

SUBMISSIONS ON THE PROPOSED HENDERSON VALLEY/OPANUKU LOCAL AREA PLAN

Appendix A:

Submissions received after 5 June 2010 Meeting of Policy and Strategy Committee

NOTE: These submissions are in addition to those submissions circulated at that prior meeting in the spiral bound folder of submissions.

Submitter #	First	Last	Organisation	Suburb (as stated)	Address Confidential	Additional Info attached	Want to be heard
36	Alex Sipka	Sipka Holdings Ltd.	Sipka Holdings Ltd.	Henderson	n	n	n
37	C/- Chong Khaw, Anchor Consulting Ltd, PO Box 137247 Parnell 1151	Sipka Holdings Ltd	Sipka Holdings Ltd		n	n	n

A1

Proposed Henderson Valley/Opanuku Local Area Plan - 6 AUG 2010
Submission Form

Office use only	MAIL CENTRE
Submission Number:	
Date Received:	36

Name: ALEX SIPKA

Organisation: SIPKA HOLDINGS LTD

(If you are submitting on behalf of a business/organisation, please ensure you are appropriately authorised to do so.)

I wish my address, email and phone details to remain confidential*
(*Address, email and phone contact detail confidentiality is subject to the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987. Note that a summary of all submitters names/organisations and the main points of their submissions will be made publicly available as part of the LAP development process.)

Signed:  Date: 14 July 2010

Submission to the Proposed Henderson Valley/Opanuku Local Area Plan

Please make any comments or suggestions on the Proposed Henderson Valley/Opanuku Local Area Plan. Please be specific about any changes you would like made.

- In particular we would like to hear your comments on:
- The proposed boundary, defining the area that this LAP applies to;
 - The nature and extent of any *Heritage Features* within the area;
 - The *Existing and Future Character and Amenity Statements*;
 - The *Objectives, Policies and Actions* (including what the priority actions are for you, your organisation and/or your community)
 - The FAQ sheet also has a number of further suggestions for comments.

I have enclosed additional information: Yes No

(Please feel free to make your submission on this form and/or provide additional comments on additional sheets - you may use this form as a free post envelope to enclose additional comments, or more substantial submissions may be sent in a suitably sized envelope to this address below, or delivered to Council offices, along with all of the required contact details, as per above).

WE ARE HAPPY WITH PROPOSED PLANS, PAREMUKA
STATIONED PLAN AREA/BABICH AREA B (ENGLAND
DISTRICT PLAN APPEAL) 39.8 HA.
WE HOPE THAT DENSITY IN THIS AREA WILL BE INCREASED

WE WOULD LIKE WAITAKERE CITY COUNCIL TO
MAKE IMPROVEMENTS ON ~~THE~~ CANDIA RD, ESPECIALLY
ON PART BETWEEN STURGES RD AND SIMPSON RD.
THIS PART OF THE ROAD SHOULD HAVE PROPER KERBS
VEHICLE CROSSING, PEDESTRIAN FOOTPAT AND DRAINAGE.
THIS IS VERY IMPORTANT FOR US AS WE HAVE
TENANTS WITHOUT CARS AND THEY HAVE PROBLEM
WALKING ON THIS PART OF THE ROAD.

2
3

WAIKAKERE CITY COUNCIL

- 6 AUG 2010

~~www.waikakere.govt.nz~~

37.



PO Box 157247, Parnell 151
Auckland, New Zealand
Phone: 021 66 99 46
Email: sales@anchorfd.co.nz

4th August 2010

Waikakere City Council
Private Bag 93109
Henderson 0650
Waikakere

Attention: Kyle Balderston

Dear Kyle,

RE: PROPOSED HENDERSON VALLEY/ OPANUKU LOCAL AREA PLAN- MAKING A SUBMISSION.

I am Chong Khaw from Anchor Consulting Ltd. I am working on behalf of Mr. Alex Sipka a director of Sipka Holdings Ltd and the owner of [redacted], Henderson. My client has received a letter from the council dated 28th June 2010 requesting comment from land owners regarding the Local Area Plan.

I understand that the submission close on the 30th July 2010 and we have gone pass the closing date. I hope that the council will still accept my late submission.

My client's/owner of the property at [redacted] Road comments are as follows:

1. Since there is existing pressure of further developing the area, I am in support for my land being further urbanised by allowing higher density development. 1
2. I would like to see infrastructure upgrades on the area by creating gravity sewer and stormwater system. 2
3. I would like the public road of Candia Road upgraded (having footpath and wider road) for better roading network. 3
4. I would like to see a urbanization concept plan showing how it will affect my land. 4

My client apologised for the late submission and would like play a part in this Local area plan.

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opanuku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Last	Street	Submission #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
1	Vitasovich	Forest Hill Road	1.1	Lived in area for long time, family owned much of valley and orchards and vineyards. Able to subdivide historically without issue	subdivision - general	Noted	No Change
			1.2	Purchased property on edge of MUL, with proposed road from HV Rd (refer Map). Zoning subdivision of this area (970m2) changed to residential (no consultation). Was able to gain access to Forest Hill Rd first informally, and then formally without issue.	subdivision - general	Cannot comment on past zoning changes and processes, (which are public) other than to note larger site has never been zoned for urban purposes, and subdivision rules for this site have been 300m2 (~30HA), 3HA (previous Waitemata City Scheme) and now at 4HA minimum.	No Change
			1.3	Support RUEMA, suggest 1000 - 4000m2 sites	RUEMA	Noted - however, based on preliminary work undertaken to date, this size is probably too small to 'maintain rural character'.	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			1.4	Houses should not always be hidden	Rural Character	Agreed - however issue for consideration when considering allowing additional houses as is being considered in RUMAs is the impact these new dwellings could have on maintenance of rural character - a key determinant being the dominance of open spaces (as opposed to buildings) and sense of spaciousness - the issue is not that houses (which are not currently provided for) be seen but whether they dominate.	No Change
			1.5	Hard to determine what valley will be like in 50 years - should let evolve on own	Rural Character	Purpose of LAP is to assist in determining future through considering a wide range of community views, and in particular identifying and agreeing on what is important about an area so it may be protected, whatever the future holds.	No Change
			1.6	Grassmere Rd as example of how smaller sites can integrate into rural landscape	Rural Character	Agreed.	No Change
			1.7	General decline in 'tidyness' over past 60 years	Rural Character	Noted	No Change
			1.8	Property values declined as a result of WRHAA and MUL	Property Values	It would be anticipated that certainty provides for long term value - short term speculative value based on anticipation of future urbanisation will have certainly declined, but over time true value of a scarce resource (attractive rural land, with long term certainty, close to urban areas) has and will continue to increase. Agree that m2 land value is likely to be less than urban. Average land values in WRHAA are, on average, higher than residential urban sites.	No Change
			1.9	Removal of economic use requires compensation - private property rights taken for public Compensation good should be paid for from public purse.	Compensation	Economic use has not been removed.	No Change
			1.10	MUL and Ranges Boundary poorly located	WRHAA	Ranges boundary set by Act of Parliament, more or less in alignment with MUL as the existing (and future) limit of urban expansion. Ranges boundary can be expanded but not contracted.	No Change
			1.11	Don't support LAPs/Ranges Act, or MUL, but feel part of Oratia - accept within Henderson Valley/Opanuku LAP	Boundary	Noted	No Change
			1.12	No Features in lower valley worth protecting	Heritage Features	Contrast between urban and rural, and rural views are a noted physical feature, but agree that there are limited other natural, heritage or historical heritage features in vicinity of site.	No Change
			1.13	Lower valley should be subdivided to improve tidyness and increase plantings and parks - Character and Amenity	Character and Amenity	RUMAs are suggested party to address this issue.	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			1.14	Should make provision for a range of property sizes between urban and large rural - lack of supply of this type. This is too large to reasonably maintain.	Subdivision General	RUMAs are suggested party to address this issue.	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			1.15	Submission passed onto Auckland Council.	Process	Noted	No Change

44

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opamuku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Last	Street	Submission Point #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
2	Atkinson	Vineyard Road	2.1	Get rid of the WRHAA except for the regional park	WRHAA	Ranges boundary set by Act of Parliament, more or less in alignment with MUL. Ranges boundary can be expanded but not contracted. RUMIMAs are suggested partly to address this issue.	No Change
			2.2	Allow progressive subdivision outward from Henderson town centre	subdivision-general	Unsure exactly what this would mean in practice. See more detailed comments below	No Change
			2.3	Take a 'more responsible attitude' towards maintenance of roads and other services	Infrastructure	WRHAA precludes urbanisation	No Change
			2.4	Urbanise the area to provide sewerage systems, water and reduce speed limits	services and maintenance	Unlikely that wider community will want to go without power, radio, TV, Phone or internet - however, agree that promotion of viable and practicable alternatives to this infrastructure should be enabled provided they are no worse. Concern regarding Poison drops [1080? Foray-10B? Willow Spraying?] noted - Auckland Regional Council Parks Management Plan precludes this approach and a more targeted (and labour intensive) manual method are used - where they are not, the wider public are generally consulted.	No Change
			2.5	Remove high voltage power lines, telecommunication towers, no poison drops without a community referendum		Unsure exactly what this would mean in practice.	No Change
3	Vlasovich	Henderson Valley Road	2.6	Administer all [council?] sub contracting properly	Council	Noted, issue requires further investigation - concerns would be that car park may encourage further use and introduce urban type infrastructure to the area - would prefer to encourage walking or cycling (it is after all a walk and cycleway).	No Change
			3.1	Increased number of cars parking on H Valley Road. Provide an off-road carpark for access to the new PTS footpath and cycleway on Henderson Valley Road	services and maintenance	Noted, issue requires further investigation - concerns would be that car park may encourage further use and introduce urban type infrastructure to the area - would prefer to encourage walking or cycling (it is after all a walk and cycleway).	Refer changes to LAP in relation to visitor management, physical connections with urban area and Foothills Walkway
4	Vlasovich	Henderson Valley Road	4.1	allow for land close to MUL to be subdivided into 1 acre density	Subdivision-general	Noted - however, based on work undertaken to date, this size is probably too small to 'maintain rural character'.	RUMIMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken.
5	Nicholson	Coulter Road	5.1	Keep the area around Candia, Coulter and Vineyard Roads as 'lifestyle' blocks. Don't allow businesses to be established (e.g. childcare facility at 101 Coulter Road)	Rural Character	Noted. Application has been made for expansion of this facility and will be assessed on its merits.	Some amendments recommended to relevant Policies and Objective to recognise lifestyle blocks, and engage appropriately sized and scaled non-residential development.
6	anon		6.1	Council should keep land for potential increases in the need for arable land for food production	General	Noted. Underlying the requirement to maintain rural character is also maintaining the potential for food production. Note that most rural land with food production potential is privately owned	No Change
7	Zhang	Candia Road	7.1	Exclude land between Simpson and Candia Road from HVO LAP	Boundary	This refers to the Paremuke Structure Plan Area. This area is within a separate visual and physical catchment from the rest of the valley.	Recommend Removal of Paremuke Structure Plan Area from LAP
			7.2	In all correspondence from the Council, we have belonged to Henderson or Swanson but never Henderson Valley	Boundary	Postal address is not affected by LAP boundary which is for planning purposes.	No Change
			7.3	The boundary of Henderson Valley/Opamuku should follow the natural roads, not running through private properties (see attached map)	Boundary	Boundary has followed roads and other features and existing cadastral boundaries.	No Change
			7.4	The land between Simpson Road and Candia doesn't have any heritage features (no vineyards, orchards or farms).	Boundary	Contrast between urban and rural is a noted heritage feature, but agree that there are limited other natural, physical or historical heritage features in vicinity of site.	No Change
			7.5	The residential subdivision from Lake Panorama should extend to the point of Candia Road to finalise the newly developed residential area along Sturges Road, for this area already had town water	Subdivision-General	Area identified as RUMIMA due to existing District Plan appeal - this seeks a more intensive form of development in the area, however location of MUL and WRHAA precludes urban development - many rural areas are also supplied with town water given that ranges is a catchment area.	RUMIMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opauku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Street	Submission Point #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
8	Wilkinson	8.1	Support school as community centre	School	Noted	No Change
		8.2	During discussions held at school hall- all lists of key features listed the school as the centre of the community. LAP document doesn't reflect this, mentioned only once in 23 pages	School	The significance of the school as the current and future centre of community life is noted in a number of places throughout the LAP.	No Change
		8.3	Enhancing community facilities (A23) marginalised by dozens of environmental monitoring and development actions	School	Number of actions relates to the complexity of the issue rather than importance of the goal. Some rationalisation is appropriate.	Some changes made in response to this and other submissions.
		8.4	Many actions appear to support creation of new jobs at Council (e.g. A2,4,8,9,11,12,13,14,15)	obs, pubs and actions	Many of these actions relate to advising where monitoring, research and policy attention (usually, but not necessarily undertaken by local bodies) is best directed. This is essentially advice to the new Auckland Council on how to best apply limited resources to achieve the best result.	Some changes made in response to this and other submissions.
		8.5	Actions should be reduced to a more focussed list of what community actually wants	obs, pubs and actions	The wider community has raised a large number of issues, in both public and more private discussions over the past 14 months, and we have attempted to address as many as possible within the framework of the WRHIA. Submissions are part of this process. Submitter has not expanded further on what actions he feels community actually wants.	Some changes made in response to this and other submissions.
9	Henderson Valley Road	9.1	Own 15 acres at this address. Do not want high density housing around them (at this stage)	Subdivision	RUMAs are suggested partly to address this issue. Any development within WRHIA must be rural in nature, and high density housing is not proposed or possible.	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken.
		9.2	Support the LAP- should have been done 15 years ago	General	Noted	No Change

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opanuku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Last	Street	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
10	Silvester Clark	Welsh Hills Road	<p>10.1 Support the boundary</p> <p>10.2 Concerned about damage to vegetation and streambanks along Opanuku Stream in the picnic area and along Opanuku Pipeline track from recreational user groups. Education is required including School and Carey Park users of responsible use.</p> <p>10.3 Native plants are being sourced from this area to provide for private gardens</p> <p>10.4 Track maintenance- Opanuku Pipeline track not adequately maintained</p> <p>10.5 Oppose further development of wilderness experiences in public areas of regional park</p> <p>10.6 Confused by juxtaposition of wording and intent of P.13 (precautionary approach) and conflict with other policies re subdivision (RUMA/LPMA) - broad guidelines are ok, but controlling building appearance and design is too far</p>	<p>Boundary</p> <p>Ecology</p> <p>Ecology</p> <p>Tracks and Walking Parks</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. Respect only comes from appreciation which only comes from experience. Organised groups may need closer oversight/education.</p> <p>While not actively encouraged, provided this is undertaken in accordance with best practice (such as seed collection or cuttings, and with permission - see for example WCC Eco-sourcing Code of Practice for EcoSourcing and Ethics) it should not be a concern - however, the submission suggests this is not being undertaken in accordance with best practice and may include seedling removal and so on. Promotion of best practice is required. Auckland Regional Council Parks Dept informed.</p> <p>Noted - Auckland Regional Council parks informed</p> <p>One of the primary purposes of regional parkland is for the use and enjoyment by the public, but this must be balanced with the other values of the parkland (including the maintenance of a 'wilderness') - tracks enable access to and cover less than 1% of the Parkland. Regional Parkland is managed via Regional Parks Management Plan and this would need to be amended to enable further activities that would detract from wilderness. This is a key feature that should be maintained and will be tricky with increasing visitors as the other submission points have noted.</p> <p>Precautionary approach is not in conflict with proposed approach including directing development to areas best able to accommodate it and managing existing opportunities to achieve better outcomes. Note that the form and nature of the resulting development in these areas has not been determined, and would be developed having regard to all of the matters in the LAP and District Plan. Guidelines for buildings would not so far as to control 'architectural style', but rather design and appearance as it relates to minimise impacts on rural & natural character - such as siting, bulk, height, screen planting, driveway design, entrance treatment, sustainability features and so on. The eclectic nature of many buildings and building styles in the area is one of its features.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>Amend LAP to reflect EcoSourcing code of practice - http://www.hellalake.govt.nz/activities/eco/eco-sourcing-codeofpractice.pdf</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>Clarify role of guidelines and expand heritage features to include eclectic mix of building uses, architectural styles and eras reflecting a long and vibrant history of occupation</p>

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opanuku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Last	Street	Submission Point #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
11	Hill	Opanuku Road	11.1	Recognition of pa site at end of Welsh Hills Road.3 dwelling now present on the site, house at the very end is built on the site of around a dozen pits, not sure if they still exist	Heritage features	Pukeatūne, or 'hill of the fern root' prior to development of house sites consisted of a collection of pits and terraces, in poor condition at the time of investigation (1970's). It is recognised by Tangata Whenua as an area of historical significance, but the pits are now destroyed or obscured as a result of past firewood farming, pastoral use and housing development and subsequent bush regrowth. As noted they are also on private property, and this area has previously been removed from LAP area at request of submitters (lack of comment with Henderson Valley)	No Change
			11.2	Walkway- continuation of walkway up northern side through reserve alongside Opanuku Stream joining up with the campsite and track to the filter station. Alternatively it could branch off Opanuku at Stoney Creek and go up to Mountain Road.	Tracks and Walking	Noted - will be investigated as part of Foothills Walkway	No Change
			11.3	Walkway- upper reach of track above Candia should be bush track rather than concrete	Tracks and Walking	Surfacing would be investigated as part of Foothills Walkway, and would need to be in keeping with nature of area and budget. Concrete is unlikely	No Change
			11.4	Establish pest control (animal and plant) around these tracks	Ecology	Noted - Policies suggested to address this issue. Assistance is available to private landowners as well. That is the proposal - support noted	No Change
			11.5	Walkway- Opanuku walkway could join up with proposed walkway from Tīkangi to Swanson	Tracks and Walking	All options will be investigated as part of Foothills Walkway - note that cost of bridge crossings may make this option prohibitively expensive.	No Change
			11.6	Establish a bridge crossing at Carey Park from walkway above, across Opanuku to join up to the school footpath	Ops, Pops and Actions	Noted	No Change
12	Lupton	Henderson Valley Road	12.1	Support Ranges Act and Objectives	Support		No Change
			12.2	Request LAP and RUMA boundary be moved to property boundary	Boundary/RUMA	Noted - LAP boundary at property boundary (site is not within WRHA), RUMA will be moved to this location also.	Amend Maps
			12.3	Address 2 zoning issue on property - request all Living Environment be realigned to property boundary	Subdivision - zoning	Noted - Will require District Plan Change and companion Regional Policy Statement Change - a number of anomalies and misalignments between the MUL and Ranges Boundary are present on the 'Western Flank', and are noted. New Auckland Council may address through new Unitary Plan and/or changes to 'legacy plans'.	No Change
			12.4	Align MUL with property Boundary	Subdivision - zoning	Noted - Will require District Plan Change and companion Regional Policy Statement Change - a number of anomalies and misalignments between the MUL and Ranges Boundary are present on the 'Western Flank', and are noted. New Auckland Council may address through new Unitary Plan and/or changes to 'legacy plans'.	No Change
13	Kim	Henderson Valley Rd	13.1	Support LAP	Support		No Change
			13.2	Close to MUL, other properties being developed nearby		Noted	No Change
			13.3	Suggest 1acre (4000m2) development is appropriate, as will allow people to live in a natural environment and close to facilities such as train stations.	Subdivision/ RUMA	Noted - however, based on preliminary work undertaken to date, this size is probably too small to maintain rural character.	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			13.4	This will not impact on LAP area as land will be used for residential, more effectively using existing resources.	Subdivision/ RUMA	Area is within LAP and WRHA, outside of MUL which seeks to maintain rural character. Efficient use of resources is secondary to the key purpose of the WRHAA which is to protect, restore and enhance the heritage features of the area. However, arguably allowing development in this area, limits impacts on areas with higher levels of heritage features and rural character.	No Change

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opanuku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Last	Street	Submission #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
14	Wellington	Grassmere Rd	14.1	Support objectives and bulk of LAP but have some concerns	General Support Subdivision General	Noted	No Change
			14.2	Consensus from public meetings appeared to be to keep area broadly as it is - concern that LAP gives strong consideration to further development in area.	General	Agreed that strong consensus that area should remain much as it is, but also a recognition that it will not (and should not) be the same, particularly in the face of local, national and global changes in society over the next 50 years. LAP attempts to do this by managing the pressure for development into areas that can best accommodate it, manage existing potential to achieve better outcomes and enabling rural sites to be used for rural activities including food production should the owners choose. It also outlines the important aspects of the area to be protected restored and enhanced (those aspects that should remain much the same).	No Change
			14.3	HV is very close to the urban area and facilities and will become very sought after and attract residents who will be happy not to make a living off land - therefore no need to develop and should retain area as lifestyle blocks.	Subdivision General	Agree that the area is under considerable pressure for additional residential opportunities. The response in the LAP (and associated Plan Change 36) is intended to be enabling of people to provide for their social, cultural and economic wellbeing, within a framework of protecting, restoring and enhancing the heritage features set out in the Act and in the LAP. The use of many sites in the area as 'lifestyle' should be noted and can be expanded on (very few sites are truly 'productive' in a rural sense), but enabling lifestyle blocks to be more actively or economically utilised if they are able to does not diminish from this lifestyle aspect. The issue is how will these current and future residents who don't need to (or are unable to) care for and manage their quite large sites? The type of 'development' suggested relates to enabling the sale and production of rural products and services - an important aspect of rural character - the likely alternative is a sterile 'spacious suburbia' where pressures for ever further residential development is less able to be resisted.	Revise LAP to highlight pre-eminence of lifestyle type land use. Actions and methods identified
			14.4	Rural/Urban Interface Management Areas. Concern at identification of 3 areas for more intensive subdivision (below 4Ha) - this may open the door for further creep of this type of development across valley, a situation the Rangere Act was passed to prevent, and which could lead to negative cumulative effects. A 'hard edge' is the current situation and should be retained.	Subdivision - RUMMA	Intention of RUMMAs is to concentrate any additional opportunities towards those areas which have been identified as being the most able to accommodate this pressure. These areas are discrete and definable, with logical boundaries. The concerns raised are also concerns, and providing for these areas in the District Plan or by Resource Consent will need to pass stringent tests. In addition, considerable work is still required to ascertain whether the suggestion in the LAP is translatable into specific potential for additional development on the ground.	Revise Policy 19 and discussion in LAP to ensure development does not occur in RUMMAs until suitable technical framework for assessing and providing for additional growth in these areas (if any) is completed, either by the relevant Council or landowners.
			14.5	Large Property Management Areas. Concern that excellent idea and concept (such as clustering development and pushing development off ridgelines) may result in future impacts particularly if large parcels remain - if cluster development is to be enabled then large parent blocks must be permanently protected from further subdivision.	Subdivision RUMMA	Agreed - this matter is one of the matters outlined in Policy 19 as "maintain the pattern of resulting settlement through consent notices or other suitable mechanisms". This could be expanded on by adding "in perpetuity" or similar	Revise Policy 19 to add "in perpetuity" or similar to the last bullet point.

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opauku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
 Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Last	Street	# Submission Point	Submission Point Summary	Title	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
15	Prica	Forest Hill Rd	15.1	Would like to develop property at 1/4 to 1/2 acre sizes	Subdivision - General	Noted - however, based on preliminary work undertaken to date, this size is probably too small to 'maintain rural character'.	Refer RUMMA
			15.2	RUMA area should be much further up FH Rd, as area is within easy distance of Henderson and Sunnyvale Stations, and is bare.	Subdivision - RUMMA	Agreed - RUMMA Area is based on broad landscape assessment indicating areas where additional development could be accommodated without negatively impacting on rural character - the area to which the RUMMA applies could change based on further work, but the area (including the submitters site) is on the crest of the Forest Hill Rd ridge and is quite visible. A number of clusters of historic smaller sites also surround the site in question, and 'joining' these together with similar development would provide a thread of suburban development (at the suggested size) into the LAP area. Its proximity to the road (the site is long and narrow, parallel with the road) would also lead to a loss of visibility and dominance of the rural backdrop potentially leading to further development in the identified RUMMA area behind. Further more detailed investigation of the RUMMA areas is required and this could result in the identification of development opportunities on the submitters site, but unlikely to be at the density suggested for the reasons outlined above.	Refer RUMMA

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opauku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Last	Surname	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response	
16	Waikare Ranges Protection Society Inc.	Surreal	16.1	1. Support Boundary as indicated	Boundary	Noted	No Change
			16.2	2. Support descriptions of heritage features as described, but number, value and importance of heritage buildings (incl their regional and national significance) could be expanded on.	Heritage features	Noted	No Change
			16.3	3. Existing Character and Amenity Statement - support		Noted	No Change
			16.4	4. Future Character and Amenity Statement		Noted	No Change
			16.5	new development should be environmentally sustainable and hydrologically neutral	Development - Sustainability	Agree - a number of policies have outlined this requirement	No Change
			16.6	new development should avoid areas where wastewater ground soakage is impacted by ground conditions, water quality issues and flooding	Development - Sustainability	Agree - a number of policies have outlined this requirement	No Change
			16.6	new development on land with a watercourse should undertake riparian restoration in accordance with the Catchment Management Plan conditions	Development - Sustainability	Agree - however ICMF for the area has yet to be granted, and is currently in the process of being rewritten. Amendments to the relevant policies and Actions can be made to reference any operative ICMF and or the general principle of requiring improvements to riparian vegetation at the time of development, as well as generally.	Amend relevant actions in appropriate section to highlight need to address riparian enhancement at time of development
			16.7	Future Rural uses, esp recreation may impact on amenity particularly peace and quiet and low traffic volumes	Future Rural Uses	Agreed - assessment criteria in District Plan and in Plan Change 36 relate to the appropriate scale and nature, which is site specific. Concerns in relation to generation of traffic in particular in the upper valley and residential enclaves (as outlined in the C&A statements) can be expanded on in relevant Objectives, policies and actions	Revise LAP to ensure future rural uses do not adversely impact on peace and quiet and low traffic volumes, particularly in the upper valley and residential enclaves
			16.8	Any future Cycleways and/or bridlepaths should connect within the valley and with the metro area, but not connect with Regional Parkland where cycling and horses are not currently permitted	Tracks and Walking	A number of existing park tracks have their trailheads at roadsides, on which cycles, motorbikes and horses regularly traverse - signage is usually provided, outlining the restrictions that apply, in addition to botanizing and etc. The ability to ride or walk to the Regional Parkland should be encouraged where appropriate. Current Parks policy may not be permanent.	No Change
			16.9	Promotion of HVO as a 'tourist destination' may impact on amenity particularly peace and quiet and low traffic volumes	Future Rural Uses	Agreed - intention of LAP is to maintain HVO as a 'hidden valley', with limited access though to the wider ranges, noting that it currently has a number of successful visitor activities operating within it that may wish to expand, relocate or diversify. New activities may also establish and would be assessed on their merits, and impacts on amenity.	Revise LAP to ensure future rural uses do not adversely impact on peace and quiet and low traffic volumes, particularly in the upper valley and residential enclaves
			16.10	5. Objectives Policies and Actions	Process	Noted	No Change
			16.11	O1, A1: WRPS consulted on wording prior to any plan changes notification	obs, pois and actions	Noted	No Change
			16.12	O1.1: support	obs, pois and actions	Noted	No Change
			16.13	O1.2: support	obs, pois and actions	Noted	No Change
			16.13	O1.3: Support - note water quality targets should be based on international best practice, e.g. UK and EU methods easily applied here.	obs, pois and actions	Agreed - LAP currently notes water quality should be monitored, and minimum targets should be set, but does not specify method or regime. Wat Care and local body monitoring already takes place in the area. Any target setting should be informed by international best practice, refined for the individual catchment characteristics and hydrology, and regional and national consistency.	No Change
16.14	A16: Sustainable Neighbourhoods Programme (Waikare City Council and WeedTrust) should be linked as this is purpose of programme	obs, pois and actions	Agreed	Amend Action A16 to note existing programmes			
16.15	O1.4, A17: any new signage should identify Heritage Area with links to more information and responsibilities of visitors. Such a sign should also double as a community identification sign to minimise proliferation.	obs, pois and actions	Agreed	Amend A17 to add 'Heritage Area Information' to list			

AK

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opauku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Street	Submission Point #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
Waikare Ranges Protection Society Inc.	Court	16.16	A18 & A33: Concerned that Foothills Walkway Concept does not have buy in from local schools and homes, not as a tourist attraction. This FHWW could also lead to a need for infrastructure to service including carparking etc, as people are unlikely to take PT to start/end points as suggested. While such an idea may support some local tourism businesses, will not address key feedback that most people wish area to stay much as it is, not a 'Foothills Theme Park'.	Tracks and Walking	Focus is on improving walking and connectivity for local communities (refer A18, A19 and A33), the Foothills Walkway being an umbrella for this wider goal. It is unlikely that a whole trail will evaluate in the short to medium term but that opportunities to add to the wider public access network should not be lost through lack of forward planning. Issues relating to parking and infrastructure also noted through experience with PTS network and will be factored into planning. Much community feedback included commentary regarding lack of safe walking options which this will assist in addressing.	No Change
		16.17	O1.5-1.7: Support - add statement to District Plan to give effect. See also comments under O3.	Obs, acts and actions	District Plan contains many of these aspects including specific reference via Plan Change 35	No Change
		16.18	O1.8-O1.10: Support	Obs, acts and actions	Noted	No Change
		16.19	O2: Support, but see comments above re FHWW	Tracks and Walking	Noted	No Change
		16.20	O3: Support objectives and intent of policy but cautions that similar approaches have not always been successful elsewhere. Further consideration required, WRPS have some ideas.	Subdivision - General	Noted - careful consideration of how to provide for development of each LPMARUIMA will be undertaken before such provisions are implemented via Plan Change or Resource Consent.	No Change
		16.21	Growth Projections & potential for additional houses show that (under Low scenario) no further capacity required or necessary - approach is supported by Ranges Act, and subdivision beyond what is currently provided for should be a Prohibited Activity.	Subdivision - General	Potential decline in population and resulting HH requirement applies only under 'Low' scenario - Refer discussion around these figures in Background report on why this may not be undertaken by Auckland Council, but may only be appropriate in RUMAs or LPMAs - in other cases, sub 4Ha subdivision is currently a non-complying activity and must pass a very high test. Current knowledge regarding this particular area does not suggest that any further subdivision beyond what is currently enabled as a controlled activity would have such significant effects that it can never be contemplated, and such provisions are only in place in other Foothills areas with operative Structure Plans (other than Oratia).	No Change
		16.22	Strongly Opposed to RUMAs, will promote ad hoc development, which is what Ranges Act intended to prevent.	Subdivision - RUMA	Intention of RUMAs is to manage development pressure towards areas best located to accommodate it, and cannot be described as 'ad-hoc'. Agree that WRHAA places a high threshold to the provision of additional development opportunities.	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
		16.23	To soften edge should promote street parking and purchase more reserve land on urban side. Note that Jackson J in Swanson SP decision specifically excluded softening as an option.	Subdivision - RUMA	Removing existing houses and establishing additional reserve land on them is not feasible or realistic. Over time these new areas will 'soften' with establishment of street trees and gardens.	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
		16.24	O4: Brocker may not be a good idea and may enable some actions (those opposed above) to be implemented more easily possible with less input from community and/or stakeholders on what is appropriate.	Obs, Acts and Actions	Comments regarding SSP noted. Considerable feedback from community around general difficulty of dealing with sometimes conflicting Council requirements and complex legal processes. The Broker role is intended to be a first contact person for all enquiries from the LAP area from the community and to coordinate an appropriate response in line with the goals of the LAP	No Change

162

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opunuku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Last Street	Submission #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
17	Harrison	17.1	Concern at abrupt transition from urban to rural. Could be addressed by some managed transition including provision for some additional development.	Subdivision - RUMMA	Noted - submitters site has not been considered suitable for inclusion in the proposed RUMMA as the general vicinity of the site is predominantly bushy rather than open, with limited potential for additional development without bush clearances. Non-Complying Activity resource consent application option available but must pass a high threshold test.	RUMMA will require a significant amount of further work before any changes to District Plan can be undertaken.
			Currently on 1.5ha and even this is hard to manage as a working couple. Preference would be to de-stock wider area and replant with native trees - improves view and easier to manage in long term.	Subdivision - RUMMA	Noted - establishment of self sustaining bush will take some work, but can be less maintenance intensive than stock if established correctly. Council has a number of information sources and initiatives from planting assistance to covenanted and fencing funds to assist in achieving this.	No Change
			Managing transition from urban to rural along with replanting (with help from Council) could improve environment for native birds. Pest Control is also needed to enable bird population to recover	Subdivision - RUMMA	Comments regarding pest and weed control noted.	Amend appropriate actions (see A7) to ensure weed and pest control includes private land including that not in proximity to the regional parkland
18	Salisbury	18.1	Bought property 15 years ago as a much dreamed of lifestyle property. However some issues as a result of prior subdivision which were not apparent then, now cause concerns	Subdivision - General	Noted	No Change
			Background: Explained reserve separates house from rear paddocks. Access to paddocks for grazing is via stream reserve and bridge over stream (within reserve), and also via neighbouring properties rear paddock, which has not always been an amenable arrangement. This is a stressful and unacceptable situation and subdivision of the rear portion could resolve this.	Subdivision - General	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUMMA	RUMMA will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			As this land (and neighbouring sites in same situation) is effectively landlocked, is this possibly a situation requiring resolution under the Property Act which may override Ranges Legislation?	Subdivision - General	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUMMA	RUMMA will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			Suggest that RUMMA be investigated more fully as currently excludes areas of casuarina shelterbelts, which could also screen any new development (refer aerial attached to submission)	Subdivision - RUMMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUMMA	RUMMA will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			Option 1: Would like to have two blocks on rear area to enable each child to build a dwelling.	Subdivision - RUMMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUMMA	RUMMA will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			Option 2: Opunuku/Silvies Area properties combined and could sustain 4000-5000m2 sections if done carefully, bridging urban/rural and could improve the area.	Subdivision - RUMMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUMMA	RUMMA will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
18.8	Large (2Ha) blocks as currently suggested may be uneconomic and are difficult to manage.	Subdivision - RUMMA	Noted - actual sizes are yet to be determined, but 2Ha is approximate size at which rural character can be maintained in these areas. More specific work may or may not result in additional potential.	RUMMA will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken		

A13

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Openuku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Street	Submission Point #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
19	Protect Pihā Heritage Society Inc. www.pihā.co.nz/heritage	19.1	Concern re Henderson Valley/Openuku LAP impacting on Pihā		Noted	No Change
		19.2	Opposed to those aspects of the LAP relating to 'future rural uses', esp recreational activities that would stimulate tourism and visitors because of air could have flow on effects on Pihā, and by Pihā Community has not been consulted re these potential effects	Future Rural Uses	Activities in HVO that generate sufficient visitors to have a discernable impact on visitor numbers to Pihā are unlikely to be granted without being widely notified through resource consent (or Plan Change) processes. HVO already has a large number of visitor activities, and transport constraints from the Valley into the wider ranges are, in practical terms, likely to limit the extent to which any further opportunities are taken up, and the extent to which any impacts extend into the Ranges, including Pihā	No Change
		19.3	LAP does not consider of impacts on nearby communities Pihā has not had a LAP, but concern re visitors and impacts well known.	Process	Noted	No Change
		19.4	Ranges Act allows communities to address own economic wellbeing, does not provide for any resulting developments to impact wider Ranges or other locations.	Process	Noted	No Change
		19.5	Concerned at piecemeal development of defunct tourism and visitor strategy for Ranges through ad-hoc development of LAPs in the absence of a mandate from those communities affected.	Process	LAPs by their nature, are focussed on the communities they relate to and are being undertaken one area at a time, but are undertaken within a wider strategic framework of the WRHAA, which recognises the value the area has for visitors and locals alike. Primarily the HVO LAP is about managing the pressure the area is under, to achieve better outcomes, and to manage any impacts that may eventually, including those that may potentially impact on far distant coastal communities.	No Change
		20.1	Agree with most of LAP, concern focussed on Sturges/Openuku RUIMA	Support	Noted	No Change
		20.2	Reserve and stream separates property - to access rear must traverse stream and be 'landlocked'. Council and members of the public have no access to the reserve either, unless by traversing private property - this causes complications for managing the area for both owners and the Council.	Subdivision - General	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUIMA	RUIMAS will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
		20.3	LAP is mainly to improve amenity of the area, including the Openuku Stream - unfortunately access to the property requires fording the stream, as there is no bridge. This situation is damaging to the stream. Support the Sturges/Openuku RUIMA	Subdivision - RUIMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUIMA	RUIMAS will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
20	Henderson Valley Rd	20.4	Access to the rear is possible via a road reserve from South Kensington Way. We see the development of the area as a distinctive residential village that bridges the tightly packed residential area and sparsely populated rural area	Subdivision - RUIMA	Noted	RUIMAS will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
		20.5	We believe this should be around 2000-3000m2 sections, as if sections are too large will not be economic to develop, and will lead to pressure for more development in the long term.	Subdivision - RUIMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUIMA	RUIMAS will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
		20.6	Provision of services will also be too expensive if too large, and believe development of this scale [2000-3000m2] will be suitable for the area.	Subdivision - RUIMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUIMA	RUIMAS will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
		20.7	Suggest that the hatched area be extended to the rear/horsh as area currently excluded is small regenerating bush, gorse and other weeds. Significant trees should be protected.	Subdivision - RUIMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUIMA	RUIMAS will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
		20.8		Subdivision - RUIMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUIMA	RUIMAS will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
		20.9		Subdivision - RUIMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUIMA	RUIMAS will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opauku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Last	Street	Submission #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
21	Jin	Simpson Rd	21.1	Would like property to be zoned residential as per Lake Panorama area	Subdivision - RUMMA	WIRHAA precludes urban development. Site is within Paremuka SP area	Refer Paremuka SP
			21.2	Area is convenient to connect to existing reticulated services, so properties could easily be smaller than presently allowed.	Subdivision - RUMMA	Noted.	Refer Paremuka SP
22	Henderson Valley Residents Association		22.1	Support the purpose of the LAP and note the significance of the Document in decision making affecting character and amenity in this location	Support	Noted	No Change
			22.2	LAP Boundary: a/ Concerned that LAP boundary set by Oratia and Waitara LAPs not HW/O community, b/ eastern boundary is defined by MUL but that extension along Opauku Stream could be desirable, there will be some practical difficulties with this, c/ the remainder of the boundary is reasonable	Boundary	Noted	No Change
			22.3	Heritage Features	Heritage features	Noted	No Change
			22.4	Proposed Name [Henderson Valley/Opauku] is generally supported	Heritage features	Agreed	No Change
			22.5	Fairy Falls and Parekura Peak should be specifically mentioned as Heritage Features	Heritage features	Agreed	Amend LAP to refer to Parekura Peak and Fairy Falls
			22.6	Strongly support the statements outlining the distinctive features of the valley, but suggest a statement relating to the valley being practically closed to the ranges to the west, and there is very little through traffic [to the ranges] in the distinctive community paragraph [Action 177], and 'and Community Hall'	Heritage features	Noted - the LAP has noted these aspects of the area (see for example at p8 and p15. This aspect could be expanded on. This appears to relate to A17 - agreed	Amend LAP to reflect on limited through traffic and 'cul de sac' nature
			22.7	Character and Amenity	Heritage features	Noted	Amend A17 to refer to the School and Community Hall
			22.8	Support statement regarding maintenance of a visibly rural backdrop, but proposed method [RUMMA] is not supported, and will compromise other aims of the LAP - see also comments below	Support	Noted - are specifically identified through broad landscape analysis as one of a number of areas which could accommodate limited additional development without impacting on rural character - one of the criteria was visibility to a wide viewing audience, and or dominance of existing urban development to first audiences	No Change
			22.9	support intention to improve community facilities, esp at the School and Hall and to improve footpaths to meet the communities recreational and social needs. While some properties are genuinely productive, most properties are 'lifestyle' properties that are not economically self sustaining. Such land use contributes positively to the valley and is valued in and for itself - Amend LAP to reflect.	School Future Rural Uses	Agreed -	RUMMA will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			22.10	Remove 'almost suburban' from last para of 42 as this is not how these rural lanes are perceived locally	Residential Enclave	Noted	No Change
22.11	IN Future C&A statement numerous references to new walking trails, management of subdivision and rural/urban edge, and encouragement for new activities - concerns are in following section. Objectives, Policies and Actions O1 Heritage Features	General Support	Note use of almost suburban - this qualifier has two purposes - 1. highlighting that the area is not suburban, and also that it is quite close to becoming suburban and extreme care needs to be taken to ensure it does not tip from almost suburban to suburban. The areas rural amenity is drawn primarily from the larger sites surrounding it and the lack of urban infrastructure - maintaining the visual connections with the surrounding rural landscape and minimising impacts of urban style infrastructure will be key to maintaining the area as a rural lane and not becoming a suburban street in the middle of the valley	No Change			
22.13	Whole section is convoluted and not in plain english - reword	General Support	Noted - some improvements to wording can be made, but Objectives and Policies in particular are creatures of statute and require careful legal wording, which is not plain english	Amend LAP as appropriate to improve flow and meaning			
22.14	O1 supported	obj, pois and actions	Noted	No Change			
22.15	O1,2 supported	obj, pois and actions	Noted	No Change			
22.16	O1,3 supported - see also A16 - such initiatives already exist and should be noted	Obj, Pois and Actions	Agreed	Amend A16 to reflect existing initiatives			
22.17	O1,4 & A17 signage should also note Heritage Area, hopefully encouraging respect and consideration of area	Signage	Agreed	Add Heritage Area to Signage list in A17			

A15

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opanuku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Last	Street	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response	
23	The Adidam Trust (New Zealand)	Sebel Rd	23.1	Agree with boundary	Boundary	Noted	No Change
			23.2	Agree with features identified	Support	Noted	No Change
			23.3	Support C&A statements	Support	Noted	No Change
			23.4	Objectives and Actions - support - however could be expanded in relation to retail below, relating to lifestyle & beliefs of adherents.	Support	Noted	No Change
			23.5	Submitter recognises and values diversity and special nature of environment and peoples in the valley, and have participated actively in that fabric as one of several spiritual organisations resident in the area	Future Rural Uses	Noted	No Change
			23.6	Peaceful setting, beauty of surroundings and sense of seclusion and maintenance of good relations are important and valued to lifestyle, and wish to preserve and enhance them.	Heritage features	Noted - this is purpose of the LAP	No Change
			23.7	Important to submitter to live in close cooperation with others who share similar values, in a sustainable and simple way	Development - Sustainability	Noted - the definition of residential (as alluded to in the submission) is based on managing effects on the wider environment and does not suit all situations. The 'non-residential' aspects of the future development of the Adidam community may achieve Plan Change 36 may be of some assistance here	No Change
			23.8	A36 - development guidelines - expand to allow communities such as Adidam to live in architecture that is conducive to way of life and able to offer more comfortable and sustainable spiritual retreat facilities	obs, pods and actions	It may be possible to allude to the wishes of Adidam in this manner, but suggest that discussions with Council and neighbours on more specific aspects of the proposal may be more appropriate method to achieve - LAP should not however preclude	Amend O2 to reflect needs of spiritual communities in area
			23.9	Current regulations limit to 1 MHU per site - this is not suitable for people wishing to live in a 'village' or cluster style, or development of a retreat. Accordingly the LAP falls short of acknowledging difference in lifestyle that make up the whole of HV	Future Rural Uses	Limitation on number of dwellings is a key way in which impacts on a rural area are managed through the Resource Management Act 1991 - however exceptions exist to every rule and these can be accommodated, provided they are in keeping with wider objectives. LAP can be amended to reflect on spiritual needs of residents and variety of lifestyles. Concern would be that allowing extra 'dwellings' then enables further subdivision (in the long term), thereby (potentially) undermining attempts to limit development in the area.	Amend LAP to recognise clustering as a possible approach. Suggest Adidam commence discussions with their community and neighbours and Council on long term plans for their sites. LAP should not unnecessarily preclude this option but will need careful consideration to ensure it is an exception, and not able to be used to undermine necessary limitations on subdivision and development potential
			23.10	Would like to see more flexibility in LAP to enable creativity and allowance for living and spiritual retreat, as many members must travel to attend due to unable to live collectively	Future Rural Uses	Noted	See above
			23.11	however, this provision should only apply to lower valley due to upper valleys different character (forest).	Future Rural Uses	Agreed	No Change
			23.12	Would like to develop a spiritual retreat accommodation in harmony with environment and ecologically intelligent, with minimal impact on environment and neighbours. This would enable the periodic accommodation of 20-30 people, and half, kitchen and bathroom facilities.	Future Rural Uses	Noted	See above - difficult to provide for specifically in LAP - such a proposal could be dealt with as a resource consent or Plan Change depending on scale of proposal
			23.13	On a nearby property(s) able to live in a cooperative village or cluster style that allows more than 6 unrelated people to live on one site. This would mean several dwellings, including more than 2 kitchens, gardens etc and perhaps a small hall, school and possible a cooperative shop. This would be rural (not urban) and self servicing.	Future Rural Uses	Noted	See above
			23.14	Appreciate breadth and depth of consultation to date.	Support	Noted	No Change

17

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opauku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Last	Street	# Submission Point	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
24	Preserve the Swanson Foothills Society	Couffer Rd	24.1	Making of submission is based on Concern at 'softening of boundaries' (RUMMA) allowing subdivision to 2Ha or lower	Subdivision - RUMMA	Noted	No Change
			24.2	Consultation with all communities in the area is important. Swanson community shares many similarities with HV.	Process	Noted	No Change
			24.3	Swanson SP is still being determined, but note that Jackson J has ruled (Jan 2008) that there would not be a softening of the boundary between urban and foothills	Subdivision - RUMMA	Applies to Swanson SP Area, but principles are common. WRHAA places a higher threshold to additions to rural capacity than were able to be considered in the SSP hearings. RUMMAs are based on HVO specific investigations	RUMMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			24.4	Boundaries between urban and rural in England and Europe do not allow for 'soft' edges. This allow for a relatively undeveloped area to buffer the bush from the city, which is vital for a city of 1M+ people to visit and relax in	Subdivision - RUMMA	Agreed - current investigations suggest approx 2Ha size would be lower limit of development to retain rural character, which is 40x larger than a typical 500m2 urban site	RUMMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			24.5	Main purpose of WRHAA to control subdivision in foothills.	Subdivision - RUMMA	Noted	No Change
			24.6	Future Rural uses, esp recreation may impact on amenity particularly peace and quiet and low traffic volumes	Future Rural Uses	Noted	Changes to LAP to limit these potential effects
			24.7	There are many unused/abandoned tracks in HV area - Have a small map from 1959 to show) - would be cheaper to reestablish these than create new ones.	Future Rural Tracks and Walking	Would be interested in making a copy of this map for the PHMW and addition to our records - it may be that in the 50 years since the map was produced 'reestablishment' may be little different from new construction, and many tracks may be over what is now private property owned by a number of people rather than one single farm.	No Change
			24.8	A risk of future rural uses is need for infrastructure to service.	Future Rural Uses	Noted	No Change
			24.9	Concern at potential for development of large rural properties without community input (LPMAs?)	Subdivision - LPMAs	This is the case already as a Controlled Activity - the point of these LPMAs is to enable a better outcome than is possible if people 'followed the rules'. Given that no additional development rights are proposed to be generated, and the outcome should be 'better' in relation to the features the community has identified through this process and the DP, it is not proposed to make the process for the owners more onerous through requiring notification of any LPMAs.	No Change
			24.10	All LAPs should encourage:	Future Rural Uses	Noted	No Change
			24.11	Forbid further subdivision (as per SSP decision Jan 2008) (note assumed beyond what is currently permitted?) especially RUMMAs	Future Rural Subdivision - General	Future Plan Change to Prohibited Activity Status may be undertaken by Auckland Council, but may only be appropriate in RUMMAs or LPMAs - in other cases, sub 4Ha subdivision is currently a non-complying activity and must pass a very high test. Current knowledge regarding this particular area does not suggest that any further subdivision beyond what is currently enabled as a controlled activity would have such significant effects that it can never be contemplated, and such provisions are only in place in other Foothills areas with operative Structure Plans (other than Oratia).	No Change
			24.12	Any softening of boundary should be on urban side of MUL	Subdivision - RUMMA	Removing existing houses and establishing additional reserve land on them is not feasible or realistic. Over time these new areas will 'soften' with establishment of street trees and gardens. Comments regarding SSP noted.	No Change
			24.13	Encourage genuine rural use of rural land but not noisy motorbikes or MTBs and associated activities where bikes are trucked up hills and competitions etc	Future Rural Uses	Low traffic volumes and peace and quiet are key features noted in LAP - Objectives and policies could be strengthened to reflect.	Amend Objectives, Policies and Actions to ensure Peace and Quiet and low traffic volumes are protected, restored and enhanced
			24.14	Encourage enhancement of environment by planting of native flora and reduction of weeds on roadsides and properties	Ecology	Noted - LAP contains a number of Objectives, policies and actions in relation to these matters	No Change

AK

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Openuku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Street	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response		
25	Whittington Henderson Valley Road	Have been arguing for a more intensive land use in HV Rd RIMA general area for many years - seems natural that area be extended up to Holdens Rd, with smaller units fronting HV and FH Rds, graduating to larger further from the road. Currently a hard contrast, with some 2 sections backing to 2.5, 5 and 8Ha sites This could allow extension of new cycleway to Parris Cross Rd Area shown on proposed plan is too small and would be uneconomic. Land cannot be left as it is now, have seen decline of landscape/rural activities over last 20 years. Once home to orchards, glasshouses and strawberries now only one grower - remaining blocks are underutilised and left to run horses or dry stock. Vision is for smaller sections giving way to larger sections. As owner of 5Ha block, am aware of hard work require to maintain such a large property	Subdivision - RUMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUMA	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken		
			25.1	Tracks and Walking	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUMA	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken	
			25.2		Subdivision - RUMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUMA	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			25.3		Subdivision - RUMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUMA	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			25.4		Subdivision - RUMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUMA	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			25.5		Subdivision - RUMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUMA	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			25.6		Subdivision - RUMA	Issues raised in submission are those that should be resolved through RUMA	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
26	Maxwell Henderson Valley Road	Support Sturges/Openuku RUMA	Subdivision - RUMA	Noted	No Change		
			Subdivision - RUMA	Noted	No Change		
27	Turnwald Mountain Rd	Boundary is appropriate Important that heritage features esp hush and rural views and aspacts are preserved Maintenance of rural character and C&A statements are supported esp those relating to preventing development beyond what is currently allowed. LAP's promotion of rural activities, walkways and softening of hard urban edge are therefore a concern The combined effect of these esp traffic, visitors and additional facilities to service would affect amenity values LAP should recognise that best use of most of the area is as lifestyle blocks, and that most landowners do not want to develop small scale enterprises. Lifestyle block land use needs to be specifically noted as a feature and future in LAP. A statement regarding regeneration of native bush on private land should be made. LAP should include metrics such as population, traffic volumes, ratio of open land to bush to serve as a measure of progress or baseline Overall, subject of amendments above, LAP is supported as giving effect to the WRHAA Support and maintaining the valleys environment.	Boundary	Noted	No Change		
			27.1	Heritage features	Noted	No Change	
			27.2	Amenity Statements	Noted	No Change	
			27.3	Character and Amenity Statements	Noted	No Change	
			27.4		Noted	No Change	
			27.5		Noted	No Change	
			27.6		Noted	No Change	
			27.7		Noted	Amend LAP as appropriate to recognise 'lifestyle' land use	
			27.8		Noted	Amend LAP as appropriate to recognise 'lifestyle' land use	
			27.9		Noted	Amend to reflect reference to all vegetation on public and private land	
27.10		Noted	Amend Policies and Actions as appropriate to ensure LAP outcomes are effectively monitored, and changes to practices can be made in response				

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opanuku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
 Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Last	Street	Submission #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
28	Atkins	Henderson Valley Road	28.1	Henderson Valley separate from Opanuku, Waitarua etc - refer Map (note approximately similar to upper/lower valley)	Boundary	Majority of feedback has differed from this suggestion. Note that boundary approximately aligned with upper/lower valley differentiation	No Change
			28.2	Area north of line is part of Ranges proper - has been damaged by allowing over 300 lots	Subdivision - General	Noted	No Change
			28.3	Roll growth at HV School is mainly due to people from outside area, reflecting in traffic generation.	Heritage features	Noted	No Change
			28.4	No amenity in area any longer.	Heritage features	Majority of feedback has differed from this suggestion, and that there are many aspects of the area that are worth protecting and assist in making the area pleasant and a great place to live	No Change
			28.5	Confirmed by revisiting trees and buildings list (CHI and District Plan Heritage appendix) with only 1 tree. Re HV School perhaps does not qualify due to no date on list and which building? Is it unaltered?	Heritage features	List referred to is current CHI List and District Plan Heritage Appendix. A number of actions suggest further investigation to ensure formal protection of particular sites and features. Heritage Features under the WRHA are far broader than historic heritage	No Change
			28.6	Concern that a number of sites in Henderson township itself are also not noted such as Old Town Hall, Cinema, HBC Office, Fire Brigade Shed, Rubbish tip or site of old Falls Hotel.	Heritage features	Henderson Township is outside of the LAP area and for brevity were excluded from the discussion in the document.	No Change
			28.7	Fix infrastructure, bring underground sewers.	Infrastructure	Underground sewerage provision outside of the present urban area requires amendment to the Metropolitan Drainage Act, and could not be justified without urban development (see below)	No Change
			28.8	Remove all RUMAs and immediately commence a Structure Plan allowing residential development esp around HV School in 'Henderson Valley' (as per boundary map attached), excluding Opanuku (Upper valley).	Subdivision - General	Map attached to submission did not identify area for proposed Structure Plan, but submitters site is adjacent to school. Urban development is precluded by the WRHA	No Change
			28.9	Reinstigate bylaw making it an offence to ride or lead horses on footpath - it is a dangerous situation.	Tracks and Walking	Noted	No Change

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opamuku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Last	Street	Submission Point #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
29	Absolom	Gum Rd,	29.1	Resident of area since 1985. Sons attended HV School. Undertook development of Kowhai Park - stony and long connection with area.	Background Report	Noted	No Change
			29.2	Minor Errors in reticulated services maps (Fig 28 HVO BR report) - refer submission	Background Report	Noted	Amend Background Report
			29.3	Minor Errors in reticulated services maps (Fig 28 HVO BR report) - refer submission	Background Report	Noted	Amend Background Report
			29.4	Minor Errors re Stream Names on Cover and in documentation - refer submission	Background Report	Noted	Amend Background Report
			29.5	Minor Errors re references to landscape companies vs. individuals - refer submission	Background Report	Noted	Amend Background Report
			29.6	Boundary is appropriate except Paremuka SP area should be removed from Henderson Valley/Opamuku LAP.	Boundary	Noted	Refer RUMIA
			29.7	Map on P5 of LAP shows Blue tone but unclear what this is	Background Report	Key notes blue tone as Structure Plan Area.	No Change
			29.8	Heritage Features: A number of features related to the early days of Dreamlands were present in the 1990s around 110 Opamuku Rd - these features should be found and recognised - refer submission for more detail	Heritage features	Agreed - actions proposed to further investigate local heritage aspects not protected by District Plan or CH - these features may not meet criteria to be formally protected, but they should be noted.	No Change
			29.9 - 29.12	Existing and Future Character Most of this section is appropriate. However concern re S2 Landscape and Landforms where 3 landscape bands are introduced - upper/lower valley and residential envelopes - these delineations do not appear to correlate to the Landscape work undertaken. However as they appear to relate to the Objectives, Policies and Actions, it is important that the line is accurately located. Perhaps alternative location in the document and/or terms should be used. A number of other minor amendments also suggested - refer submission for details	obs, pois and actions	Agree - this map is better referred to as a 'policy area map' to guide the application and expansion of some of the policies in the LAP.	No Change
			29.13	1. Maintaining rural character: is most important heading - amend second paragraph to read 'and subdivision', beyond that currently provided in the District Plan will be avoided to protect the unique amenity and to retain the sense of small clusters of houses which borrow their amenity from the surrounding land uses.'	Character and Amenity Statements	Agree	Amend LAP as appropriate to include Broad Character Areas Map to link to relevant Objectives, Policies and Actions
			29.14	3. Maintaining an urban rural contrast - amend to make clear that it is physical as opposed to visual connections that will be maintained and enhanced.	Character and Amenity Statements	LAP seeks to maintain visual connections in the sense that rural and urban communities should be able to view and physically connect with each other, not that rural should 'look' urban.	Amend LAP to reflect submission, also adding reference to relative lack of suburban infrastructure
			29.15	Support encouragement of high speed telecommunications	Infrastructure	Noted	Amend LAP to ensure visual connections does not imply a requirement for a similar appearance
			29.16	Objectives Policies and Actions P4: Amend to read 'Avoid any further loss of areas of indigenous vegetation' as all vegetation remaining in area is 'significant'.	obs, pois and actions	Agree	No Change
			29.17	A17: sign should refer to 'Opamuku' in preference to 'Henderson Valley'	Signage	Noted	No Change
			29.18	A18: Should be extended to read "...improvements to existing infrastructure while maintaining the low key, rural character of that infrastructure". Urban solutions such as Twin Streams Cycleway should be avoided - Same applies to A31 and A33	obs, pois and actions	Agreed	Amend relevant aspects of LAP to recognise all remaining indigenous vegetation is 'significant' to some degree - care to ensure this does not result in confusion between meaning of 'outstanding' and 'significant vegetation' as it is used in the District Plan
			29.19	P19 Should be re-written to ensure precautionary approach is always taken to assessment of subdivision or development	Subdivision - General	Agreed	No Change
			29.20	A33: 3rd bullet amended to read "...negotiation and securing access to private land by agreement and/or purchase at the time of subdivision"	Tracks and Walking	Agreed - drafting error	Amend LAP as appropriate to reflect infrastructure improvements should be of an appropriate rural standard. Amend Policy 19 to ensure precautionary approach is always taken to subdivisions in particular, but also other developments
			29.21	A42: The phrase "in the rural areas of the valley" suggests some parts of the valley are not rural, and contradicts earlier descriptions	obs, pois and actions	Agreed - this is not intended - should read 'predominantly pastoral', or 'Lower valley'	Amend A42 to read 'predominantly pastoral', or 'Lower valley rather than Rural'
			29.22	P22: as per A42	Ecology	As above	Amend P22 to read 'predominantly pastoral', or 'Lower valley' rather than 'Rural'

For Committee Approval
(18 August 2010)

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opanuku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Street	Submission Point #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
30	Henderson Valley Road	30.1	Support the purpose of the LAP	Support	Noted	No Change
		30.2	Support the boundary of the LAP but wish to note that it was determined prior to consultation with the residents of HV Boundary should not be undermined by further subdivision within the Heritage Area	Boundary	Noted	No Change
		30.3	OS.1 Support the statement that "Henderson Valley/Opanuku has little capacity to absorb further subdivision"	Subdivision - RUMMA	Noted	No Change
		30.4	OS.2 should be amended to avoid individual development being considered in isolation from cumulative effects	Subdivision - General	Noted	No Change
		30.5	RUMAs: Object to identification of areas as being of "Low Landscape Sensitivity" - recognised Upper Paremuka as being subject to an appeal, but Opanuku to Sturges Rd and Lower HV Rd areas are ill conceived and unnecessary erosion of Foothills and Heritage Area Act.	Subdivision - RUMMA	OS.2 refers to consideration of any subdivision or development to be considered "...of itself or in respect of its cumulative effects..."	No Change
		30.6	Most of land in foothills is currently unproductive, used for lifestyle blocks and grazing, providing a natural progression from the urban area to the Ranges. Many owners derive great pleasure from using their land for such things as equestrian sport and preservation of native bush.	Lifestyle	Identification of these areas based on professional landscape advice. More work is required to determine what the potential for development within them is, but it will not be urban	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
		30.7	Sturges RUMAs: Will impact on 8 Acres (~3Ha) of bush that family have preserved since cessation of commercial logging - this currently open pastoral area serves as an essential buffer between the new urban developments and this ecologically valuable area.	Subdivision - RUMMA	Agree	Changes suggested to reflect lifestyle use of many properties in the area
		30.8	HV Rd RUMAs: View coming up HV Rd should be preserved - Should not be able to move contrast further up the valley. View is important in signalling transition from urban to rural and entering special area that protects the Ranges.	Subdivision - RUMMA	Agree - impacts on this important area will be considered as part of determination of what, if anything should occur in the RUMMA area.	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
		30.9	MUL - Softening of Edge should have been considered when developing urban land adjacent to edge - Heritage Area should not be compromised to address past mistakes. Concerned that the new softended edge may be considered a default MUL and further development could follow.	Subdivision - RUMMA	Agree - maintenance of this contrast is an important consideration	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
		30.10	RUMAs: while oppose them, should they go ahead then subdividers and new residents should be made aware of their obligations. IN additions suggest the following:	Subdivision - RUMMA	Agree. Primary purpose of RUMMA in this location is to provide a solution to existing landlock issues in a way that would preclude in perpetuity urbanisation should the MUL and WRHAA be withdrawn	No Change
		30.11	Underland a 2Ha minimum is suggested - this must be maintained - there should also be a 4Ha residual lot size.	Subdivision - RUMMA	These aspects have yet to be determined, but would note that a 4Ha residual lot size requirement would result in no potential for additional dwellings in the area	No Change
		30.12	Stormwater runoff is a significant concern and all development should be hydrologically neutral to the 1:10 year event	Development - Sustainability	Agree - a number of actions are proposed on this point	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
		30.13	Reticulated sewer should be extended in to these areas from urban side to avoid runoff entering stream	Infrastructure	Difficult choice to be made - on the one hand extending the sewer requires approval and change to the Metropolitan Drainage Act, and would be unlikely unless there was urban development, but would avoid any issues with onsite disposal. Onsite disposal systems are very advanced and this aspect will be one of the matters to be determined when considering the capacity of the area for development - see also P20 which is intended to avoid establishment of development which requires reticulated infrastructure, which is generally urban in nature.	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
		30.14	Access and all other services should be from urban side to minimise impacts on Heritage Area.	Infrastructure	Agree - this is a precondition for development of the area, and also a complicating factor given arrangement of land in the area	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken

422

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Openaku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Street	# Submission Point	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
31	Henderson Valley Rd	31.1	Agree regarding identification of 'quietness and darkness' as a desirable amenity.	Heritage features	Noted	No Change
		31.2	Note however school hockey turf lights and Carey Park Lighting	Heritage features	Noted	No Change
		31.3	Noise from Carey Park is an ongoing issue, and does not appear to be within limits set down by the Environment Court.	Carey Park	Noted	No Change
		31.4	Any changes at Carey Park should be in keeping with quiet nature of the area, and activity level there has increased significantly over the years.	Carey Park	Noted	No Change
		31.5	Expansion of the site is an issue with effluent disposal soakage issues, potentially leading to deterioration of road stability near new soakage area.	Infrastructure	Noted	No Change
		31.6-B	Further issues regarding Carey Park - Refer submission for Details	Infrastructure	Noted	No Change
		31.10	Footpaths should be improved, thank you for (finally) removing trees outside school. Issue remains at short steep section by Carey Park VYG.	Carey Park	Noted	No Change
		31.11	Horse traffic on footpath is an issue	Tracks and Walking	Noted	No Change
		31.12	A17: do not want further clutter of signage in valley	Tracks and Walking	Noted	No Change
		31.13	Disagree with reduction in speed limits.	Walking	Noted	No Change
		31.14	Commercial operations should be regularly inspected to ensure consent conditions are continuously met.	Signage	Noted	No Change
		31.15	Promotion of camps in Valley is a worthy idea, but personal experience suggests may be inappropriate due to considerable impacts on amenity and neighbours, to benefit of temporary visitors only.	Traffic	Noted	No Change
		31.16	Minor error in business map showing poultry farming across whole site, up Gum Rd - is restricted to sheds at road frontage only.	Future Rural Uses	Noted	No Change
		31.17	2. Volume of Background information very useful - these should be made more widely available to promote a greater understanding and respect for area in which we are privileged to reside.	Future Rural Uses	Noted	No Change
		32	Upper Paremuka RUMAs	32.1	LAP does not make adequate provision for appropriately designed and managed future growth in the area	Future Rural Uses Background Report
32.2	The LAP allows for no flexibility once existing opportunities are utilised.			Subdivision - General	Submission Relates to Paremuka Structure Plan Area	Refer Paremuka SP
32.3	LPMA provisions are supported			Subdivision - General	LAP is intended to provide certainty	Refer Paremuka SP
32.4	Consider that the Upper Paremuka Area can be developed in a way that promotes the Objectives in the LAP, including maintaining a contrast, improving the management of the area, and establishing a permanent settlement pattern.			Subdivision - LPMAs	Noted	Refer Paremuka SP
32.5	Inclusion of RUMAs are supported			Subdivision - RUMAs	Agree	Refer Paremuka SP
32.6	A number of specific amendments to the Policies and Objectives are sought. A draft Structure Plan Concept Plan and Discussion Document are attached to the submission.			Subdivision - RUMAs	Noted	Refer Paremuka SP
32.7	O1.5: replace 'subservient to' with 'compatible with'			Subdivision - RUMAs	Noted	Refer Paremuka SP
32.8	P13: delete portion from after "heritage features..."			Subdivision - RUMAs	Noted	Refer Paremuka SP
32.9	P14: delete entirely			Subdivision - RUMAs	Noted	Refer Paremuka SP
32.10	O3.1 replace "has little capacity to absorb further subdivision" with "development within ... should be carefully designed and managed"			Subdivision - RUMAs	Noted	Refer Paremuka SP
32.11	O3.2 Delete (i) and (ii)			Subdivision - RUMAs	Noted	Refer Paremuka SP
32.12	Add new O3.3: To recognise over time the District Plan may change or proposed subdivision and/or development applications will be received reflecting an increasing pressure for growth and the present needs of the community that will be assessed on their site specific merits against the relevant policies, being P18 through P23 respectively.			Subdivision - RUMAs	Noted	Refer Paremuka SP
				P19: delete first two sentences, and remove "capacity limits of existing District Plan" from (i)	Subdivision - RUMAs	Noted

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Opauku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Street	Submission Point #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response	
33	Lawley Henderson Valley Road	33.1	RV is a unique area with a unique history - because of this most residents have a strong environmental consciousness and think long term, and recognise that the area is special, but that it is also part of the Ranges, and provides an important linkage from rural to urban It is important that the LAP supports small rural businesses there is an increasing tension between the quiet rural valley feel and increasing traffic volume and speed which is becoming a safety issue - the LAP should attempt to address this	Future Rural Uses Traffic	Noted	No Change	
		33.2			Noted	No Change	
		33.3			LAP has attempted to do this but speeds are primarily a wider social issue experienced nationally - a number of initiatives are underway including changes to speed limits etc. Traffic volumes will be limited by limits on residential development and cut-de-sac nature of area limiting through traffic, other than on Candia Rd - recent increases should be temporary until Sturges Rd Bridge works are completed, but Candia Rd remains a key arterial route	Amend or add appropriate Policy and Action in relation to reducing traffic speeds and minimising increases in volumes particularly above Candia road	
		33.4		Tracks and walking The Upper Opauku Cycle/walkway is a big success but is bringing issues particularly parking for walkers RUMAs: a good way to preserve these areas from future urban development - however possibly the thin end of a wedge that could lead to more development.	Noted	No Change	
		33.5		Sturges/Opauku RUMAs: particularly appropriate in this area for following reasons Owned by multiple owners, access difficult, not vehicle access, and only by crossing stream.	Noted	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken	
		33.6			Subdivision - RUMAs Subdivision - RUMAs	Noted	No Change
		33.7			Subdivision - RUMAs Subdivision - RUMAs	Noted	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
		33.8		If area could be developed to 2-3Ha with one house on each this would be a good outcome providing for a transition and buffer between urban and rural and addressing the issues with the current layout, stemming from poorly considered subdivision at some point in the past. The LAP's guidance as to where & how houses should be located and designed when development is undertaken is supported.	Final development potential yet to be determined, but this suggestion is consistent with the work we have completed to date	No Change	
		33.9			Development - Sustainability	Noted	No Change
		34.1	Adventure Trust Camp Board (ATCB) own and operate Carey Park Christian Camp			Noted	No Change
34	Adventure Trust Camp Board (Carey Park)	34.2	Park has a long history of providing outdoor education and recreational opportunities to churches, youth groups and schools. The Park recently received Department of Conservation concession to use and operate in the adjacent Henderson Valley Scenic Reserve, confirming their sustainable and trusted use of this asset.	Carey Park	Noted	No Change	
		34.3		Carey Park	Noted	No Change	
		34.4	Support the LAP generally, but some amendments are suggested	Carey Park	Noted	No Change	
		34.5	A Carey Park specific Objective and/or policy should be added to reflect the role it has in contributing to the character of the area, including generating visitors to the area, as well as providing social, cultural and educational opportunities, and providing for the continued evolution of the Park and its facilities. Such an objective/policy can support the benefits of the park to the wider community while also ensuring adverse effects on the immediate environment and neighbours are minimised	Carey Park Carey Park	There are a number of similar facilities in the area - prior to keep LAP at a high level recognising points outlined above	No Change No Change	
		34.6		Carey Park	A number of objectives and policies are suggested that will apply to all activities in relation to minimisation of impacts, and protection, restoration and enhancement of the heritage features including peace and quiet. As for 34.5	No Change	
		34.7	Importantly, a Carey Park specific objective/policy will clearly signal that the Council and community acknowledge the wider benefits of the Park brings to the WRHA	Carey Park	Plan Change 38 hearings are soon to commence, and may be the appropriate place for such a foothills wide policy. LAP should be amended to recognise benefits of Carey Park and similar facilities to wide community but also potential impacts operations can have on close neighbours	Amend LAP to reflect positive and potential negative impacts of large scale visitor and education facilities can have for the area	
		34.8		Future Rural Uses	Noted	No Change	
		34.9		Future Rural Uses	Noted	No Change	

104

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Openaku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Street	Submission Point #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response
35	Auckland Regional Council	35.1	Supports the LPA process as a method for promoting the purpose of the WRHAA	Support	Noted	No Change
		35.2	Approach and Purpose of the LAP, and descriptions of current and future character and amenity are supported, as well as the research and consultation undertaken to reach this point are acknowledged.	Character and Amenity Statements Boundary	Noted	No Change
		35.3	Amend the LA boundaries to remove Regional Parkland from influence of the LAP		WRHAA describes how private and public land together make up the entirety of WRHAA. Boundary between private and public land and the heritage features they contain is for most intents and purposes arbitrary as bush across seamlessly traverses arbitrary cadastral boundaries that are usually unknown and untempered. Separating the public and private land for the purpose of the LAP would not promote integrated and sustainable management or the protection and enhancement of the heritage features and would not serve any logical purpose. The LAP has given effect to s226(c) by 'having regard' to the current management plan for the parkland, noting that it was developed prior to the passing of the WRHAA. Note that s19 requires any review of the management plan to 'give effect' to the WRHAA and its objectives.	No Change
		35.4	Inclusion/amend policies in the LAP to ensure effects are managed and integration is achieved at the private/parkland interface	Regional Parkland	These policies would be best achieved by ensuring that the parkland enclosing the private land is considered as part of the Local Area. Some amendments to the LAP is recommended to ensure private actions do not impact on the values of the parkland - this is best achieved by treating the heritage features as a whole, rather than differently depending on whether they are on private or public land.	No Change
		35.5	O3.2 amended to support the protection of the amenity of the adjacent parkland when development is undertaken particularly in the upper valley	Regional Parkland	This Objective would be best achieved by ensuring that the parkland enclosing the private land is considered as part of the Local Area. Some amendments to the LAP is recommended to ensure private actions do not impact on the values of the parkland - this is best achieved by treating the heritage features as a whole, rather than differently depending on whether they happen to be on private or public land.	Some amendment to relevant policies to ensure natural and historic resources of Waiakare Ranges Regional Parkland are protected in perpetuity.
		35.8	FHWV concept (A18 and A33) are supported, provided it is predominantly for local use and not an extension or an alternative to the existing Parks trails network	Tracks and Walking	The FHWV is intended to provide a number of functions, depending on its final configuration (noting that it will take many years to establish a full network) including but not limited to - provision of a complementary experience, - as a possible alternative to the Parks trails network, and as a priority, local accessibility improvements. This function may also include allowing walking (cycling or even horseback riding) access from the parkland trailhead to the urban area and the PT services and accessibility it provides, including for the intrinsic benefit, use and enjoyment of the people of the Auckland region and New Zealand.	No Change
		35.7	P12 and A19 promoting local walking is supported.	Tracks and Walking School	Noted	No Change
		35.8	P17 recognising HV School as the centre of the community is supported.		Noted	No Change
		35.9	Provide a clear distinction between Policies, Objectives and Actions (where appropriate) in relation to the Upper, Lower Valleys and Residential Enclaves	obs, pois and actions	Agree - changes to the description and effect of the Map and variations to Objectives, policies and Actions is required to reflect the variation in character and issues in these areas	Amend LAP as appropriate to reflect variation in character and issues across the 3 identified areas.
		35.10	A22: amend to include maintenance of key views/vistas from walkways and lookouts from within the Regional Parkland	obs, pois and actions	Agree - Submitter to provide details of such points	Amend A22 to add reference to public walking trails
		35.11	P6: Amend to refer also to the Landscape provisions of the ARPS	obs, pois and actions	Agree	Amend P6 to reference ARPS
		35.12	Add a map identifying the Outstanding or Regionally Significant Landscapes from the ARPS	obs, pois and actions	Amendment to policy 6 is considered sufficient - maps are available in the referenced document and are subject to change	No Change
		35.13	Ensure there is emphasis on 'natural character' as well as rural character esp in relation to the 3 landscape bands identified within the valley	Ecology	Agree - further emphasis on natural as well as rural character is required	Amend LAP as appropriate to reflect on protection of natural character in the Local Area

For Committee Approval
(18 August 2010)

Summary of submissions to Proposed Henderson Valley/Openaku Local Area Plan and recommended responses.
Also refer to amended LAP text document

Submitter #	Street	Submission #	Submission Point Summary	Theme	Staff Assessment of Submission Point	Staff Recommended Amendments to LAP in response	
36	Auckland Regional Council	35.14	A16: amend to ensure neighbourhood restoration aligns with regional initiatives	Ecology	Local initiatives will evolve in response to local issues, the enthusiasm of members and availability of resources and assistance available, including any regional initiatives - Parkland management may need to be more flexible to 'tap into' and support local initiatives where they exist to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes. This will be more logically achieved if the Parkland is part of the LAP area and not artificially separated, particularly as the heritage features traverse these arbitrary boundaries	No Change	
			35.15	Further emphasis on the intrinsic ecological, biodiversity, and wildlife values of the Heritage Area and the Regional Parkland about the LAP area is required. The foothills are an integral part of the Rangere acting as a buffer, as well as forming linkages with the urban area. The foothills are not a separate zone, but integral with the ranges.	Ecology		No Change
			35.16	P5 supported, but a broader approach is required to natural character, not just significant areas and threatened species.	Ecology	Agree see comment above - note that Objectives are taken directly from WRHHA	Expand Objectives 1.0-1.3 inclusive
			35.17	P13 supported, but should add need to avoid fragmentation of natural areas, corridors and connections, loss of habitat, impact of weeds and pest and impacts on regional parkland.	Ecology	These matters are noted in other policies and do not require repetition	No Change
			35.18	ensure that Subdivision and Development also address wildlife and ecological issues by ensuring there is an adequate setback.	Subdivision - General obs, pots and actions	Noted	No Change
			35.19	A28 is supported offering formal protection of land outside Regional Parkland	Ecology	Noted	No Change
			35.20	Add Policy to ensure careful consideration of ecology, biodiversity values and connections between the LAP area and the surrounding Regional Parkland	Ecology	This will be more logically achieved if the Parkland is part of the LAP area and not artificially separated, particularly as the heritage features traverse these arbitrary boundaries	No Change
			35.21	Amend P19 to give effect to submission points above (see submission for details)	Subdivision - General Development - Sustainability	Noted	Amend Policy 19 to refer to other relevant policies in LAP
			35.22	Add an Action to ensure weed and pest control is undertaken as part of new subdivision or development	Ecology	Agreed	Add/amend action to encourage weed and pest control is considered as part of new subdivision or development as well as in existing areas
			35.23	P13: amend to specify fragmentation and habitat destruction is to be avoided	Ecology	This is implicit in the policy	No Change
			35.24	O1.3 add a specific policy that maintains and enhances the streams in the upper catchment.	Ecology	Not necessary to specifically identify upper catchment streams as distinct from lower catchment - policy currently covers all streams	No Change
			35.25	O1.4, P10 and A17 re: heritage trails and interpretation is supported.	Tracks and Walking obs, pots and actions	Noted	No Change
			35.26	LAP suggests Plan Change(s) will be undertaken - other than in A38 the matters to be addressed by Plan Change are not clearly articulated.	Tracks and Walking obs, pots and actions	Agreed	Identify in the LAP Actions which matters are to be addressed by regulatory change
			35.27	P19 - the site specific management approach as it relates to LPMAs is supported in principle, including A38 to undertake a plan change in the short to medium term.	Subdivision - LPMAs	Noted	No Change
			35.28	P19 the site specific management approach as it relates to RUMAs is supported in principle, but the suggestion that this would be enabled by allowing further subdivision is not	Subdivision - RUMA	Noted	RUMAs will require a significant amount of further work before any change to District Plan can be undertaken
			35.29	Recommend that a public hearing is undertaken to allow people to speak and hear the submissions of others.	Process	Noted	No Change
			37	Sipka Holdings Canola Rd Ltd. (Mr. A Sipka)	36.1	Support Paramuka Structure Plan Area, and hope that density in this area can be increased.	Subdivision - RUMA
36.2	Would like to have improvements to roadside infrastructure (kebs, VXC's, footpaths and drainage) in the area particularly Candia Rd between Sturges and Simpson Rd.	Subdivision - RUMA			Noted - issue is addressed by various actions though out document. Proposed Paramuka SP may also improve this situation by providing walkways offroad to urban area	Refer Paramuka SP	
36.3	Tenants have trouble walking on this part of the road.	Tracks and Walking			Noted	No Change	
37.1	As there is existing pressure for development in the area, support land being urbanised by allowing higher density development	Subdivision - RUMA			Paramuka Structure Plan	Refer Paramuka SP	
37.2	Would like to see infrastructure improvements to the area including gravity wastewater and storm water systems.	Infrastructure			Paramuka Structure Plan	Refer Paramuka SP	
37.3	Would like the public road to be upgraded (footpaths and wider road surface)	Tracks and Walking			Paramuka Structure Plan	Refer Paramuka SP	
37.4	Would like to see an urbanisation concept to see how it would affect my land	Subdivision - RUMA			Paramuka Structure Plan	Refer Paramuka SP	

For Committee Approval
(18 August 2010)