

Plan Change 54 - Northlake - Ian Greaves – KLP3 Submission Summary

- 1 My full name is Ian Christopher Greaves. I have practiced in planning and land development since 2006. I am currently employed by Southern Ventures NZ Ltd as their Planning and Development Manager. In this role I manage and deliver land and property development projects for Southern Ventures and their associated entities. One of these associated entities is Kirimoko No.3 Limited Partnership (KLP3) which owns land within the Kirimoko area that borders Sticky Forest and the Northlake Zone. As a result, KLP3 has a strong vested interest in the effects of development within Sticky Forest and the Northlake Zone.
- 2 KLP3 is a Section 274 party on the Sticky Forest appeal and has lodged evidence accepting some rezoning of Sticky Forest, subject to landscape protection and recreation use of remaining areas. However, the extent of the rezoning remains a live issue between the parties. In addition to this KLP3 is not supportive of any vehicle access from Sticky Forest or Northlake that enters the Kirimoko area given the potential for high traffic volumes and the potential for this to cause traffic safety and nuisance effects. KLP3 accepts that this matter is outside of the scope of PC54.
- 3 As outlined within KLP3 submission we consider that Council needs to consider a more integrated approach to PC54, the Sticky Forest rezoning appeal and adjoining areas. The expert evidence presented for PC54 further supports this position. What is clear from the traffic evidence for PC54 is that the proposed roading access from Northlake to Sticky Forest is no silver bullet. Based on Mr Smith's traffic evidence for Council which states there is constrained capacity for Sticky Forest traffic (both in terms of forestry activities or future residential activities) to be accommodated within the Northlake Roding network. I acknowledge Mr Munro has recommended changes to PC54 including amendments to road widths and a new rule that addresses traffic generation effects on Northlake from Sticky Forest. However, as Mr Munro acknowledges there will be a 'ceiling' on what can occur within Northlake to support additional traffic within the zone from Sticky Forest. Mr Munro suspects this ceiling will support less development on the Sticky Forest site than may come to be enabled. I agree with this position.
- 4 There are also a wider integration issues beyond traffic related effects that need to be considered with respect to PC54. This includes integrated urban form, landscape protection areas, boundary treatments and infrastructure across Northlake, Sticky Forest and Kirimoko. An integrated approach is supported by Strategic Objective 3.2.2 and its

implementing Policy 3.2.2.1(a) of the PDP that promotes a compact, well designed and integrated urban form.

- 5 The Kirimoko blocks went through a Council-initiated plan change, PC13 in the 2007-2008 period. The plan change process for PC13 raised issues of the appropriateness of urban development on the more visually prominent and sensitive upper slopes on the land adjoining Sticky Forest. This issue was addressed by five landscape architects through the process, who were all in agreement as to the important values of the upper slopes and the need to protect the more natural and open character. As a result, the higher land in Kirimoko, above approximately the 350-360m contour remained zoned Rural with a Building Restriction overlay.
- 6 If PC54 is confirmed, the Building Restriction Areas of Kirimoko and rural zoning of Sticky Forest become less defensible as more urban development will have established higher and closer to Sticky Forest. Expanding urban development in this area could call into question the continuing function of the Kirimoko Building Restriction Area. This is an example of why I consider the area needs to be reconsidered as an integrated whole, so Kirimoko does not end up with an outcome exactly the reverse of what the PC13 sought to deliver.
- 7 Overall, I agree with Mr Munro's sentiment that there is a 'chicken and egg' element to PC54, the Northlake Zone and Sticky Forest. However, I do not agree that PC54 is the best planning vehicle to resolve the Sticky Forest access issue and wider integration matters between the directly adjoining zones. KLP3 does not imply that the outcomes sort by PC54 are wholly inappropriate, however KLP3 position is that PC54 should not be considered in isolation of the development proposed in Sticky Forest and wider integration matters between Northlake, Sticky Forest and Kirimoko. The best way to achieve this outcome is a Council lead Plan Change that deals with all relevant matters across these areas as one package.



Ian Greaves

24 July 2023