomes an issue within the Future Development Area. The cost of this work will be borne by the developer, regardless of the infrastructure being owned by the Masterton District Council”.</i> <p>Relief sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Upgrade work including installation of booster pumps at the reservoir needs to be carried out before further developments are approved (upgrades should be funded either by the Cashmere Oaks developer or Council; but it appears this should be on the developer to fund). ▪ It should be confirmed if the current existing water feed to the subdivision is 100mm, 150mm or 200mm as there appears to be some inconsistency between the reports, the developer and Council records. ▪ The Request should include an independent report including detailed analysis and design of the firefighting water requirements for the development including how these may affect flows in the current subdivision, to ensure future firefighting needs can be satisfied. ▪ Not to approve the Plan Change until appropriate upgrades to civil engineering (namely potable water and wastewater) are confirmed and agreed on, or an alternative plan submitted and agreed upon, and an outcome found where the private plan change will not place any property at risk due to insufficient water pressures for firefighting demands. ▪ A binding requirement to install booster pumps on potable water supply should be made before the plan change is granted.
--	--	---

Appendix A

**Further Submission Form
Form 6 Resource Management (Forms,
Fees and Procedure) Regulations 2003**

FORM 6
FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN
OPPOSITION TO, SUBMISSION ON PUBLICLY NOTIFIED
PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Masterton District Council, PO Box 444, Masterton, ATTN: Planning
planningadmin@mstn.govt.nz

Name of Person Making Further Submission: [full name]

.....
This is a further submission in support of (or in opposition to) a submission on the following proposed change to the Operative Wairarapa Combined District Plan.

Welhom Developments Limited Private Plan Change to the Operative Wairarapa Combined District Plan (2011)

.....
[name of proposed plan change]

I am

.....
[state whether you are –

- *A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest. In this case, also specify the ground for saying that you come within this category; or*
- *A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has. In this case also explain the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or*
- *The local authority for the relevant area.]*

I support (or oppose) the submission of

.....
[name and address of original submitter and submission number of original submission if available]

The particular parts of the submission I support (or oppose) are

.....
[Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose together with any relevant provisions of the proposal]
[continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary]

The reasons for my support (or opposition) are:
[give reasons]

.....

.....

[continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary]

I seek that the whole (or part [describe part]) of the submission be allowed (or disallowed):
[Give precise details.]

.....

.....

[continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary]

I wish (or do not wish) to be heard in support of my further submission.
[please delete one option]

*If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

*Delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case

.....

.....
Signature of person making further submission
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making further submission.)

.....

.....
Date:
(A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means)

Address for service of person making further submission:

.....

.....

Telephone number:

.....

Email:

.....

Contact Person: *[name and designation, if applicable]*

.....

Note to person making further submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after making the further submission to the local authority.

If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use form 16C.