



PERCEPTION PLANNING  
*your connection with the environment*

# Proposed Private Plan Change request: Section 32 evaluation

RE-ZONING OF APPROXIMATELY 13.82HA OF LAND FROM RURAL (PRIMARY PRODUCTION) ZONE TO RESIDENTIAL ZONE, WITH A SPECIFIC CHARACTER AREA OVERLAY FOR THE ORCHARDS RETIREMENT VILLAGE TO ENABLE THE DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF A CONTINUING CARE RETIREMENT VILLAGE, REST HOME, HOSPITAL, DEMENTIA CARE AND ANCILLARY ACTIVITIES

6 March 2019  
The Orchards Limited Partnership





Perception Planning Ltd  
www.perceptionplanning.co.nz  
11 Jellicoe Street, PO Box 259, Martinborough 5741  
Level 1, 127 Tongariro Street, Taupō 3330



# Proposed Private Plan Change Request Section 32 Evaluation

**Murphy's Orchard**  
**67 Reading Street and 31 Market Road, Greytown**

Prepared for:  
The Orchards Limited Partnership  
05 March 2019

Disclaimer:

This document has been prepared using information and data that is sourced from external documents and information from third parties. Where possible, we have attempted to verify the accuracy of this material but accept no responsibility or liability for any inaccuracies or omissions from that material that may affect the accuracy of the assessment or recommendations made in this report. It should not be construed that we have conducted an audit of any of the information used in this report or any of the individuals, companies or organisations consulted during the course of preparing the document.

We reserve the right, but are under no obligation, to revise or amend our report if any additional information (particularly as regards the assumptions we have relied upon) which exists on the date of our report but was not drawn to our attention during its preparation, subsequently comes to light.

©Perception Planning, 2019

Report prepared by: *L. E. Cooper*  
.....  
Lucy Cooper, MA  
Planning Consultant, Perception Planning Limited

Report reviewed by: *D. H. Kissick*  
.....  
Deborah Kissick  
Planning Consultant, Perception Planning Limited

# Contents

1	Introduction.....	6
1.1	Executive Summary.....	6
1.2	The Requester and Property Details.....	6
1.3	The First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act).....	8
1.4	Scope of the Plan Change.....	9
1.5	The Purpose of the Proposed Private Plan Change.....	9
1.6	Background to the Proposed Private Plan Change.....	11
2	Site and Context.....	12
2.1	Location.....	12
2.2	Landowner and Legal Description.....	12
2.3	Historical Planning Review of the Site.....	13
2.4	Description of the Site.....	14
2.4.1	Zoning.....	14
2.4.2	The Permitted Baseline.....	15
2.4.3	Physical Description.....	17
2.4.4	Existing Services.....	18
2.4.5	Existing Site Access.....	18
2.4.6	Soils and Geology.....	18
2.4.7	Contamination.....	19
2.4.8	Natural Hazards.....	19
2.4.9	Heritage.....	19
2.5	Receiving Environment.....	19
2.5.1	Existing Landscape Setting.....	19
2.5.2	Existing Services.....	20
2.5.3	The Roding Network.....	20
2.5.4	Public Transport.....	22
2.5.5	Footpaths and Cycling Facilities.....	22
2.5.6	Amenities.....	23
2.5.7	Future Development.....	23
2.6	Relevant Plan Changes.....	23
2.6.1	Private Plan Change 10.....	23
2.7	Resource Consents.....	24
3	Site Constraints and Opportunities.....	25
3.1	Site Selection.....	25
3.2	Site Constraints.....	26
3.2.1	Contamination.....	26
3.2.2	Existing Vegetation.....	26
3.2.3	Geology and Soil Type.....	26
3.2.4	Existing Road Network.....	26
3.2.5	Rural Location.....	26
3.3	Site Opportunities.....	27
3.3.1	Site's Location.....	27
3.3.2	Site Topography.....	27
3.3.3	Road Network and Connectivity.....	27

3.3.4	Proximity to Amenities .....	27
3.3.5	Size and Shape of the Land.....	28
3.3.6	Existing Vegetation .....	28
3.4	Summary.....	28
4	Consultation.....	28
4.1	Engagement with Council Staff.....	28
4.2	Engagement with the community.....	28
4.3	Response to Feedback .....	29
4.4	Survey .....	30
5	Statutory and Policy Context.....	30
5.1	Resource Management Act 1991.....	30
5.1.1	The purpose of the RMA .....	30
5.1.2	The First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act).....	31
5.1.3	Section 32 of the RMA .....	31
5.2	Statutory and Strategic Context for Retirement Villages.....	32
5.2.1	The Resource Management Act.....	32
5.2.2	The Retirement Villages Act 2003.....	33
5.3	Regional Policy Context.....	33
5.3.1	Regional Policy Statement .....	33
5.4	Local Policy Context.....	33
5.4.1	Wairarapa Combined District Plan.....	33
5.4.2	Other Strategies, Plans and Policies .....	33
6	Supporting Documents and Expert Reports .....	35
7	Section 32 Evaluation .....	35
7.1	The issues that the Private Plan Change Request seeks to address .....	35
7.1.1	Introduction.....	35
7.1.2	Identification of Issues .....	35
7.1.3	Consideration of Options to Address the Issue .....	37
7.1.4	Appropriateness of the Options .....	38
7.2	Examining the Appropriateness of the Objectives.....	43
7.3	Examining the Appropriateness of the Policies, Rules and Other Methods .....	43
7.3.1	Analysis of the proposed provisions.....	44
7.3.2	Assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed provisions .....	59
8	Environmental Effects Resulting from the Proposed Private Plan Change.....	59
8.1	Actual and Potential Effects .....	59
8.1.1	Socio-economic effects .....	59
8.1.2	Social and Cultural effects.....	61
8.1.3	Landscape and visual effects .....	63
8.1.4	Noise .....	65
8.1.5	Dust.....	65
8.1.6	Lighting.....	65
8.1.7	Hours of operation .....	65
8.1.8	Potential effects on Significant Natural or Historic Values .....	66
8.1.9	Site servicing .....	66
8.1.10	Management of contaminated soils.....	67
8.1.11	Soils/Productivity .....	67

8.1.12	Natural Hazards.....	69
8.1.13	Transportation effects .....	69
8.1.14	Construction effects.....	70
8.1.15	Reverse Sensitivity Effects.....	71
8.2	Summary.....	71
9	Part II Assessment.....	72
9.1.1	Summary of Part II Assessment.....	74

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Executive Summary

This report has been prepared to support a private Plan Change request to re-zone 13.82ha of land in Greytown from Rural (Primary Production) Zone to Residential Zone with an Orchards Retirement Village Character Area overlay. The site is to be known as the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area ("the proposed zone").

Currently, there is no specific provision for retirement villages in the Wairarapa Combined District Plan (WCDP). The purpose of the Proposed Private Plan Change (the Change) is to enable the development and use of the Murphy's Orchard site at 67 Reading Street and 31 Market Road for the purposes of developing and operating a continuing care retirement village, rest home, hospital, dementia care and ancillary activities. The Change will result in the rezoning of the land from Rural (Primary Production) to the existing Residential Zone within the Wairarapa Combined District Plan.

New Zealand's population is ageing, and this trend is also reflected in the demographics of Greytown and South Wairarapa. As a consequence of the demographic change being experienced in New Zealand, housing and caring for our older population is anticipated to become a significant resource management issue for the country (Hinchey, 2015). Retirement villages are becoming a popular housing model for older people and already play a significant part in housing and caring for elderly people in New Zealand.

The Orchards is proposed to be a continuing care retirement village and will make a significant contribution to fulfilling the housing needs of the region's older population. Continuing care means that the village provides a full range of living options to residents from independent living to full care in one location (Hinchey, 2015). It will be registered under the Retirement Villages Act 2003 and subject to other industry regulations and codes of practice focused on protecting the interests of residents.

The approach proposed in this Private Plan Change is consistent with The Retirement Villages Association preferred option:

*[...] we consider that in general, Councils' Residential Zone objectives and policies need to be amended to acknowledge that retirement villages are a residential use, and that their development is actively supported in the residential zones (Retirement Villages Association, 2014).*

## 1.2 The Requester and Property Details

**Requester:** The Orchards Limited Partnership

**Address for Service:** Lucy Cooper, Perception Planning Ltd, 11 Jellicoe Street, Martinborough 5711



**Site Address:** 67 Reading Street and 31 Market Road, Greytown

**Site Area:** 13.82ha approximately

**Legal Description:**

Current Street Address	Legal Description	Title	Site Area	Occupier	Owner
31 Market Road	Lot 4 DP 437963 and Lot 1 DP 6753	437963	8.2857	Vacant	The Orchards Limited Partnership
67 Reading Street	Part Tahorahina Block	WN403/156	5.5315	Vacant	The Orchards Limited Partnership

**Current Zoning:** Rural (Primary Production) Zone

**Proposed Zoning:** Residential Zone with The Orchards Retirement Village Character Area Overlay

**Request:** This Private Plan Change request seeks the re-zoning of approximately 13.82ha of land that is currently zoned Rural (Primary Production) Zone to Residential Zone with a specific character area overlay for the Orchards Retirement Village to enable the development and operation of a continuing care retirement village, rest home, hospital, dementia care and ancillary activities.

The current Rural (Primary Production) Zone is no longer considered appropriate for the land. The site is flat and easily accessible and is located within 400m of the Greytown's Main Street and borders existing residential development zoned residential along its northeastern-most boundary. The Greytown Primary School is immediately opposite the site on the Reading Street frontage. There is an enclave of rural-residential style development (zoned Rural (Primary Production)) on Reading Street on the site's south west boundary. The Rural (Primary Production) Zone is not appropriate for the scale or infrastructure needs of the proposed Orchards Retirement Village.

The Private Plan Change is requested by the land owners to enable a more sustainable, efficient and effective use of the land. The proposed Residential Zone and Orchards Retirement Village Character Area overlay will provide for and ensure that development on the site results in a high-quality retirement village that is specifically designed to best suit the land, its location, and the accommodation needs of Greytown and the wider community.

### 1.3 The First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act)

Clause 21 and 22 of Part 2 of the First Schedule of the RMA set out the procedures for requesting a private plan change. This includes that:

- Any person can request a change to a district plan or regional plan;
- Requests be made to the local authority in writing and:
  - explain the purpose of, and reasons for, the proposed plan change, and
  - contain an evaluation report prepared in accordance with s32 of the RMA.
- Where environmental effects are anticipated, the private plan change request describe those effects, taking into account clauses 6 and 7 of Schedule 4 of the RMA.
- The detail in the s32 report shall correspond with the scale and significance of the actual and potential environmental effects anticipated by the implementation of the private plan change.

Clause 25 sets out the processing options for a local authority which are:

- a) Adopt the request as if it were a proposed plan prepared by the local authority itself; or
- b) Accept the request (in whole or in part) and proceed to notify it; or
- c) Deal with the request as it were an application for resource consent; or
- d) Reject the request (in whole or in part), but only on the grounds that:
  - i. The request is frivolous or vexatious
  - ii. The substance of the request has been considered or given effect to (or rejected) by the Council or the Environment Court within the past 2 years; or
  - iii. The request is not in accordance with sound resource management practice; or
  - iv. The request would make the policy statement or plan inconsistent with Part 5; or
  - v. The policy statement or plan has been operative for less than 2 years.

The requester seeks that South Wairarapa District Council (Council) **accept** the request in whole in accordance with clause 25(2)(b) of Schedule 1.

This evaluation report confirms that the request is:

- a) neither frivolous nor vexatious (cl. 25 (4)(a)), and
- b) in accordance with sound resource management practice (cl. 25 (4)(c)); and

c) consistent with Part 5 of the Act (cl. 25 (4)(d).

## 1.4 Scope of the Plan Change

This private Plan Change applies to the land identified in Appendix 1. The land is contained in two titles, referred to as 67 Reading Street and 31 Market Road and legally described in Section 2.2 below and shown on the map in the appendix.

## 1.5 The Purpose of the Proposed Private Plan Change

The proposed Private Plan Change relates to land owned by The Orchards Limited Partnership and is located entirely within the Rural (Primary Production) Zone under the operative Wairarapa Combined District Plan.

The purpose of the Proposed Private Plan Change (the Change) is to enable the development and use of the Murphy's Orchard site at 67 Reading Street and 31 Market Road for the purposes of developing and operating a continuing care retirement village, rest home, hospital, dementia care and ancillary activities. The Change will result in the rezoning of the land from Rural (Primary Production) to the existing Residential Zone within the Wairarapa Combined District Plan.

The Change will specifically provide for development and operation of the retirement village by identifying the site as 'The Orchards Retirement Village character area' (the Character Area) within the Residential Zone. Character areas are an established spatial planning tool in the environmental zones of the Wairarapa Combined District Plan (WCDP). They are overlaid on an area within a Zone and spatially identified in the planning maps. They are typically used for areas where a different, more specific, management approach is required from that provided in the underlying zone provisions. They are also used in the WCDP to spatially identify and manage areas where conceptual plans apply to determine future land use and/or development, e.g. the Greytown Future Development Area.

The Change results in the provisions of the Residential Zone applying to the site, and establishes a suite of site-specific provisions, including rules, to provide for the development of the site for a continuing care retirement village and elderly care hospital as a character area overlay.

The Change will provide for the development of the site in accordance with a concept plan, which is included in Appendix 6. The Concept Plan shows the general pattern of development of the site, specifically designed to meet the needs of older residents and includes the stages by which the development will proceed.

The Change will provide for the development and ongoing use of the site as a lifestyle retirement village and elderly care hospital as a **Controlled Activity** provided the development proceeds in accordance with the Concept Plan and the controls and standards for Controlled Activities which will form part of the Character Area provisions (to be known as the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area). Residential development

within the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area that is not for the purposes of a retirement village is proposed to be a non-complying activity.

A resource consent for the residential stages of the development has been submitted concurrently with this Private Plan Change application. It is anticipated that development of the site will proceed by early 2020, with all stages of the development (including the elderly care hospital) having been completed by 2030.

This Private Plan Change request involves the following components:

- Rezone the land from Rural (Primary Production) Zone to Residential Zone with a character area overlay specifically for the Orchards Retirement Village development;
- Introduce a new policy in the Residential Zone to provide specifically for retirement village development within the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area;
- Introduce a new Standard for Permitted Activities at 5.5.2 to enable the development of a retirement village in the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area;
- Introduce a new Rule at 5.5.3 to provide for the development of a retirement village within the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area as a Controlled Activity;
- Introduce a new Non-Complying Activity Rule at 5.5.6 to provide for no-retirement village residential development within the Orchards Village Character Area as a non-complying activity;
- Introduce a new subdivision standard at 20.1.2(a) to provide for future subdivision within the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area as a Controlled Activity;
- Introduce new Assessment Criteria at 22.1.1 to enable assessment of subdivision activity within the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area;
- Introduce new Assessment Criteria at 22.2 to enable assessment of future land use development within the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area;
- Introduce a new Appendix to Part D to include the Orchards Retirement Village Concept Plan; and
- Introduce a new definition for 'Retirement Village' in section 27 of the Plan; and
- Consequential amendments to give effect to the purpose and scope of the proposed Private Plan Change.

This type of development is unique for Greytown and will provide high quality living for older people (70+ years). Occupancy of the independent residential units will be on the

basis of a License to Occupy (LTO). An LTO is the most common legal title which New Zealand retirement village units are sold on. 'License to occupy' means the resident is paying to live in the unit for the duration of their life or for as long as they choose.

The advanced residential care facilities will provide assisted living, rest home care, hospital care and dementia care options.

**Assisted Living:** Sometimes referred to as supported living, or serviced apartments. Assisted living is designed for those who need regular help with day-to-day tasks, or with medical conditions. In the Orchards, assisted living residents can receive this help in a serviced apartment up to rest home level care.

**Rest Home Care:** This is residential care in a dedicated facility from trained caregivers and registered nurses. 24-hour care is provided to those who are no longer able to live independently.

**Hospital Care:** Sometimes referred to as continuing care. Often offered in tandem with rest home care, hospital level care offers a higher level of nursing and clinical care for those suffering from illness or other medical conditions.

**Dementia Care:** Dementia level care will be offered in a dedicated unit and by specially trained staff.

## 1.6 Background to the Proposed Private Plan Change

This proposed Private Plan Change seeks to rezone land known as Murphy's Orchard in Greytown from Rural (Primary Production) Zone to Residential Zone with a specific Orchards Retirement Village Character Area overlay to provide for the comprehensive development of a continuing care retirement village and elderly care rest home, hospital and dementia care facility.

New Zealand's population is ageing. In 2009, the population of people aged 65 years, or more was around 550,000. By 2051 that number is expected to over 1.14 million (Khawaja and Thomson, 2000). Furthermore, the over-80-year-olds are the fastest-growing cohort (of any age group), increasing at a rate of around 5% per annum (Grant, n.d.).

There is also the expectation of an ageing population in South Wairarapa. While the population of South Wairarapa increased by on 12% between 2008 and 2018 to 9,500 people, the population aged 65 and over increased by a considerable 45%. As a share of the total, the population aged 65+ increased from 17% in 2008 to 22% in 2018. By 2043, this proportion is expected to increase to 31% (Cox and Groom, 2019).

As a consequence of the demographic change being experienced in New Zealand, housing and caring for our older population is anticipated to become a significant resource management issue for the country (Hinchey, 2015). Retirement villages are becoming a popular housing model for older people and already play a significant part in housing and

caring for elderly people in New Zealand. There are currently 382 villages in New Zealand, with 29,801 units in them. The number of residents, as of November 2017, was 38,741 (Hawkes, 2018).

The Orchards retirement village is proposed to be a continuing care retirement village and will make a significant contribution to fulfilling the housing needs of the region's older population. Continuing care means that the village provides a full range of living options to residents from independent living to full care in one location (Hinchey, 2015). It will be registered under the Retirement Villages Act 2003 and subject to other industry regulations and codes of practice focused on protecting the interests of residents.

Providing suitable housing and care for the older population demographic, is critical to ensuring the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities, in accordance Section 5(2) of the RMA.

## **2 Site and Context**

### **2.1 Location**

The land is located on the east side of Greytown and can be accessed from both Reading Street and Market Road. The Reading Street frontage is 152.4m in length. The Market Road frontage is, in total, 312.8m in length. All boundary lengths are shown on plan 3.1 in the DGSE Design Statement (Appendix 18)

At the Reading Street frontage, the site is located approximately 400m south east of the Greytown's Main Street. It borders existing residential development within a residential zoning along its northeastern-most boundary. The Greytown Primary School is immediately opposite the site on the Reading Street frontage. There is an enclave of rural-residential style development (zoned Rural (Primary Production)) on Reading Street on the site's south west boundary. The Rural (Primary Production) Zone is not appropriate for the scale or infrastructure needs of proposed Orchards Retirement Village.

### **2.2 Landowner and Legal Description**

The land is owned by The Orchards Limited Partnership.

The titles of the land subject to the proposed private plan change are included in Appendix 13. The table below summarises the legal descriptions of the titles involved.

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF TITLES

Current Street Address	Legal Description	Title	Site Area	Occupier	Owner
31 Market Road	Lot 4 DP 410283 and Lot 1 DP 6753	437963	8.2857	Vacant	The Orchards Limited Partnership
67 Reading Street	Part Tahorahina Block	WN403/156	5.5315	Vacant	The Orchards Limited Partnership

### 2.3 Historical Planning Review of the Site

The South Wairarapa District Council consent history for the private Plan Change site is set out in the table below:

TABLE 2 RESOURCE CONSENT HISTORY

Resource Consent Ref	Date Granted	Details
3369	27 February 2008	5 lot subdivision, Lots 1-3 DP 86576 and Lot 9 DP 26547, Church Street Greytown. This subdivision did not create any additional saleable allotments and the resultant density of land use remained unchanged. The application changed the status of the existing access to legal road, as opposed to it being a series of parallel and jointly used private accessways. A small strip of proposed lots 1 and 4 ran along the edges of the road, effectively acting as an isolation strip.

There are resource consents under regional planning documents also associated with the site. These are documented in the table below, and copies of the decision notices are included in Appendix 28:

TABLE 3 REGIONAL RESOURCE CONSENT HISTORY

Resource Consent Ref	Date Granted	Duration of Consent	Details
WAR120275	18 May 2012	30 September 2017	To take and use groundwater from bore S26/0515 (4G/52/6/l) located in the Greytown groundwater zone for

			horticultural irrigation purposes
WAR120275 (variation)	22 December 2014	As above	GWRC initiated a process which enabled 22 consent holders to apply to change the low-flow conditions on their consents to align with the existing minimum flow limits in the RFP.
WAR170241	18 April 2017	30 September 2027	To take and use groundwater from bore S26/0515 for horticultural irrigation purposes

## 2.4 Description of the Site

### 2.4.1 Zoning

The site is currently zoned Rural (Primary Production) Zone. It is not subject to any other overlays or special features. There are no specific rules that apply to the site apart from the standard WCDP Rural (Primary Production) Zone rules, the Subdivision Rules (Section 20) and the District Wide Land Use Rules (Section 21).

The plan at Appendix 1 shows the site and its current zoning and the zoning of the land immediately surrounding the site is bounded to the north and north east by land zoned Residential, and to west, south west and south by Rural (Primary Production) zoned land.

A summary of the key zone-based performance standards at section 4.5.2(a) - (l) of the WCDP which manage permitted development in the Rural (Primary Production) Zone are provided in Appendix 30. A key provision to consider in the context of this Private Plan Change request and the accompanying resource consent is 4.5.2(e)(i). This standard limits the number of dwellings per Certificate of Title in the Rural (Primary Production) Zone as follows:

- One dwelling per CT under 4ha;
- Two dwellings per CT between 4ha and 100ha; and
- Three dwellings per CT over 100ha in size.

In addition to the dwelling density standards identified above, the WCDP allows for an additional minor dwelling (up to 60m<sup>2</sup> floor area) on titles of between 4-100ha. Under this standard, each certificate of title that comprises the land being considered for re-zoning could yield 3 dwellings (6 in total). This density is not an efficient use of the site or commensurate with a modern (or financially viable) retirement village.



## 2.4.2 The Permitted Baseline

Sections 95D(b) and 95E(2)(a) of the Act provide that when determining the extent of the adverse effects of an activity or the effects on a person respectively, a council 'may disregard an adverse effect if a rule or national environmental standard permits an activity with that effect'. This is known as the permitted activity baseline test. The consent authority is not required to apply the permitted baseline. It may be inappropriate to apply the permitted baseline where the permitted effect would only arise as a result of a fanciful activity or where the permitted baseline may have unintended or undesirable consequences for Part 2 matters.<sup>1</sup>

The permitted activity baseline applies to consideration of both who is affected and whether effects are or are likely to be more than minor. If a council applies the permitted activity baseline, it is only the adverse effects over and above those forming a part of the baseline that are relevant when considering those two issues.<sup>2</sup>

Here, I set out my understanding of the permitted baseline in relation to the application site in the event the Council uses its discretion to apply it in this instance. I consider that the activities forming part of the proposal credible (i.e. non-fanciful) and are therefore worthy of consideration against any permitted baseline provided in the Rural (Primary Production) Zone rules in the Plan.

The WCDP provides for any activity, whether listed in the District Wide Activities in Section 21 of the Plan or not, in the Rural (Primary Production) Zone provided it meets the performance standards of the Rural Zone and is not otherwise provided for as a controlled, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity.

### **Residential Development**

The Rural Zone does not impose any site coverage limitations on permitted land use development in the rural environment but does require buildings and other dwellings to achieve a range of setbacks from roads (sealed and unsealed), waterbodies, oxidation ponds, side and rear boundaries and intensive farming activities.

Permitted residential activities in the Rural (Primary Production) Zone are constrained to the following densities:

- One dwelling per CT under 4ha;
- Two dwellings per CT between 4ha and 100ha; and
- Three dwellings per CT over 100ha in size.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.environmentguide.org.nz/rma/resource-consents-and-processes/notification-of-resource-consent-applications/when-are-adverse-effects-more-than-minor/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.qualityplanning.org.nz/index.php/node/850>

In addition to the dwelling density standards identified above, the WCDP allows for an additional minor dwelling (up to 60m<sup>2</sup> floor area) on titles of between 4-100ha. Residential dwellings are permitted to be up to 10m high (two storeys).

The lot with direct access to Reading Street, 67 Reading Street, has an area of 5.53ha and is currently occupied by one residential dwelling. Under the permitted activity provisions of the WCDP, this site could accommodate another residential unit and a minor dwelling unit as a permitted activity. The Market Road allotment is 8.29ha and is currently undeveloped. This site could similarly accommodate two residential dwellings and a minor dwelling under the Permitted Activity standards of the Plan.

The Reading Street allotment is the older of the two titles (pre-2008), and therefore the side yard setbacks that would apply for dwellings would be 10m and not 25m<sup>3</sup>. Residential development on the Market Street allotment have to comply with the 25m boundary setback standards.

The dimensions, natural features, and neighbouring environment of the two lots are such that the setbacks and other permitted activity standards of the Rural (Primary Production) Zone would be unlikely to impose significant constraints on the ability to build up to two homes and a minor dwelling on each allotment (six dwelling units in total across the site) as allowed by the Plan.

The effects associated with the permitted scale of residential activity in this part of the Rural (Primary Production) Zone could be carried out with minor visual or other effects, given the site areas of both parcels, and existing vegetated boundary treatments. There are also several existing access points to both parcels which could be used to access new permitted activity residential activity on site. The traffic generated by this scale of residential development would be commensurate with surrounding residential development in the Rural (Primary Production) Zone.

### **Non-residential development**

Commercial, retail and industrial activities of any scale are not permitted in the Rural (Primary Production) Zone by the WCDP. However, plantation forestry and intensive and non-intensive primary production activities are provided for as permitted activities, as well as the establishment of non-residential buildings, for which there is no maximum permitted threshold. The Plan allows for non-residential buildings to be 15m in height as a permitted activity (commensurate with a 3-storey building). Primary production activities could involve in the removal of existing vegetation, introduction of fence lines and stock, and establishment of farm buildings, glass houses or growing tunnels. These activities are subject to set back and other standards. However, the nature, topography and dimensions of the application site are such that the activities considered here could be established whilst meeting the relevant permitted activity standards.

---

<sup>3</sup> As provided for by Rule 4.2.5(d)(iii)

The introduction of non-residential permitted activities provided for within the Rural (Primary Production) Zone on the site could reasonably be expected to result in visual, amenity and traffic effects on neighbouring allotments and residences. Furthermore, I consider that even changes in the type of permitted activity, for example from the current orcharding use to dry stock farming, market gardening or greenhouses, is likely to have visual and other effects that would be noticeable and experienced from neighbouring allotments and land holdings.

### **Vegetation Removal**

The site does not contain any scheduled or heritage trees, and the current vegetation cover is predominantly exotic in the form of over 700 orchard trees and several large, established shelterbelts throughout the site (Treecology, 2018). The removal of trees and exotic vegetation can be undertaken as a permitted activity on the application site. Given the current treed and vegetated nature of the site, the visual effects of vegetation removal could be considerable. The recent removal of the double row of mature pine trees along the Reading Street boundary of the site (directly opposite the school) is an example of the dramatic visual effect tree removal can have on a site from the public road.

### **2.4.3 Physical Description**

The site has been described in full in Ms Annan's Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVAEE) (Appendix 20). In summary, it is an irregular shaped site with an area of approximately 13.82ha with nine boundary faces. Due to the application site's irregular shape (along with the pattern of surrounding tree planting), the site cannot be viewed in its entirety from any one location in the immediate surrounds. There is currently a single dwelling and ancillary buildings located in the north east area of the site, with access off Reading Street. The outhouses and sheds are associated with the site's former use as a working stone fruit orchard. Near the house is a manicured lawn area with established trees. A detailed description and health assessment of these trees and trees and shelter belts throughout the site has been provided by Treecology (Appendix 23).

The Reading Street boundary of the site has recently undergone significant change as the row of large pines that dominated this boundary have recently been removed. The removal of these trees allows views into the orchard of the first few rows of mature orchard trees within the site.

In terms of vegetation cover, the site is divided into two different productive land use areas, with orchards to the north-east area of the site and crop paddocks to the south-west. These are referred to in the architectural design statement as the 'Orchard Precinct' and 'Southern Precinct' (Appendix 18).

Two shallow water races run through the site. These are branches of the Moroa Water Race, with one following the northern boundary and the other running more centrally through the site.

Internal site views are described and illustrated in Ms Annan’s report.

#### 2.4.4 Existing Services

A civil feasibility report was prepared by Calibre Consulting Ltd and is attached at Appendix 21. It confirms the following existing services and infrastructure to the application site:

TABLE 4 EXISTING SERVICES TO THE APPLICATION SITE

<b>Service</b>	<b>Provision</b>
Water supply	Current 100mm diameter pipe servicing northern end of lot (Reading Street), 50mm outside southern end of site (Market Road).
Wastewater	The existing dwelling disposes wastewater to a septic tank onsite.  2 x 225mm pipelines at downstream end of site. The pipes are of unknown depth but are likely to be deep enough for a fully gravity conveyed system.
Stormwater	The existing dwelling on site discharges stormwater to a soakpit.  Water races are currently the only stormwater conveyance infrastructure in the area servicing the overall application site.
Power network	There is power to the existing dwelling and farm buildings
Fibre network	The existing dwelling is connected to the telecommunications network.

#### 2.4.5 Existing Site Access

The site has two frontages, Reading Street to the northwest and Market Road to the southwest. The Reading Street frontage currently acts as the principle access to the site and is located approximately 30m from the northeastern boundary (Boundary 2). There are several existing farm accesses to the site along Market Street.

#### 2.4.6 Soils and Geology

Geological maps indicate a mixture of soils nearby, with the site lying in an area of Greytown silt loam and Ahikouka loam. Silt loams have a wastewater classification of moderately well drained (Standards New Zealand, 2012), and are likely to provide a good balance between drainage and attenuation and degradation of contaminants. The Ahikouka loam is typically finer and hence slower draining than the Greytown silt loam. This information is detailed at page 13 of the site investigation report attached as Appendix 24.

## 2.4.7 Contamination

The application site is not on the Greater Wellington Regional Council Selected Land Use Register (SLUR). However, the National Environmental Standard (NES) for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to protect Human Health is triggered when an activity noted on the Hazardous Activities and Industries List (HAIL) coincides with a proposed activity on the site. The storage and application of agrichemicals on the site triggers the need for investigation under the NES. An application under the NES to remediate the site has been submitted on behalf of the Requester and a decision is expected in March 2019. It is the Requester's intention to remediate and validate the site in accordance with the conditions of the NES resource consent prior to this Plan Change request being heard.

## 2.4.8 Natural Hazards

Flow path analysis is provided in Calibre's report, *Civil Design for Resource Consent* Appendix 21). There is no existing stormwater reticulation infrastructure on site. Currently, surface water exits the site at 6 release points as shown on Drawing C431 in Calibre's report. The flood hazard mapping on record at Greater Wellington Regional Council and South Wairarapa District Council does not indicate any flood hazard in the immediate vicinity.

The nearest known fault line lies around 5.5km to the north west of the site (Duncan 2019, p.10).

## 2.4.9 Heritage

Under the Historic Places Act (1993) an archaeological site is defined as a place associated with pre-1900 human activity, where there may be evidence relating to the history of New Zealand. The application site is not recorded as an archaeological site by Heritage NZ Pouhere Taonga, and there is no evidence that the site was associated with pre-1900 human activity.

The site is not identified in either the Regional Plan maps or the WCDP as being associated with any specific Māori or cultural values, sites or taonga.

As part of the land use consent, a condition is proposed that establishes the accidental discovery protocol so as to ensure that in the event of an accidental discovery of an archaeological site, archaeological material, artefacts or potential human remains (kōiwi), the appropriate procedures are adopted.

## 2.5 Receiving Environment

### 2.5.1 Existing Landscape Setting

A description of the existing landscape setting of the private plan change site is provided in Ms Annan's LVAEE (Appendix 20). Key components of the landscape setting are summarised as follows:

- Greytown is located towards the north end of the South Wairarapa District, and set within a rural landscape in mixed use pastoral landcover.
- This setting involves a rural patchwork of typically gridded pattern of land parcels, and shelterbelts.
- The Waiohine River loosely winds through the rural landscape around the north of Greytown (then feeding into the Ruamahanga River east of Greytown, beyond Papawai Marae).
- To the south, and closer to Featherston, is the Tauherenikau River, also a braided river.
- Greytown is an attractive, picturesque country village offering amenity and heritage values and a relaxed and creative character.
- SH2 provides the main street central axis of Greytown.
- The Greytown area is not considered to be within an outstanding natural landscape area (ONL) or significant amenity landscape (SAL)
- The application site abuts residential zoning to the north and is located opposite Greytown School (a full primary school to year 8) on Reading Street.
- Generally, the site has rural-residential neighbours to the southwest and more productive scale rural land use to the east. While the density of these property holdings varies, the adjacent rural residential development is also rurally zoned.
- This composite landscape setting illustrates the site's peri-urban location.
- In the vicinity of the site, through both rural and rural residential areas, extensive tree planting along property and paddock boundaries creates a 'compartmentalised' landscape setting and sense of enclosure.

### 2.5.2 Existing Services

The services around the site are described in detail in Calibre's report, *Civil Design for Resource Consent*, which is included in Appendix 21. In summary, current utility infrastructure around the Orchards site consists of a reticulated water supply ('trickle feed'), a gravity sewer system, and limited open drainage for stormwater. There are also several water races that run through the site. South Wairarapa District Council (SWDC) are currently investigating Greytown's water supply capacity to facilitate the required demand of the proposed development. Upgrades are proposed for the gravity sewer system and treatment facilities to the same effect.

### 2.5.3 The Roding Network

The roading network surrounding and serving the application site is described in Stantec's Traffic Impact Assessment (Appendix 22). The road network relevant to the assessment of this private plan change request comprises the following:

- Reading Street
- Market Road
- McMaster Street
- Church Street
- The Reading Street/McMaster Street intersection
- The Reading Street/Church Street/Market Road intersection
- State Highway 2 (Main Street)

### 2.5.3.1 Reading Street

Reading Street is classified as an access road and, adjacent to the site, has a sealed width of 5.4m. Reading Street also provides access to Greytown Primary School located on the north western side of the road adjacent to the development site frontage. Informal parking for the school is available on both sides of the road as well as a 1.5m wide footpath on the northern side of the road. During peak periods of the school, the informal parking on both sides of the road is well used. The footpath extends from the school to the Reading Street / McMaster Street intersection further northeast. To the southwest of the school, Reading Street is configured as a rural road.

### 2.5.3.2 Market Road

Market Road is not classified however Stantec consider it is likely to be an access road as it only provides access to some residential dwellings. This road is part of the road network owned by the council and is configured as a sealed 5m wide road without any road marking, kerb and channel or pedestrian facilities. Instead, wide grassed berms are available on both sides along the full length of the road.

### 2.5.3.3 McMaster Street

McMaster Street is classified as an access road. It is configured as a two-way road with a cross-section width of about 12m which provides sufficient space to accommodate two 3.5m wide traffic lanes and on-street parking on both sides. The section of road between SH2 and East Street provides footpaths on both sides however the section between East Street and Reading Street only provides a footpath on the west side.

### 2.5.3.4 Church Street

Church Street is a low volume road between SH2 and Market Road. It is configured as a sealed, unmarked, two-way road along its length and has a width of about 6m. It provides footpaths on both sides between SH2 and East Street but the southern section of the road between East Street and Market Road does not provide footpaths. The southern section does however provide wide, grassed berms much like Market Road.

#### 2.5.3.5 The Reading Street/Church Street/Market Road intersection

This intersection is configured as a priority controlled, three leg intersection. The major movement is along Market Road and Church Street, such that vehicles travelling from the Reading Street approach must give way.

#### 2.5.3.6 The Reading Street/McMaster Street intersection

This is a crossroad, priority-controlled intersection with give way sign controls on the McMaster Street west approach and the Reading Street south approach. The eastern McMaster Street approach is stop sign controlled. The Reading Street north approach does not have any forms of control and Stantec's view is that the major movement is likely to occur from this approach to the McMaster Street west approach towards the state highway.

#### 2.5.3.7 Main Street/SH2

Access to SH2/Main Street is achieved from McMaster Street and Church Street. Many of Greytown's shops and amenities are located on Main Street, as described in the plan in Appendix 10a & 10b. SH2 accommodates an annual average daily traffic volume of about 8,500vpd, with peaks occurring at 9am and 6pm.

#### 2.5.3.8 Crash History

This report notes that there were no crashes were recorded on any of the local roads near the development site. A total of five crashes were recorded in the area, including two minor injury crashes and three non-injury crashes. There was a general trend of rear end type crashes as a result of drivers failing to notice other parties, fatigue or inattention. One of the minor injury crashes occurred on SH2, north of Church Street and involved a head on collision between two vehicles as one of them was distracted. The other minor injury crash occurred on SH2 just south of Church Street and involved a vehicle hitting a parked vehicle due to fatigue.

### 2.5.4 Public Transport

The public transport system available in Greytown is discussed in Stantec's Traffic Impact Assessment report included in Appendix 22. Woodside Station is Greytown's nearest train station and is on the Wairarapa Line and provides services to Masterton and Wellington. Currently, there are five services every weekday in each direction. At the weekend there are two services a day. Bus services 200 and 204 also operate through Greytown. The 204 service provides a direct link to Woodside Station. The 200 is a sporadic daily service operating a Masterton-Greytown-Featherston-Martinborough route.

### 2.5.5 Footpaths and Cycling Facilities

Walking and cycling facilities are described in Stantec's Traffic Impact Assessment report included in Appendix 22. There are footpaths available on the north west side of Reading Street adjacent to the development site providing a connection to McMaster Street. This



provides a key connection for children, parents and staff travelling to / from Greytown Primary School. McMaster Street has footpaths on either side of its length from the junction with Reading Street northwest to Main Street, where many of Greytown's shops, restaurants and cafes are located. There are no cyclist specific facilities in the area, so cyclists are expected to share the roads with vehicles. The roading network around and to the application site is laid out of a grid network and generally flat.

### **2.5.6 Amenities**

The local amenities available in Greytown are described in the Design Statement prepared by DGSE and in the illustrated at Appendix 10b & 10c. Greytown is well provided for in terms of shopping (groceries, meat, fruit and vegetables and non-essential items), cafes and restaurants. Many of these amenities are within 400m-800m of the Orchards site.

Greytown Primary School is directly opposite the site, and Kuranui College is located on East Street to the south west of the plan change site. The library is approximately 400m from the Orchards site on McMaster Street. The town also has local branches of Rotary, Lions and Lionesses as well as a number of other social and cultural groups and organisations. The Greytown Community Sport and Leisure Society is based at the Town Centre complex (which houses the library and the local iSite). This organisation provides administrative and management support for 16 member sports clubs active in Greytown including Greytown Community Gym (located on East Street), and the local tennis, football and cricket clubs.

### **2.5.7 Future Development**

The Greytown Primary School is a designated site, and currently has a school roll of around 340. The school has plans to build a new senior block at the north end of the site, with construction anticipated to take place in early 2020. At the time of writing, plans of the proposed new building(s) were not available.

Greytown Little Theatre are expected to lodge a resource consent to develop a new community theatre at the south west end of West Street, approximately 1km from the Orchards Retirement Village site.

## **2.6 Relevant Plan Changes**

### **2.6.1 Private Plan Change 10**

In 2000, Council received a request for a private Plan Change to rezone 7.7ha of Rural zoned land fronting West Street, Greytown to urban residential land use. In particular, the change sought to allow for development of the site as a retirement complex or special residential accommodation particularly suited to the needs of retirees. It was described as Greytown Villas. The Private Plan Change was approved and as a result, the WCDP was updated to include Greytown Villas Character Area specific to this site. The request was also structured so that in the event that the demand for special retirement accommodation

is insufficient to justify development of the total site, "consideration will be given to later stages of the development of its use for other urban (residential) purposes, compatible with whatever retirement complex development may have occurred and within the provisions of the District Plan for the Urban (Residential) area".<sup>4</sup>

Mr Russell Hooper, senior planner at SWDC, confirmed the following in an email in July 2018, which is included in Appendix X of this report:

*The Greytown Villas Character Area is an overlay within the residential zone where a retirement development was provided for. This came through in Plan Change 10 to the South Wairarapa District Plan. The site is undergoing a residential subdivision and is not taking up the retirement development option **leaving the concept plan obsolete** (emphasis added).*

## 2.7 Resource Consents

An application for land use consent to develop and operate the independent residential components of the proposed Orchards Retirement Village has been lodged with SWDC concurrently with this request for a private Plan Change. The key components of that application are:

- Up to 180 independent dwelling units consisting of 4 typologies;
- 3 stages of development for the residential component;
- Roading network throughout the development, and connecting to the public roading network at Market Road and Reading Street;
- Provision of cycling and pedestrian paths throughout the site;
- Provision for one independent dwelling unit to operate as a show home;
- Wastewater, potable water and stormwater collection and disposal infrastructure;
- Retention of significant number of orchard and other trees throughout the development site;
- Construction of a bowling green and village green;
- Construction of community garden spaces throughout the site;
- Temporary use of an independent residential unit as a showhome;
- Comprehensive landscaping throughout the site.

Under the Operative WCDP this application is a Discretionary Activity. The discretionary status is triggered by the construction period, which will exceed the 12-month threshold of permitted activity rule 21.1.16 Temporary Activities.

---

<sup>4</sup> Plan Change 10, Decision prepared by R M Smith, 12 October 2001, paragraph 2.10.

## 3 Site Constraints and Opportunities

### 3.1 Site Selection

The South Wairarapa district was selected to build a retirement village for the following reasons:

- Population demographics highlight an ageing population;
- Desirability of the area to retire/live in;
- Lack of immediate competition providing this essential infrastructure; and
- Proximity to the Wellington district

A meeting with South Wairarapa District Council in early 2018 highlighted that they would be supportive of a retirement village development as they recognized the aged care crisis in the district.

Initially Martinborough was investigated. However, it became apparent early in the site investigation stage that there were no parcels of land large enough that were in close proximity to the local community. Any land close to Martinborough generally has substantial dwellings and in order to get the scale required more than 4 parcels of land would have needed to be purchased.

Greytown was then identified as the most desirable location for a retirement village as it is a beautiful town and has strong property prices, an aged demographic, good quality local amenities and services and is relatively close to Masterton Hospital. Initial due diligence was undertaken on land that was for-sale at the North Eastern end of Greytown. This is the land that fronts SH2 to the East with the old Red Barn on it. Further investigations highlighted the following:

- the land was in the floodplain and not suitable for a retirement village
- due to the location road noise would be excessive
- the highway and speed limit would pose a danger to residents of a retirement village

The applicant used Google Earth to highlight the best site in Greytown. It became apparent that Murphy's Orchard was the most desirable location as it had the following features and characteristics:

- Generous land area contained in two contiguous allotments;
- No restrictive covenants on the titles;
- Close proximity to amenities and the existing community;
- Several existing accesses on the roading network;
- Flat topography;
- Not located in the floodplain
- Easily accessible from the centre of Greytown, by foot, bicycle and car;

- Existing established planting that can be utilised in the design; and
- Available for purchase.

## **3.2 Site Constraints**

### **3.2.1 Contamination**

A detailed site investigation has revealed contamination hot spots in the site, associated with primary production activities carried out on the site in the past. The type, scale and causes for the contamination are detailed in EQO Ltd's report which is providing in Appendix 26. The contamination will need to be remediated and managed prior to development. A resource consent under the NES-CS has been obtained to remediate the hotspots. A copy of this resource consent is attached at Appendix 25.

### **3.2.2 Existing Vegetation**

Treecology Ltd have identified that a number of the existing shelter belts are coming to the end of their life and present some health and safety challenges. Treecology's advice is that unsafe and aged shelter belts will need to be removed. The location and orientation of some of these shelter belts also pose a shading issue.

### **3.2.3 Geology and Soil Type**

As confirmed in the Foundation Report prepared by EQO Ltd (Appendix 26), the site contains soft silt soils for 1.5-2.5m with gravels underneath. It also identifies that specific foundation design may be required for majority if not all buildings. This matter will be addressed through at the building consent stage and I do not consider that any mitigation of this matter is required through the resource consent process.

### **3.2.4 Existing Road Network**

The existing roads need to be able to accommodate the additional traffic anticipated to be generated by the proposed development. As a consequence of the proposed rezoning and change of use of the land, in the future, Reading Street would need to accommodate about 680vpd with the addition of development traffic. Stantec find that on this basis, it is anticipated that Reading Street would need to be upgraded as per Figure E12 of NZS 4404:2010 (Appendix 22)

### **3.2.5 Rural Location**

The site is bounded on seven boundaries by Rural (Primary Production) Zoned land. Of these boundaries, Boundaries 3, 4 and 5 are the most sensitive in terms of potential reverse sensitivity effects at the Rural and proposed residential boundary interface. Boundaries 6, 7, 8 and 9 are less sensitive as the interface here is more rural-residential style development. This is particularly the case at Boundaries 8 and 9 which border a cluster of denser peri-

urban development accessed off Reading Street. Ms Annan's observation is that this composite landscape setting illustrates the site's peri-urban location, and that although the site is located at the town's 'built edge', it is only a short walk from the town centre.

### **3.3 Site Opportunities**

#### **3.3.1 Site's Location**

The site's location and its landscape setting is described in detail in Ms Annan's Landscape and Visual Assessment (Appendix X). The re-zone site abuts residential zoning to the north and is located opposite Greytown School (a full primary school to year 8) on Reading Street. Generally, the site has rural-residential neighbours to the southwest and more productive scale rural land use to the east. While the density of these property holdings varies, the adjacent rural residential development is also rurally zoned. Ms Annan considers that this composite landscape setting illustrates the site's peri-urban location roughly midway down the eastern edge of Greytown. The town's layout is narrow in width, in the vicinity of the site. Therefore, although the site is located at the town's 'built edge', it is only a short walk from the town centre. In the vicinity of the site, through both rural and rural residential areas, extensive tree planting along property and paddock boundaries creates a 'compartmentalised' landscape setting and sense of enclosure.

The site is also well located to the shops and amenities available in Greytown (as illustrated in Appendix 10a and 10b), as well as to major transport routes to Wellington and Masterton and public transport options.

#### **3.3.2 Site Topography**

The site is generally level throughout and covered in either orchard trees, pasture or crops. This is advantageous for development, and in particular a retirement village.

#### **3.3.3 Road Network and Connectivity**

The road network surrounding the site is generally flat and laid out to a grid network. McMaster Street will not need to be upgraded to accommodate the proposed rezoning and change of use of the land. Stantec also finds that both the Reading Street/McMaster Street and Reading Street/Market Road/Church Street intersections are desirable in this area and can accommodate the proposed rezoning. In terms of walking and cycling opportunities, Stantec finds that the convenience of the location of the site and the good pedestrian connectivity of the site is expected to encourage residents to walk to nearby destination which would in turn reduce car ownership to some degree (Appendix 22).

#### **3.3.4 Proximity to Amenities**

The amenities and services located in Greytown, and generally within 400m-800m metres of the site are discussed in this report and in the DGSE Design Statement. The opportunities

they afford the site and the proposed development are also enumerated in the Partnership's statement (Appendix 14) and Section 3.1 Site Selection.

### **3.3.5 Size and Shape of the Land**

The land is comprised of two contiguous titles, both of which are of a generous site area and have existing access to Reading Street and Market Road. The titles are unencumbered by restrictive covenants. The northernmost title is a regular size. The southernmost title is an irregular shape, but this is not considered to be a significant constraint to development

### **3.3.6 Existing Vegetation**

The existing orchard trees and native underplanting within and near the shelter belts on site provide an opportunity to create a distinctive and attractive residential environment. This is discussed and illustrated in the Orchards Masterplan prepared by Local Collective (Appendix 19) and analysed in Ms Annan's Landscape and Visual Assessment (Appendix 20). DGSE also describe the existing orchard environment as follows: "A key design driver in this project is to retain the memory of the orchard as the special character that will define the sense of place for The Orchards development" (Appendix 18).

## **3.4 Summary**

The site opportunities illustrate the site's suitability for rezoning to allow for a retirement village development. The site constraints can be effectively managed through the design of the site overall and through mitigation measures.

## **4 Consultation**

Copies of all consultation material is included at Appendix 9.

### **4.1 Engagement with Council Staff**

The applicant initially engaged with Council staff in March 2018. In that meeting, Council were receptive to the concept of a retirement village in Greytown on the Murphy's Orchard site. Consultation and discussion with Council has been consistent throughout the process, with team meetings (with both Council and Requester's team attending) held regularly leading up to lodgement of the Private Plan Change and resource consent application. Council staff have continued to be supportive of the proposal for a Private Plan Change and concurrent resource consent application throughout the development of the concept plan for the site and have provided feedback and guidance on the development of the proposed provisions and matters for consideration which has been greatly appreciated.

### **4.2 Engagement with the community**

The application team have consulted with the community about the proposals since mid 2018. Copies of letters sent to immediate neighbours is included in Appendix 9.

In addition to the neighbours immediately bounding the site, the following parties and organisations have been actively consulted throughout the process in face-to-face meetings, email correspondence, phone calls and meetings.

- Greytown Community Board
- Featherston Community Board
- Martinborough Community Board
- Māori Standing Committee
- SWDC Council members
- Arbor House
- Greytown Primary School
- Greytown Bowling Club
- South Wairarapa Rotary Club
- Ministry for Education
- Greater Wellington Regional Council
- Wairarapa DHB
- Representatives of Rangitāne O Wairarapa and Kahungunu ki Wairarapa

The table lists the key meeting and consultation event dates:

TABLE 5: KEY COMMUNITY CONSULTATION DATES

Date	Type of Event
16 and 17 October 2018	Public consultation events. The first was held at the South Wairarapa Working Men's Club and was aimed at immediate neighbours. The event on the 17 October was held in the WBS Rooms in the Town Centre, Greytown, and to which the public were invited. Adverts for this event were placed in the Wairarapa Midweek and Wairarapa Times-Age newspapers. Attendance was good on both days.
October - November 2018	Presentations to each of the community boards (Featherston, Martinborough and Greytown) and the Māori Standing Committee.
November 2018	Meeting with representatives of Rangitāne o Wairarapa on site.

The development of the proposals for Murphy's Orchard have also been well covered in articles in local newspapers, as described in the Partnership Statement in Appendix 14 of this report.

### 4.3 Response to Feedback

The key areas of feedback and the design response are set out below:

#### 4.3.1.1 Water Quality

Rangitāne o Wairarapa representatives highlighted their desire for water leaving the site to be of equal quality, or better, to its quality as it enters the site. This consideration has been incorporated into the overall stormwater drainage solution on site, which is detailed in Section 8.1.9 of this report.

#### 4.3.1.2 Boundary Setbacks and Landscape Treatment

There has been a high level of consultation with neighbours on Boundaries 8 and 9 throughout the design process. Of particular concern to them was the proximity of built development on these boundaries. In response, these boundary setbacks have been set to 7.5m instead of 3m, which is a Residential Zone setback standard. Attention has also been paid to the staggering of proposed dwellings on these boundaries, and landscape treatment.

### 4.4 Survey

During the October 2017 public consultation, a survey was set up to hear the community's views on the proposed development. The results of this survey are summarised in Appendix 9. The responses were generally positive. Where dissatisfaction with the proposals was expressed, the respondent generally proposed ways in which they could be (in their view) improved. There was no outright objection to the proposals.

## 5 Statutory and Policy Context

### 5.1 Resource Management Act 1991

#### 5.1.1 The purpose of the RMA

The purpose of the RMA is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Section 5(2) of the Act states:

"In this Act, sustainable management means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while:

- a) sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;  
and
- b) safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems;  
and



- c) avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.”

### 5.1.2 The First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act)

The requirements and procedures that apply to private plan changes in Part 2 of the First Schedule of the RMA have been set out in section 1.3 above.

### 5.1.3 Section 32 of the RMA

The section requires that:

- New proposals must be examined for their appropriateness in achieving the purpose of the RMA;
- The benefits and costs, and risks of new policies and rules on the community, the economy and the environment need to be clearly identified and assessed; and
- The analysis must be documented, so stakeholders and decision-makers can understand the rationale for policy choices.

Specifically, Section 32(1) requires an evaluation report to:

- a) examine the extent to which the objectives of the proposal being evaluated are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of this Act; and
- b) examine whether the provisions in the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives by–
  - i. identifying other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives; and
  - ii. assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives; and
  - iii. summarising the reasons for deciding on the provisions; and (c) contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.

When assessing the ‘efficiency’ and ‘effectiveness’ of the provisions in achieving the objectives the report must:

- a) identify and assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions, including the opportunities for–
  - i. economic growth that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and

- ii. employment that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and
- b) if practicable, quantify the benefits and costs referred to in paragraph (a);  
and
- c) assess the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions.

This plan change request is defined as an 'Amending Proposal' for the purposes of section 32(3), and therefore any examination under section 32(1)(b) must relate to:

- a) the provisions and objectives of the amending proposal; and
- b) the objectives of the existing proposal to the extent that those objectives–
  - i. are relevant to the objectives of the amending proposal; and
  - ii. would remain if the amending proposal were to take effect.

The following sections sets out the relevant operative objectives and provides a corresponding assessment under section 32(1)(a). The four elements to this plan change request are then assessed under section 32(1)(b), taking into account those matters referred to above.

## **5.2 Statutory and Strategic Context for Retirement Villages**

### **5.2.1 The Resource Management Act**

Providing suitable housing and care for the older population demographic is critical to ensuring the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities, in accordance with section 5(2) of the RMA:

*In this Act, sustainable management means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while–*

- a) *sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and*
- b) *safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and*
- c) *avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.*

The RMA specifically requires that the needs of future generations be considered when achieving the sustainable management of the environment. In this regard, the proposed developed is meeting a recognised need for accommodation for our future aging population. This is discussed in detail in the BERL Wellbeing Report included as Appendix 15 where it is identified that “additional service delivery and community development work is likely needed anyway, because the population of older people will grow significantly, even without the Orchards”.

### **5.2.2 The Retirement Villages Act 2003**

The retirement village industry is regulated by the Retirement Villages Act 2003 (the RV Act), associated regulations and codes of practice. The regulatory regime is focused on protecting the interests of the residents. If a village meets the Act’s definition of “retirement villages”, it must abide by the RV Act.

## **5.3 Regional Policy Context**

### **5.3.1 Regional Policy Statement**

An assessment of the private plan change request has been undertaken and is included in Appendix 33 of this report.

I consider that the proposed private Plan Change application is consistent with the direction provided in the relevant RPS objectives and policies.

## **5.4 Local Policy Context**

### **5.4.1 Wairarapa Combined District Plan**

An assessment of the private plan change request has been undertaken and is included in Appendix 32 of this report.

I consider that the proposed private Plan Change application is consistent with the direction provided by the relevant residential zone and district wide objectives and policies.

### **5.4.2 Other Strategies, Plans and Policies**

The South Wairarapa, Carterton and Masterton District Councils are developing a joint Positive Ageing Strategy which will follow the principles of the age-friendly communities’ guidelines.<sup>5</sup> According to these guidelines, an age-friendly community has:

- Green spaces are well-maintained with seating, shelter, and toilets

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.superseniors.ms.govt.nz/age-friendly-communities/index.html>

- Safe pedestrian crossings and footpaths are wide enough for wheelchairs, walkers or strollers
- There is public transport to health centres, shops, and parks
- Affordable housing options are close to services and facilities
- Signage is clear and easy to read Council events and activities appeal to people of different Ages older people contribute to community groups.
- Facilities are located close to residential areas and services; and
- Older people are consulted and included in decision-making

The proposed Orchards Retirement Village Character Area will enable the development of a continuing care retirement community that both directly provides many of these features (for example the green spaces and safe pedestrian environment) and provides easy access to places within the local community that offer those features (for instance, public transport, more good quality open spaces and easy-to-access facilities, services and amenities).

According to the Council's website, early research by the Councils to support the development of the Strategy has shown that:

- Families are changing and more older people are living alone;
- The ethnic diversity of older adults is increasing;
- Regions are ageing at different rates - towns are ageing faster than rural centres or cities;
- Older adults are making a growing contribution to our economy - both as paid employers and consumers;
- Fewer older adults will own their own homes in the future;
- In the Wairarapa, early results from our initial District Council staff and politicians survey tell us that transport, services to older adults and opportunities for social connection are important issues.

The proposed provisions to support the development of the Orchards Retirement Village within the proposed Character Area seek to ensure that the needs of the District (and region's) older people are met by:

- providing choice in housing and care provision;
- creating an environment and community that fosters social connection not only within the older population but inter-generationally; and
- provides easy access to key facilities, infrastructure and services that can help people enjoy full and healthy lives.

## 6 Supporting Documents and Expert Reports

The number of reports and plans have been prepared to support the requested private plan. The complete list is available at the front of the Appendices document and individual documents are referenced throughout this report.

## 7 Section 32 Evaluation

### 7.1 The issues that the Private Plan Change Request seeks to address

#### 7.1.1 Introduction

In order to undertake the evaluation required by section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("the Act") (in which the focus is on the objectives, policies, rules or other methods of the plan change) it is necessary first to understand the context of the plan change - the issues that it seeks to address. As an overview, this process involves five steps:

1. Identify the issue and whether it is a resource management issue
2. Broad options to address the issue (methods, e.g. plan change or resource consent)
3. What form should the method take (e.g. use existing zoning or new zoning)
4. Objectives: analysis
5. The provisions - policies, rules and methods: analysis

The last two steps of this process are those required by section 32 of the Act. This section of the report addresses the first four steps, and in so doing seeks to provide an appropriate understanding of the context of this proposed plan change

#### 7.1.2 Identification of Issues

The subject site is currently zoned Rural (Primary Production). The Rural (Primary Production) Zone envisages "diverse activities in the Rural Zone", but those that are "compatible with the rural environment in scale, character and amenity". The permitted activity performance standards seek to ensure this outcome, for example by limiting the number of dwelling units that can be located on a title and ensuring that large-scale commercial or retail activities in the rural environment require resource consent before they can be established. In short, a retirement village (or residential subdivision) at any scale in the rural environment cannot comply with the provisions of Rural (Primary Production) Zone.

Ms Annan identifies, in her Landscape and Visual Assessment Report (Appendix 20), that the site abuts an urban area, and that the application site's proposed change to this residential zoning is less dramatic than it would be if surrounded entirely by a rural landscape. The site is also within a setting of property parcels with varying density. This composite landscape setting reflects the surrounding area comprising of both rural and residentially zoned land. Ms Annan also notes that this is not a stretch of a purely rural working landscape but a zone boundary setting at the existing urban edge of Greytown. The mixed characteristics and densities of the surrounds afford capacity for a level of landscape change on the application site to be absorbed here.

The site has been in agricultural production for several decades, as a berry farm and, more recently, for the growing and harvesting of stone and pip fruit. However, as established by the Economic Impact Assessment (EIA) (Appendix 16), the economic impact of the farming activity has been small and at the time of the sale of land to the applicant was only employing 1.5FTE. The infrastructure assessment shows that the site can be serviced by means of the town's reticulated wastewater system and potable water supply. The traffic impact assessment demonstrates that the site is accessible by car, foot and bicycle. These assessments indicate that a more suitable and effective use for the site is a retirement village development can be accommodated on site.

Currently, there is no specific provision for retirement villages in the Wairarapa Combined District Plan (WCDP), yet evidence suggests that there is a significant need. This is despite the fact that introduction to the Residential Zone recognises that a:

*"growing ageing population, and a demand for lower maintenance properties has resulted in infill and high-density housing in some areas of the Wairarapa, such as inner parts of Masterton. Retirement villages and housing complexes for the elderly are also more popular. These more intensive forms of residential development need good design to ensure they fit well with the residential character"* (WCDP, page 5-1).

As discussed in Section 1.6, New Zealand's population is ageing, and this trend is also reflected in the demographics of Greytown and South Wairarapa. As a consequence of the demographic change being experienced in New Zealand, housing and caring for our older population is anticipated to become a significant resource management issue for the country (Hinchey, 2015). Retirement villages are becoming a popular housing model for older people and already play a significant part in housing and caring for elderly people in New Zealand.

Market research undertaken by the Partnership support the evidence that there is a shortfall in good quality retirement village accommodation in the Wairarapa generally, and in the South Wairarapa more acutely. Facilities providing support and care for people suffering from dementia is also in short supply in the region. The Partnership is currently receiving 3-4 enquiries a week about living at the Village, and that is before any formal advertising of the site has taken place. The Partnership's findings are also borne out by the analysis of retirement village provision in the Wairarapa in Appendix 14 which lists the aged care

providers in the Wairarapa region. There are 16 providers, 11 of which are located in Masterton. Arbour House is the only rest home in Greytown ((Eldernet.co.nz, 2019 and Ministry of Health NZ, 2019). Of these providers, eight have been identified as providing independent living accommodation for older persons. Five of these providers registered vacancies in their independent living offer, but the number of vacancies in each case tended to be just one or two units. As highlighted in the Partnership statement, there is no retirement village provision in South Wairarapa of any scale and there are no known plans for any of the established operators to setup in the foreseeable future. It is understood that Arbor House will close if a replacement facility is not built in the immediate future.

The Orchards is proposed to be a continuing care retirement village and will make a significant contribution to fulfilling the housing needs of the region's older population. Continuing care means that the village provides a full range of living options to residents from independent living to full care in one location (Hinchey, 2015). It will be registered under the Retirement Villages Act 2003 and subject to other industry regulations and codes of practice focused on protecting the interests of residents.

A concept plan has been developed by Design Group Stapleton Elliot (DGSE) (Appendix 18) to illustrate what the retirement village development will look like on site. While the character of the site will change, Ms Annan's landscape and visual assessment (appendix 20) finds that the future amenity provided will be appropriate to the setting. The proposal's amenity will be derived from design measures to soften and enhance the proposal's appearance as a suitable development pattern for this location.

The purpose of the Proposed Private Plan Change (the Change) is to enable the development and use of the Murphy's Orchard site at 67 Reading Street and 31 Market Road for the purposes of developing and operating a continuing care retirement village, rest home, hospital, dementia care and ancillary activities. The Change will result in the rezoning of the land from Rural (Primary Production) to the existing Residential Zone within the Wairarapa Combined District Plan.

### **7.1.3 Consideration of Options to Address the Issue**

In formulating this private plan change, five reasonably practicable options have been identified and evaluated. These options reflect the intent of the applicant, that is, to build and operate a retirement village on the site. Therefore, options which do not result in the provision of a retirement village development on the site have not been considered. These options are as follows:

1. The status quo - Maintain current zoning and provisions of the site and apply for resource consent to enable the development; or
2. Await review of the WCDP acknowledging the possibility of rezoning of the site as a result; or

3. Apply for a private plan change that amends the Rural (Primary Production) Zone provisions to accommodate a retirement village by means of a character area in the Rural Zone; or
4. Apply for a private plan change that amends the Rural (Primary Production) Zone provisions to provide for a retirement village as a controlled or discretionary activity; or
5. Rezone the site to an express purpose zone; or
6. Rezone site to general Residential Zone with a specific character overlay to provide for the express use of the site as a retirement village, rest home and hospital.

The table below assesses each of the options against the objectives of the operative plan, evaluates the costs and benefits of each of the options, and provides a concluding statement.

#### **7.1.4 Appropriateness of the Options**

Option 1 will not provide sufficient certainty for the future operation or development of the site as a retirement village, rest home, hospital and dementia care facility. Furthermore, retaining the current zoning but allowing for a retirement village by way of resource consent has the potential to undermine the Council's ability to retain the integrity and purpose of the Rural (Primary Production) Zone and guarantee the environmental outcomes commensurate with such a zoning.

The infrastructure performance standards of the current zoning for the site are not aligned with the site's needs or the current and future capacity of the public services. By aligning the retirement village development with an appropriate plan zone will also ensure that the site is rated appropriately, and that sufficient rates are collected to maintain the public infrastructure that supports the development. For these reasons, Option 1 is considered inappropriate.

Option 2 also does not provide the certainty of outcome the landowner and operator of the retirement village requires. The plan change requester is financially able to develop the retirement village in the near future. The need for the retirement village is demonstrated in the supporting material from BERL and by the strong support for the development expressed by the community throughout the pre-lodgement phase (Section 4). Furthermore, as explained by the Partnership in its supporting statement, they are receiving several expressions of interest a week about the village without marketing the proposed development. The opportunities to influence and submit on the WCDP review are still some months away, and decisions on re-zoning may not be released for another 3-5 years. For these reasons, Option 2 is also considered inappropriate.

Options 3 and 4 involves amending the Rural (Primary Production) Zone to provide for a retirement village and hospital complex, for example through a Rural character area



(Option 3) or by means of a controlled or restricted discretionary rule in the Rural (Primary Production) Zone. These options carry with it the risk that the overall objectives and outcomes of the Rural (Primary Production) Zone are undermined by providing for 'residential development that is essentially urban in character and intensity. The objectives and policies of the Rural (Primary Production) Zone would need to be amended to support either of these two options. However, I believe the introduction of such provisions would be incongruous with the overarching environmental outcomes anticipated by the Plan, which seek provide for diverse activities in the Rural Zone provided they are "compatible with the rural environment in scale, amenity and character" (Section 4.4, WCDP).

Additionally, Options 3 and 4 undermine the 'low impact' infrastructure provision characteristic of the Rural zone, e.g. on-site wastewater treatment and non-reticulated potable water supply. These options could also undermine the development of any strategic proposals the Wairarapa Councils may be considering to address the provision of retirement villages in the region. Options 3 and 4 are therefore considered inappropriate.

Option 5 involves the creation of an express purpose zone, for example and Retirement Village Zone, such as recently introduced in the Hutt City Council Plan by Plan Change 35. However, as with Option 3, this could undermine or complicate the Wairarapa Councils' development of any proposals to address the provision of retirement villages in the region more strategically. As part of the District Plan review, Council may consider including the Orchards site in a proposal to introduce an express purpose zone for retirement village development but again with Option 2, the timeframe for this review to the finalised and the ability for the new provisions to be realised by the land owner are some years away. As a result, Option 4 is considered to be inappropriate.

Option 6 is more likely to achieve a properly integrated and comprehensive development approach to developing and operating the site for the purposes of providing a continuing care retirement village in the short to medium term, and for its ongoing maintenance, development and operation. It can achieve this without undermining the purpose and objectives of the Rural (Primary Production) Zone and is entirely consistent with the outcomes anticipated in the Residential Zone. It meets a housing need for a demographic that is increasing in the Wairarapa (Cox and Groom, 2019) and can do so in a way that is consistent with sustainable management of natural and physical resources. This option also provides certainty for the future use of the site for a retirement village by applying the character area overlay provision. This will ensure that the site is developed for the intended use to meet the needs of the aging population and not simply an extension of the existing Greytown residential zone.

Having taken the relevant factors into account, it is considered that Option 6 is the most practicable option for achieving the objectives.

TABLE F: IDENTIFICATION OF REASONABLY PRACTICABLE OPTIONS FOR ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVES

Option	Meets the Objectives?	Benefits	Costs	Risk of acting or not acting	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Conclusion
<p><b>Option One</b></p> <p><b>Status Quo:</b> Maintain current zoning and provisions of the site and apply for resource consent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The objectives of the Rural Zone do not anticipate or envisage development of the density and nature proposed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only resource consent needs to be applied for, so potentially cheaper and quicker process for applicant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst the activity status is 'modest' (RD), the way the rule is written, and the way the policies are framed result in a much higher test.</li> <li>The infrastructure requirements and standards of the Rural (Primary Production) Zone are inconsistent with the demands and requirements of the development necessary to ensure the adverse effects of servicing the site are avoided.</li> <li>The scale of the development is at odds with the policy direction for the Rural (Primary Production) Zone. Could set an awkward precedent for Council and the community that could undermine the integrity of the District Plan.</li> <li>Challenges to the RC only approach could end up being as costly as the preferred option</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The risk of acting is that scale of the development is at odds with the policy direction for the Rural (Primary Production) Zone. Could set an awkward precedent for Council and the community that could undermine the integrity of the District Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This may be a more efficient process in terms of time and financial cost for the applicant compared to other options.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the Rural (Primary Production) Zone</li> </ul>	<p>This may be a more efficient process in terms of time and financial cost for the applicant. However, the proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the Rural (Primary Production) Zone.</p> <p>Not recommended</p>
<p><b>Option Two</b></p> <p>Await review of the WCDP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could result in specific zone or overlay that would make subsequent development straightforward</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potentially costly and time-consuming process for applicant to register and pursue interests through Schedule 1 process</li> <li>Uncertainty around timing of Plan review, Councils' strategic direction in respect of providing for retirement village development, and outcome</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The risk of acting is that opportunities identified by the Requester in acting now are lost.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potentially inefficient for applicant to register and pursue interests through Schedule 1 process if this option was pursued successfully to its conclusion it could result in the Orchards being included in a suite of district or region-wide measures to provide for retirement villages. This approach could be more efficient for other landowners and operators but not necessarily the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This assessment is hampered by the fact that the objectives could be introduced under this option are unknown.</li> </ul>	<p>This option is both potentially inefficient and ineffective.</p> <p>Not recommended.</p>

Option	Meets the Objectives?	Benefits	Costs	Risk of acting or not acting	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Conclusion
<p><b>Option Three</b> Maintain current zoning and amend [rural rule]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The objectives of the Rural Zone do not anticipate or envisage development of the density and nature proposed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only resource consent needs to be applied for, so potentially cheaper and quicker process for applicant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The infrastructure requirements and standards of the Rural (Primary Production) Zone are inconsistent with the demands of the development.</li> <li>The scale of the development is at odds with the policy direction for the Rural (Primary Production) Zone. Could set an awkward precedent for Council and the community that could undermine the integrity of the District Plan.</li> <li>Significant costs incurred to pursue private plan change process for change that is insufficient robust or fair reaching</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The risk of acting is that scale of the development is at odds with the policy direction for the Rural (Primary Production) Zone. Could set an awkward precedent for Council and the community that could undermine the integrity of the District Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costly process that results in insufficient strategic gain for the Requester</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the Rural (Primary Production) Zone</li> </ul>	<p>This option is both potentially inefficient and ineffective. Not recommended.</p>
<p><b>Option Four</b> Amend the Rural (Primary Production) Zone provisions to provide for a retirement village by a rule</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The objectives of the Rural Zone do not anticipate or envisage development of the density and nature proposed.</li> <li>Amending or introducing new policies to support a retirement village would continue to be inconsistent with remaining operative policies and objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More comprehensive than Option 3.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The infrastructure requirements and standards of the Rural (Primary Production) Zone are inconsistent with the demands of the development. Changing these requirements just for retirement villages could undermine integrity of the Plan in the Rural Zone.</li> <li>The scale of the development is at odds with the policy direction for the Rural (Primary Production) Zone. Could set an awkward precedent for Council and the community that could undermine the integrity of the District Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The risk of acting is that scale of the development is at odds with the policy direction for the Rural (Primary Production) Zone. Could set an awkward precedent for Council and the community that could undermine the integrity of the District Plan with regard to the overall Rural Zone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costly process for proposal that could be robustly challenged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed development is inconsistent with the remaining objectives and policies of the Rural (Primary Production) Zone</li> </ul>	<p>This option is both potentially inefficient and ineffective. Not recommended.</p>

Option	Meets the Objectives?	Benefits	Costs	Risk of acting or not acting	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Conclusion
<p><b>Option Five</b></p> <p>Rezone the site to an express purpose Environmental Zone</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would require new suite of objectives and policies to support approach.</li> <li>Unlikely to be inconsistent with District wide objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could result in an outcome that would make subsequent development of the site straightforward</li> <li>Strategic approach that could benefit other retirement village operators and landowners in the region as a whole</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inconsistent with the current format and structure of the WCDP</li> <li>Not efficient – it does not take advantage of the Plan's current architecture</li> <li>Highly costly for the Requester, who would be arguing benefits and costs on a more region-wide basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The risk of acting is associated with determining the costs and benefits of a proposal of this scale.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs disproportionate to the scale of the Requester's scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would achieve the purpose designed objectives</li> </ul>	<p>Potentially effective but cost prohibitive.</p> <p>Not recommended</p>
<p><b>Option Six (Preferred)</b></p> <p>Rezone site to Residential Zone with a specific character overlay to provide for the express use of the site as a retirement village, rest home and hospital</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment in Appendix 2 demonstrates that this approach is consistent with achieving the objectives of the Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sets up a long-term management framework for the site and proposal.</li> <li>Provides an appropriate and supportive planning framework for The Orchards development application.</li> <li>Establishes a certain and transparent relationship (for all involved) between the plan change request and the ultimate aspirations of the developer for the Orchards site.</li> <li>Helps to ensure that submitters do not 'jump to conclusions' about the potential development on site – this can take up valuable time in a hearing and increase uncertainty within community</li> <li>Ensures future development on the site, or any changes or amendments to retirement village development, assessed and provided for against proposed zone standards and rules, not Rural PP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potentially time-consuming and costly process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Requester has determined sufficient information to support this approach. The information is certain and sufficient to proceed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The costs of the approach are outweighed by the social, environmental, cultural and economic benefits associated with the implementation of the proposed provisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment in Appendix 2 demonstrates that this approach is consistent with achieving the objectives of the Plan.</li> </ul>	<p><b>This is the Preferred option. It is effective and efficient.</b></p>

**The preferred option is Option 6 for the reasons outlined earlier in this report.**

## **7.2 Examining the Appropriateness of the Objectives**

This Private Plan Change is an amending proposal as it amends an existing Wairarapa Combined District Plan. In this situation, the Act requires the proposed provisions of the Private Plan Change to be evaluated against both the objectives of the plan change (if there are any) and the relevant objectives in the existing Plan. This is so a plan change cannot be justified based solely on its own objectives, without being consistent with the broader plan objectives. The evaluation must assess whether the new provisions will help achieve the objectives already in the plan and will not undermine them.

There are no new objectives proposed as part of this plan change. This is because the operative objectives of the Residential Zone are considered to be the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. Furthermore, the new proposed provisions (policies, rules and assessment criteria) will achieve the objectives already in the Plan, and will not, in my view, undermine them.

The tables at Appendix 2 assess the operative objectives against a number of criteria to determine their appropriateness in respect of private plan change.

## **7.3 Examining the Appropriateness of the Policies, Rules and Other Methods**

Section 32(1)(b) examine whether the provisions in the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives by–

- i. identifying other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives; and
- ii. assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives; and
- iii. summarising the reasons for deciding on the provisions

An assessment against Section 32 (1)(b)(ii) must:

- a) identify and assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions, including the opportunities for–
  - i. economic growth that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and
  - ii. employment that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and

Summary of findings of the appropriateness of the preferred option is contained in Appendix 3 and an assessment of the appropriateness of the performance standards, to help achieve the objectives is included in 7.3.1.

### 7.3.1 Analysis of the proposed provisions

#### 7.3.1.1 Amend the Residential Zone Resource Management Issues

Resource management issues state “an existing or potential problem that must be resolved to promote the purpose of the RMA”. Issues can also be “opportunities to assist in promoting the purpose of the RMA” ([www.qualityplanning.org.nz/node/610](http://www.qualityplanning.org.nz/node/610)).

Modest amendments to Issues 4 and 5 in Section 5.2 of the WCDP are proposed as part of this Private Plan Change request, as follows:

4. *The need to provide for a wide range of residential lifestyle choices, including more intensive forms of residential development, including retirement villages, in a way that protects the amenity values and character of the residential neighbourhoods.*
5. *The design and layout of new comprehensive residential development, including retirement villages, may not provide an appropriate basis for an evolving sense of coherent character and amenity values, including appropriate connections for pedestrian, cycle and car modes of transport, and access to commuter rail services (where they exist) to the existing urban area.*

As indicated by the summary of the site selection process undertaken by the requester in Section 3.1 of this report, finding land with the topographical, size, drainage, demographic and locational qualities advantageous for a retirement village is challenging. Land of this quality is also highly desirable for general residential development, and there can be considerable competition for it.

In my opinion, the proposed amendments to Issues 4 and 5 are consistent with the concept of a resource management issue provided by Quality Planning. It allows for the site-specific requirements of retirement villages to be considered both strategically through site selection for such development (Issue 4) and at the individual site scale (Issue 5). Information from BERL and other sources discussed earlier in this evaluation indicates that meeting the housing and care needs of older people is a resource management issue. The proposed amendments therefore provide a resource management foundation for the overall policy and regulatory approach proposed for the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area. The emphasis proposed in the issues is also consistent with the description of retirement villages and their design requirements expressed in the Introduction of Chapter 5:

Residential character and amenity will change over time, so as to meet a wide range of urban residential lifestyles. A growing aged population, and a demand for lower maintenance properties has resulted in infill and higher density housing in some areas of the Wairarapa, such as inner parts of the Masterton. Retirement villages and housing complexes for the elderly are also more popular. These more intensive forms of residential development need good design to ensure they fit well with the residential character (WCDP, section 5.1).

### **7.3.1.2 Introduce a new policy under Objective Res1 to provide for a retirement village development in the Residential Zone**

Proposed Policy 5.3.2 Res1 (k) is as follows:

Provide for the development and operation of a retirement village in the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area shown on the Indicative Concept Plan (Appendix 6) subject to such environmental standards as necessary to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects.

Policies are the course of action to achieve or implement the objective (i.e. the path to be followed to achieve a certain, specified, environmental outcome) ([www.qualityplanning.org.nz/node/610](http://www.qualityplanning.org.nz/node/610)). This private plan change request does not seek to amend the single objective in Chapter 5 Residential Zone. The reasons for this are set out in Section 7.2 of this report. The proposed policy directs that development specifically in the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area for retirement village purposes be provided for. It refers to the Concept Plan and the site-specific environmental standards in order that adverse effects arising from the development are avoided, remedied or mitigated. This approach is consistent with achieving the objective, which is:

To maintain and enhance the character and amenity values of Wairarapa's residential areas, having due regard to the particular characteristics of each neighbourhood, and the need to provide for a diversity of residential lifestyles and non-residential services and activities.

The drafting of the policy is similar in style to existing policies in this part of the Plan.

### **7.3.1.3 Rezone the land from Rural (Primary Production) Zone to Residential Zone and provide specifically for retirement village development as a Character Area;**

The Residential Zone is the only Zone in the WCDP that envisages the development of large-scale comprehensive development including retirement villages. The introduction acknowledges the Wairarapa is characterised by an ageing population and that retirement villages are becoming an increasingly popular housing choice for this demographic:

Residential character and amenity will change over time, so as to meet a wide range of urban residential lifestyles. A growing aged population, and a demand for lower maintenance properties has resulted in infill and higher density housing in some areas of the Wairarapa, such as inner parts of the Masterton. Retirement villages and housing complexes for the elderly are also more popular. These more intensive forms of residential development need good design to ensure they fit well with the residential character (WCDP, section 5.1).

This private plan change request utilises the principles of the existing framework in the operative plan that provides for a retirement village. This framework is referred to in the Plan as Greytown Villas Character Area and is located off West Street, Greytown. As

explained earlier in this report, the retirement village development will no longer be realised, and the Greytown Villas Character Area has instead been developed for standard residential allotments and development. Nevertheless, the framework provides an efficient and effective means of providing for a retirement village in the Residential Zone.

This request does not seek to replace the Greytown Villas Character Area, which was introduced to the WCDP in 2001 following a Private Plan Change request. In my view, this is a matter that can be addressed as part of the Council's review of the WCDP. This request is limited to a consideration of the costs, benefits and assessment of effects of rezoning the application site for the purposes of a retirement village.

Residential character areas are a tool in the WCDP to enable the development and implementation of policies and methods to manage specific areas within a Zone so that issues specific to those areas can be addressed (WCDP, section 2.1). In this instance, overlaying the subject site with a character area allows for specific standards to be developed to enable a comprehensive development of the site for a retirement village.

The proposed site-specific standards should be considered as a package. Together they seek to provide some flexibility with regard to the following matters:

- Number of independent residential units;
- Number of advanced residential care beds;
- Number of persons employed on the site;
- Provision of on and offsite parking (provided it is all contained within the retirement village character area;

To ensure that the flexibility does not give rise to more than minor adverse effects, the flexible components are established within a framework that includes spatial limits including maximum site coverage and minimum planted areas; and also, a requirement to ensure that the number of car parks on site is commensurate with the requirements of the district plan.

An analysis of each of the proposed specific character area performances standards for the Orchards Retirement Village now follows:

- 1.** The total number of independent residential units (including stand-alone, duplex and terrace dwellings but excluding advanced residential care facilities) shall not exceed 180

Analysis of the site's potential yield was carried out by DGSE and Local Collective and took into consideration the site's constraints, the proximity and nature of neighbouring activities, character of the surrounding environment and the character of residential environment that is intended within the Orchards site. The site plan accompanying resource consent application shows 176 independent dwelling units. Flexibility is sought within the conditions of consent to provide up to 180 units. Density and open space provision associated with the provision of up to 180 units



is controlled by performance standards 8 (site coverage maximum), 19(b) (planted space minimum) and the boundary setback standards and internal setback standards provided in standards 3 and 6. Up to 180 dwelling units can be provided in accordance with these standards through the mix of dwelling typologies.

## **2. Advanced residential care facilities shall not exceed 120 beds**

The upper threshold of 120 beds is necessary to allow the advanced care component of the village to respond to the needs of the aged care community in the long term. The 120 beds are envisioned to offer a mix of serviced apartments, rest home, hospital and dementia level care. As has been explained in the Partnership's Statement (Appendix 14) there are currently no operators in the South Wairarapa providing specialist dementia care. It is anticipated that the Orchards advanced care facility will accommodate the staff and residents of Arbor House (which currently has 25 beds) in the immediate term and make a meaningful contribution to the region's advanced care provision in the long term. An upper limit of 120 beds allows the Partnership to respond to the needs of the advanced care market flexibly and efficiently.

## **3. Boundary setbacks**

The boundary setbacks of the Residential Zone in the WCDP are as follows:

- For front sites, 1.5 metres from all other boundaries, except that there shall be two setbacks of at least 3 metres from any side and/or rear boundary.
- For rear sites, 1.5 metres from all other boundaries, except that there shall be two setbacks of at least 3 metres from any side and/or rear boundary.

An alternative approach has been taken for this private plan change re-zoning in order to better respond to the characteristics and opportunities of the site and the variable density surrounding the site (LVAEE, Appendix 20). The proposed boundary setbacks are as follows:

- Boundaries 1, 2, 3 and 7 - 5m
- Boundaries 4, 8 and 9 - 7.5m
- Boundaries 5 and 6 - 10m

In addition, the setting of boundary setbacks at Boundaries 8 and 9 also seek to respond to the concerns of the immediate neighbours at those locations and provide setbacks that are closer to those that are required to be achieved in the Rural (Primary Production) Zone. The proposed setbacks work in combination with the landscaping requirements of these provisions and the detailed landscape

concepts for these boundaries as illustrated in Local Collective's masterplan (Appendix 19). The appropriateness of this measure accords with Ms Annan's view that the visual effects of the development will be mitigated by the boundary setbacks and an overall design approach, responsive to the existing amenity and character of adjacent residential development.

#### 4. Design controls for the advanced residential care facility

Specific design controls are proposed for the advanced residential care facility. This facility is proposed to occupy a portion bounded by the length of Boundary 3 and which faces an area of land currently zoned Rural (Primary Production). The provision is drafted as follows:

The main advanced residential care facility must include doors, windows, building modulation or other architectural detail for no less than 50% of its total façade facing Boundary 3.

The purpose of the provision is to control the bulk and mass of the care building along the a sensitive receiving environment boundary, whilst allowing the design of the building to make efficient use of internal space. I understand from Ms Annan that she is supportive of the proposed modulation measure, in combination with the proposed setback, as a means to mitigate the proposed density at Boundary 3.

#### 5. Setback distances between dwellings

Minimum setback distances between dwellings are proposed to be 4.5m. Setback distances of this nature are common in retirement villages in New Zealand. As demonstrated in the design statements of both Local Collective and DGSE, the gaps between dwellings will be extensively planted, with density offset with the provision of generous and high quality shared open space and accessible, useable and attractive personal outdoor space to each dwelling.

#### 6. Building coverage

Overall site coverage is intended to be limited to 26%. This is lower than the 30% standard in the Subdivision provisions required by allotments in the Residential Zone. This is considered to be an appropriate design control in order to achieve a development that is sympathetic with its surrounding environment and consistent with the design principles for the site, set out in DGSE's Design Statement and Local Collective's landscape concept plan and design statement (Appendix 18 and 19).

#### 7. Exclusive paved outdoor living courts

DGSE show exclusive paved outdoor living courts ranging from 6.4m<sup>2</sup> (Villa Type A, North facing) to 18.24m<sup>2</sup> (Villa Type C, South facing). These figures are generally for the covered

terraces which are all accessible from the living area of each dwelling. The covered nature of these areas is achieved through an extension of the roofline. For most proposed villa types, there is more exclusive outdoor space available to each dwelling but uncovered. Dwelling Types A (south and north) do have partial covering of the main area of exclusive outdoor living space.

It is proposed that the proposed character area provisions provide for 6m<sup>2</sup> minimum of exclusive paved outdoor living court area for terrace units and 15m<sup>2</sup> for all other typologies.

The proposed private outdoor living spaces should be considered within the context of the passive outdoor recreation opportunities the overall offers in the shared green space proposed (as shown in the Concept Plan). These include spaces such as Murphy's Garden, the Orchard Garden and the Swale Parkland. The general location of these are indicated on the Concept Plan.

#### **8. Wastewater disposal**

This provision states that building requiring wastewater disposal shall be connected to the reticulated wastewater system. This is consistent with Calibre's findings that the site can be appropriately serviced by connection to the public reticulated network.

#### **9. Stormwater disposal**

This provision is drafted as follows:

Stormwater from buildings and hard surfaces within The Orchards Retirement Village Character Area shall be disposed in accordance with NZS 4404:2010 Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure.

This is consistent with the advice and guidance established for stormwater management in Calibre's report (Appendix 21).

#### **10. Private roads**

The proposed internal roading network will be private. The benefits to the development of this approach are that it provides the developer/operator of the Village with control to maintain the site in accordance with its operational philosophy and requirements. The proposed provision establishes the minimum width formation of the proposed roads through the development. As confirmed by Stantec (Appendix 22), The primary roads are configured as suburban roads with the following attributes:

- movement lane width of 5.5m;
- 1.5m footpaths on at least one side of the road;
- parking provided adjacent to the movement lane; and
- cyclists are expected to share the movement lane with vehicles.

Stantec considers this arrangement to be conducive to a slow speed environment with a specified target operating speed of 20km/h.

The secondary roads are proposed with the following attributes:

- movement lane width of 3m; and
- pedestrians and cyclists are expected to share the movement lane with vehicles.

These secondary roads will provide access to a limited number of dwellings, generally not exceeding nine dwelling units. Stantec advises that due to the narrow movement lane width, this arrangement has a target operating speed of 10km/h.

#### **11. Vehicle crossing standards**

A number of the dwellings on Reading Street and Market Road are proposed to be directly accessed from those public roads. This is consistent with the design response described by DGSE (Appendix 18) which states:

To create an integrated community village, the proposal locates villas fronting the streets, activating street frontages. Multiple road connections also link the existing roading network with the village. These strategies combined with no gates will create a village which seamlessly integrates with the surrounding neighbourhood and wider community (DGSE, Appendix 18, p.4.2).

Where this relationship between dwellings and the public road exists, the vehicle crossings to those dwellings are required to comply with the standards in Appendix 5 of the WCDP - Requirements for Roads, Access, Parking and Loading. The proposed standards provide for this design response in a manner that is consistent with achieving a safe and efficient roading network.

#### **12. Staff cycle parking**

There are currently no provisions in the WCDP requiring cycle parking. However, there are policies encouraging developers to provide for the needs of cyclists and pedestrians. For example, Issue 5 of the Residential Zone states:

The design and layout of new comprehensive residential development may not provide an appropriate basis for an evolving sense of coherent character and amenity values, **including appropriate connections for pedestrian, cycle and car modes of transport**, and access to commuter rail services (where they exist) to the existing urban area.

Policy TT1(e) (Section 17 Transportation) also seeks to support and encourage the safe provision of non-vehicular forms of transport within the road network, including cycling and walking. The Plan give strong reasons for this policy:

It is imperative that pedestrians, cyclists, and mobility scooters are able to use the roading network in a safe manner, whether it is within the road reserve itself or through the provision of separate facilities, such as clearly delineated cycleways and footpaths. An integrated approach for all modes will therefore be taken in the design and management of the Wairarapa's roading network (Section 17.3.3, WCDP).

The proximity of the site to Greytown provides a significant opportunity to the development to provide for cycling opportunities, particularly for staff at the site, many of whom may live in or near to Greytown (BERL, Appendix 15).

The proposed provision here is designed meet the needs of staff who chose to cycle to work at the Orchards. It does not require cycle parking per se but ensures that where it is provided for staff it is secure and sheltered from the element. This proposed provision is consistent with the policy direction of the WCDP, and with the general policy shift in New Zealand to provide for the needs of cyclists effectively and efficiently. NZ based evidence demonstrate the costs to employers of cycle-friendly facilities and providing for the storage of bicycles is relatively modest in dollar terms, and far outweighed by social, economic and environmental benefits. According to *Active Communities: Cycle Friendly Employer*, providing facilities for 10 bikes is equal to the cost of providing a single car park space.<sup>6</sup>

### **13. Maximum contiguous car parking areas**

The permitted standard in the WCDP is 4 contiguous car park spaces. This provision proposes 15. This provides for the 'worst case' scenario shown in the masterplan (and for which resource consent is being sought). The visual impact of this number of contiguous parks will be offset by the generous and high-quality landscaping proposed.

### **14. Parking Spaces - residential units**

It is proposed that all units aside from Villa A units and the main building have provision for off-street parking spaces. The Villa A units and the main building activity would have dedicated 90° on-street parking available on surrounding internal roads. This is contrary to the requirements of the WCDP, which requires that activity shall provide off-street parking and loading for vehicles associated with the activity and vehicles expected to visit or be stored on the site in connection with the activity, in accordance with Table 21.1.25. Stantec consider that whilst this does not meet the requirement, it is considered that it would operate without any major concerns as the internal roads of the developments are anticipated to operate with slow speeds and low traffic volumes. The proposed provision in the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area suite of standards seeks to formalise this departure from the District Plan in perpetuity.

### **15. Parking Spaces - advanced residential care facilities**

---

<sup>6</sup> Active Communities: Cycle Friendly Employer, p.3. According to <https://www.greaterauckland.org.nz/2014/05/15/what-do-car-parks-cost-to-build/>, a ground level car park can cost \$70-80 a metre to build, excluding land costs.

This provision reiterates the parking standards for resthomes, as defined in Section 21.1.25 and Table 21.1.25.1 of the WCDP.

#### **16. Parking Spaces - non-residential activities**

This standard deviates from the WCDP standards by allowing for non-residential activities within the Orchards site to provide parking commensurate with the demands generated by the activity. In addition, the proposed standard allows for this parking provision to be provided as on-street or off-street parking spaces.

The degree of flexibility sought for by this provision is necessary to ensure that parking spaces are not over-provided within the site. This would be an inefficient use of land, and potentially undermine the ability to achieve good urban design outcomes. Much of the activity generated by the non-residential activities on-site will be by residents of the site and their guests and visitors. The majority of the housing typologies proposed include garaging for one or two cars, and driveway space for visitor parking. Whilst some residents will choose (or need) to drive from their dwelling to a non-residential facility on the site, it is more likely that residents and their guests will choose to walk to these on-site amenities, making parking provision expressly for those facilities in accordance with the Plan unnecessary.

The exception to this is the Bowling Green, which may be the future home of the existing Bowling Club in Greytown (located at 55-59 East Street). This activity is likely to generate car trips from visitors outside the site who may not necessarily be visiting somebody resident at the site. However, given the location of the Orchards, people visiting the site to bowl may also walk, cycle or car share. It is appropriate, given the quantum of car parking that can be accommodated within the Orchards site, and given that on-site non-residential amenities will be predominantly used by residents and their guests, that parking provision associated with non-residential activities be demand-driven.

The proposed standard is similar to existing permitted activity standard 21.1.25(c)(i)(3) which states (emphasis added):

On sites where there are multiple activities, and each activity requires vehicle parking in terms of this Plan, the total parking required shall be the combined total requirement for all activities. The Council will consider reducing parking requirements, where it is demonstrable that parking demands generated by each activity do not occur simultaneously and that operational hours or arrangements of those activities means shared parking will occur.

The ability for the Council to undertake this consideration in the context of The Orchards Retirement Village, the matters of control in proposed Rule 5.3.3(c) Roading and the provision of access and parking spaces. The bowling green and all the non-residential amenities, such as the wellbeing centre, will form part of a separate resource consent.

## **17. Screening standards**

This provision is proposed as follows:

All screening and landscape treatment within The Orchards Retirement Village Character Area shall comply with the following standards:

- Any commercial storage, bin storage or service area shall be screened. The screening shall be no less than 1.8m in height, comprising either a densely planted buffer or a solid fence or wall.
- Not less than 10% of the common areas within the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area shall be planted with shrubs of a minimum height of 200mm in general accordance with the Concept Plan in Appendix X.

The screening of commercial, bin storage and service area is designed to ensure such areas are sufficiently screened to preserve residential amenity (both within the site and from outside the site looking in), but also allow for some flexibility in approach, including how wide or deep the screening should be.

The second component relates to the overall planting of the development as a whole. Currently, Local Collective's plan shows 15,815m<sup>2</sup> of planting. This equates to around 11% of the site's total area. Establishing planting minimum of 10% of the site area in the provisions will ensure that in the long term the site is developed in a manner consistent with the objectives of the design team and the requester of this private plan change.

## **18. Signage provisions**

The proposed signage provisions allow for more than the permitted activity maximum in the Residential Zone and enables appropriate entry signage to be installed at each of the entrances at Reading Street and Market Road. Apart from the total face area provision being greater than the permitted activity standard the other sub-clauses of this provision mirror the standards in the Plan.

## **19. Provision for non-ancillary activities**

The purpose of this provision is to allow for ancillary activities necessary to the operation of the retirement village and will enable it to operate efficiently and effectively in the long term.

## **20. Provision for employment**

Permitted activity performance standard (j) of section 5.5.2 of the Plan limits the number of persons (full time equivalents) on a site in the Residential Zone to 2 persons. My understanding is that this permitted activity threshold is designed to enable some

economic activity from residential dwellings while preserving residential amenity and parking and traffic effects.

Once fully built, the Orchards Retirement Village will employ in the region of 93-119 FTEs (Appendix 17). As shown in the schedule at Appendix 17, employment at these levels is necessary to enable the efficient and effective operation of the village and provide for its maintenance and upkeep.

To allow for employment commensurate with the scale, size and functions of the Village, I propose no limits to the number of FTE persons that can be employed on the site, provided the parking requirements generated by the number of FTEs employed in the various roles at the Village can be met. As discussed above, the provisions allow for parking provision associated with activities on site to be provided by means of on and off-street parking. Stantec's assessment is that although this does not meet the requirements of the Plan, it is considered that it would operate without any major concerns as the internal roads of the developments are anticipated to operate with slow speeds and low traffic volumes (Appendix 22).

#### **7.3.1.4 Introduce a new Controlled Activity Rule at 5.5.3 to provide for the development of the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area as a Controlled Activity;**

This Private Plan Change request provides for the development and operation of a retirement village on the Orchards site as a controlled activity. An application for a controlled activity cannot be declined (except if s106 applies). Technical analysis of the site to date would indicate that s106 is unlikely to apply.

A controlled activity is one that is described in the RMA, regulations (including a national environmental standard), or a plan as a controlled activity. The RMA, regulations or plan must specify:

- any requirements, conditions, and permissions with which the activity must comply
- the matters over which the consent authority has reserved control.

In this instance, a controlled activity status is being used within a very specific context in conjunction with performance standards that have been developed for a particular site and designed to ensure that the adverse effects of the development are avoided, remedied or mitigated. The proposed matters over which Council will retain control are as follows:

- (i) [The design, scale and appearance of all buildings.](#)
- (ii) [Minimum floor areas for residential units.](#)
- (iii) [Building coverage for the site as shown in the Indicative Concept Plan in Appendix 9.](#)
- (iv) [The provision for and method of stormwater collection and disposal.](#)



- (v) The provision for wastewater disposal.
- (vi) The location of buildings with respect to site boundaries and each other.
- (vii) The provision of outdoor living courts.
- (viii) The provision of outdoor storage and service areas, including bin storage and collection.
- (ix) Roading and the provision of access and parking spaces.
- (x) The provision for safe pedestrian and cycle access throughout the site.
- (xi) The provision of landscaping, screening and open space.
- (xii) Noise and vibration management.
- (xiii) Lighting.
- (xiv) Signage.
- (xv) Staging of development.
- (xvi) Odour.
- (xvii) Sediment and dust management.
- (xviii) Financial contributions.

These relate back to the performance standards associated with development in the Residential Zone generally and the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area specifically, and enable the Council to effectively address these matters through resource consent conditions.

Permitted Activity status in this instance would not be appropriate in my view. This is because of significant size of the Character Area, the overall scale of the development, and the fact that, once completed, it will also include non-residential activities at a scale not anticipated as a Permitted Activity in the Operative Plan. More stringent activity status such as Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary are also not appropriate in my view. Both these status allow Council to decline an application. However, the process of defining the subject site as a Character Area in the Residential Zone and determining environmental standards to ensure adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated gives, in my opinion, Council sufficient certainty regarding the anticipated outcomes from the development to warrant Controlled Activity status.

**7.3.1.5 Introduce a new Non-Complying Activity Rule at 5.5.6 to provide for non-retirement village residential development within the Orchards Village Character Area as a non-complying activity;**

It is imperative that the Council and the community have certainty and assurance that the proposed Orchards Retirement Village Character Area is developed for a retirement village and not for general residential development. This is also necessary for the requester, who is committed to establishing and developing a retirement village to meet the demand for

such accommodation and facilities in the region. Consequently, to provide the necessary certainty, non-retirement village residential development within the Character Area is a non-complying activity.

Non-complying activity status is often reserved for those activities where the potential adverse effects are great but do not necessarily warrant prohibition. An application for a non-complying activity can be declined or granted (with or without conditions). Councils can grant consent where an application can meet any of the following tests:

- the adverse effects on the environment will be minor (disregarding the adverse effects on those who have given their written permission, and exercising the discretion to disregard adverse effects of the type generated by activities the plan permits or is permitted by a national environmental standard (ss104(2) and 104(3)(a)(ii))
- the application is not contrary to the objectives and policies of the plan, the proposed plan, or both (as appropriate - s104D(1)(b))
- the activity can comply with any restrictions, conditions and permissions specified in the Act, regulations or plan (s87A(5)(b)).

Providing for general residential development within an area specifically identified to provide for retirement village accommodation and facilities would be contrary to the proposed policy designed to provide for the retirement village in this location. The environmental standards devised for the village have been designed to ensure the adverse effects that its establishment and operation may generate are avoided, remedied or mitigated. It cannot be guaranteed that these same standards would be able to manage the potential and actual adverse effects of a general residential development. Consequently, I consider the status of non-complying for non-retirement village residential accommodation within the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area as appropriate.

#### **7.3.1.6 Introduce new subdivision standards at 20.1.2(a) to provide for future subdivision within the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area as a Controlled Activity;**

The requester seeks an amendment to the table in 20.1.2 Standards for Controlled Activities to provide for subdivision in the Orchards Retirement Village Character area as a Controlled Activity and subject to no minimum lot area and no minimum average lot area. The private plan change site is currently in two large allotments. In the future, these allotments may be reconfigured for example to enable the efficient operation of the advanced care facility as separate from the licence to occupy independent residential units. Regardless of how the site is subdivided in future, the licence to occupy model for the village is such that the current residential subdivision standards are not appropriate and would not result in the development and ongoing operation of the site being effective or efficient.

### 7.3.1.7 Introduce a new Assessment Criteria at 22.1.1 to enable assessment of subdivision activity within the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area;

The following assessment criteria is proposed for Section 21.1.1 of the WCDP:

Whether subdivision provides for lots that meet the operational requirements of the Orchards Retirement Village that accords with the development shown on the Concept Plan at Appendix X.

This assessment criteria ensures that Council have the ability to consider the operational basis for any future subdivision applications for the Orchards site.

### 7.3.1.8 Introduce a new Assessment Criteria at 22.2 to enable assessment of future land use development within the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area;

The proposed assessment criteria for any land use consent at the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area enables the Council to assess the alignment of any proposal with the Concept Plan and take into consideration landscape and visual effects and the degree to which the land resource within the character area is being used efficiently. The assessment criteria are consistent with the scope of consideration provided under the proposed Controlled Activity rule for the Village.

### 7.3.1.9 Introduce a new definition for Retirement Villages

The private plan change request introduces the following definition:

**Retirement Village** - means any land, building or site used for a comprehensive residential development that contains two or more residential units, together with services and/or facilities for on-site residents and staff and which may include staff accommodation, advanced residential care facilities, such as nursing, medical, hospital or dementia care, recreation, leisure, welfare facilities and activities, and other non-residential activities ancillary to the retirement village, predominantly for persons in their retirement and their spouses or partners.

The operative plan includes the following related definitions (emphasis added):

**Community Activity** - means the use of any land or premises purpose built for any activity or service which has an individual or community health, welfare, care, safety, educational, recreational, cultural, ceremonial, spiritual, art or craft purpose.

**Community Facility** - means any land, building or premises which provides any community activity; and includes educational facilities, places of worship, libraries, hospitals, **retirement homes and rest homes**, community halls, kohanga reo, and childcare centres, but excludes entertainment facilities.

Whilst retirement homes and rest homes are included in the definition of 'community facility', these facilities are not expressly provided for in the Plan in any rule or other provision. In addition to Section 27 Definitions, the term community facility is referenced only twice in the WCDP in Section 22.2.17, the assessment criteria for the Greytown Villas Character Area. The term community activity is referenced in Appendix 7 of the Plan, Carterton Town Centre Design Guidelines, and Appendix 8, the South Wairarapa Town Centres Design Guidelines. In both cases the term is used in reference to encourage the development of vibrant and active town centre spaces. The terms do not appear to serve any regulatory purpose with regard to retirement villages. They are not referred to in any rule in the Plan and appear to have only limited function as an assessment tool.

In my opinion, in order to properly support the suite of proposed provisions for the Orchards Retirement Village, a new definition is appropriate. The proposed definition seeks to encapsulate the components that individually or in combination comprise a common understanding of a modern retirement village. The definition is an adaptation of one currently used in the Christchurch City Replacement Plan. The definition lists the features associated with advanced residential care facilities. This is an efficient approach as it avoids the need to repeat these features individually in the performance standards and assessment criteria.

My earlier analysis of the operative community facility definition leads me to conclude that its reference to retirement homes and rest homes is redundant. Therefore, I also seek that these references are deleted from the community facility definition. This will ensure that there is no confusion in interpreting the Plan with regard to retirement villages.

#### **7.3.1.10 Introduce a new Appendix to Part D to include the Orchards Retirement Village Concept Plan;**

The Orchards Retirement Village Concept Plan shows the key components of the development, including areas dedicated to independent residential units, the area for the advanced care facility, key landscape and planting elements and the overall circulation and access strategy.

#### **7.3.1.11 Consequential amendments to give effect to the purpose and scope of the proposed Private Plan Change.**

A consequential amendment identified is revising Section 26.3.5: Information Schedule 5: Controlled Activities to include reference to the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area as follows:

The Orchards Retirement Village Character Area  
Information regarding the relationship of the proposal for which consent is sought with the Indicative Concept Plan in Appendix 6.

This ensures that information submitted with any controlled activity proposals that may be lodged with Council under the proposed Controlled Activity rule is consistent with the proposed Concept Plan.

### 7.3.2 Assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed provisions

Section 32 requires an evaluation of the effectiveness, efficiency and risk of the provisions of the preferred option. I have chosen to undertake this assessment using a cost-benefit analysis approach. This is because many of the costs and benefits can be monetised or otherwise quantified. In summary, the analysis finds that the proposal is consistent with achieving the relevant objectives of the Plan. It is also the most efficient means of addressing the issues identified earlier in this report and achieving the relevant objectives. Section 32(2) requires an assessment of the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions. In my view, sufficient information has been provided about the subject matter of the provisions. The information is not uncertain. The proposed provisions have been drafted in light of the information provided by the technical experts working on the project, and in light of an assessment of the objectives of the Plan the proposed provisions must contribute to achieving. I conclude that the risks of acting based on the information provided are low. The risks of not acting are that the environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits that are available as a consequence of the Private Plan Change request are not captured, and that the needs of the region's ageing population are not sufficiently met.

## 8 Environmental Effects Resulting from the Proposed Private Plan Change

### 8.1 Actual and Potential Effects

#### 8.1.1 Socio-economic effects

Positive socio-economic effects are generated by the proposed private plan change at the construction phase and the operational phase of the development it will facilitate. The benefits of the construction phase are temporary and likely to be spread over the estimated 10 years build period. The socio-economic effects associated with the operational phase will be enduring.

#### **Construction Phase**

The direct, indirect and induced impacts of the construction phase of the retirement village on the local economy will be considerable and will be spread across a 10-year time period, though intensity of these impacts is likely to vary over that time period. As detailed in the

BERL EIA (Appendix 16) \$17.5 million of the anticipated \$102 million construction costs associated with the development of the retirement village will occur in the South Wairarapa. The direct effects of this spend is likely to result in additional \$7.2 million in GDP and create 96 FTE jobs in the South Wairarapa. As shown in the table below, positive indirect effects occur when local companies spend the \$17.5 million on goods and services in the course of fulfilling their contract. Positive induced effects arise when employees of local businesses spend their wages and salaries:

	Direct	Indirect	Induced	Total
<b>Expenditure (2018\$m)</b>	17.5	7.4	3.0	27.9
<b>GDP (2018\$m)</b>	7.2	3.1	1.8	12.1
<b>Employment (FTEs)</b>	96	41	14	151

FIGURE 1: IMPACTS OF THE CONSTRUCTION WORK ON THE SOUTH WAIRARAPA DISTRICT ECONOMY (SOURCE: BERL EIA)

### Operational Phase

BERL estimate that \$2.7 million of the annual \$6 million expenditure required to run the Orchards Village will be spent in the South Wairarapa, directly resulting in an additional \$2.4 million in GDP and 47 FTE jobs in the South Wairarapa district. The table below shows the economic impact on the South Wairarapa economy when the indirect and induced impacts are factored in:

	Direct	Indirect	Induced	Total
<b>Expenditure (2018\$m)</b>	2.7	0.6	0.7	3.9
<b>GDP (2018\$m)</b>	2.4	0.4	0.6	3.4
<b>Employment (FTEs)</b>	47	8	9	63

FIGURE 2: ANNUAL IMPACTS ON THE SOUTH WAIRARAPA ECONOMY OF VILLAGE OPERATION (SOURCE: BERL EIA)

Positive economic impacts associated with the operation of the Village also filter to the economies of the Wairarapa sub-region and Wellington region.

In the EIA BERL provide data on the positive impacts on the economy associated with the spending of the residents the Village will accommodate. BERL estimates that around \$4.97 million will be spent each year by village residents, 48 percent of which (\$2.1 million) will be spent in the South Wairarapa District. The increase in GDP related to this spending will be associated with the creation of 30 FTE jobs within South Wairarapa. These direct effects will be multiplied by indirect and induced effects (flow-on effects).

	Direct	Indirect	Induced	Total
Expenditure (2018\$m)	2.1	0.5	0.4	3.1
GDP (2018\$m)	1.1	0.3	0.3	1.6
Employment (FTEs)	26	2	2	30

FIGURE 3: ANNUAL IMPACTS OF RESIDENTS' SPENDING ON THE SOUTH WAIRARAPA DISTRICT ECONOMY (SOURCE: BERL EIA)

BERL provide compelling evidence to demonstrate that the population of Greytown and the wider region is aging. This creates an increasing need for safe and well-designed residential accommodation suitable for older people and their increasing social and health needs. The proposed Orchards Character Area overlay will contribute to meeting the housing and care needs of older people in the Wairarapa. This need is not currently being met at scale in the South Wairarapa district. It is anticipated that some of people moving into the proposed retirement village will come from within the district and therefore a potential effect of the proposed plan change is will be to free up homes for the local housing market. This possibility has become more evident with ongoing enquires from local residents about the availability and timing of the proposed retirement village units.

The private plan change proposal also includes specific provision for advanced residential care facilities. This is recognised in the proposed definition of retirement village, and in the detail of the character overlay performance standards and controlled activity rule. This provides an opportunity for the merging of existing services such as the services provided by Arbor House. An arrangement between the Orchards and Arbor House will see a continuation in care for existing Arbor House residents and continued employment for staff.

The RMA specifically requires that the needs of future generations be considered when achieving the sustainable management of the environment. In this regard, the proposed developed is meeting a recognised need for accommodation for our future aging population. This is discussed in detail in the BERL Wellbeing Report included as Appendix 15 where it is identified that "additional service delivery and community development work is likely needed anyway, because the population of older people will grow significantly, even without the Orchards".

Overall, I consider that there are significant socio-economic benefits arising from the proposed development.

### 8.1.2 Social and Cultural effects

The site provides residential accommodation for older people in close proximity to existing churches, clubs and organisations within Greytown Village. The access to public transport routes means that access to social and cultural activities in the wider Wairarapa area will also be readily accessible for residents. This will enable residents with existing club memberships to retain these interests and is also likely to mean increased membership by

new Orchards residents. The same can be said generally for residential and other existing businesses within Greytown which is addressed above under socio-economic effects.

Providing for a retirement village in Greytown could, once the Village is fully operational and occupied, result in an increase in people involved in the local community including local sports, arts and cultural groups. This is acknowledged in the BERL report at section 5.1. This could boost the membership of some of these organisations and increase the available 'volunteer' hours in the district. The cumulative impacts of more individuals volunteering are potentially significant:

*39 minutes a day amongst 65+ year olds may seem small but, when multiplied up by the number of days in a year and the number of 65+ year olds in question, the total becomes significant. In fact, it is  $39 \times 365 \times 320 = 4,555,200$  minutes, or 85,410 hours during the course of a year. This equates to roughly 55 people operating on a full-time, full year basis (BERL, Four Wellbeings Report, p.4).*

The proposed development site, in close proximity to the centre of Greytown, is connected to the existing community. These linkages have been promoted through the way the site has been designed, including road frontages to Reading Street and Market Road for some dwellings. The design and proximity of the site is likely to promote community integration of the development. The site will also provide on-site facilities for those residents who may not currently have access to such opportunities due to distance from town or due to mobility constraints.

The proposed Wellbeing Centre associated with the Village and provided for within the Concept Plan will be a central location within the development for recreational, social and cultural activities. Given the close proximity to Greytown Primary School, it is also recognised that there is ample opportunity for interactions between Orchards residents and school students through such things as reading groups and performances which are mutually beneficial to the participants.

The proposed relocation of the Greytown Bowling Club to the Orchards site is an opportunity for both existing bowling club members who will benefit from a modernised and updated facility, and also for Orchards residents to be active participants in the sport of lawn bowls.

The private plan change will facilitate and support a development will provide ample opportunities for older people to socialise and interact with other people within the site, including opportunities for support for those who may be on their own, unwell or of limited mobility. The site also provides the opportunity for walking and cycling within the site itself to enable residents are able to keep active and exercise in a safe and supportive environment. In this respect also, the Orchards development will provide for a range of residential accommodation options to providing variation in the level of independence/care required, with the comprehensive nature of the development allowing for change as an individual's needs might change over time.



In relation to Māori cultural effects, the site is not known to be a site of significance to local iwi. However, it is proposed that an ongoing relationship between local iwi and the Papawai Marae to be developed and strengthened throughout the development and operation of the site. During the development of the Orchards concept for the site, members of the development team met with Rangitāne (on site), Kahungunu and the Council's Māori Standing Committee. These meetings helped provide a useful forum for communication where Rangitāne shared that effects on water quality was their greatest concern for the development. The Māori Standing Committee expressed their desire for Papawai heritage to be acknowledged in some way, either through the naming of buildings or through the use of Te Reo on site. There is also the potential for local iwi to contribute to the detailed landscape design of the site by including Māori/cultural references in the landscaping.

### 8.1.3 Landscape and visual effects

Ms Annan concludes in her report (Appendix 20) that though the character of the site will undoubtedly change as a consequence of the development the proposed private plan will provide for, the future amenity provided will be appropriate to the setting. She finds that the proposal's amenity will be derived from design measures to soften and enhance the proposal's appearance as a suitable development pattern for this location. Having assessed Ms Annan's report and the design statements provided by Local Collective (Appendix 19) and DGSE (Appendix 18), I concur with Ms Annan's views on the impact of this development on landscape character and visual effects.

#### 8.1.3.1 Landscape Effects

Ms Annan considers the landscape effects of the proposed development in her LVAEE (Appendix 20). She finds that physically, the application will involve a shift of the current edge of residential development in this part of Greytown. She also finds that the development of the site in accordance with the proposed Concept Plan will result in the loss of some rural land use within the site, open space areas and permeable ground area.

However, Ms Annan acknowledges that several design features incorporated into the Concept Plan and provided for in the proposed provisions help mitigate the impact of the proposal on landscape values. These include:

- Differing boundary setbacks that are greater than required in the Residential Zone acknowledges the greater scale of the development (than adjacent single dwelling lots);
- Variable, staggered setbacks of proposed villas;
- Provision to ensure the elevation of the future advanced care building is modulated where it faces Boundary; and
- Dispersal of green space areas through the site help break up built form development through the site.

### 8.1.3.2 Visual Effects

Ms Annan acknowledges that there are some limiting factors with regards to the request site's visual catchment and viewing audience. She notes that the site is not visible in its entirety from any one location in the immediate surrounds which is a factor of shape, scale and the mature vegetation patterns both within and surrounding the site.

I agree with Ms Annan's point that vegetation (either within or outside the site) cannot be relied upon as the sole mitigation measure to manage the visual effects of the development facilitated by the private plan change request. This is especially the case here where there is not formally protected trees of vegetation on site. Ms Annan notes that "vegetation has a dynamic lifecycle and will face removal at some point (as evident in the now more open views to the site with the Reading Street frontage pine trees now removed)".

However, Ms Annan considers that structural vegetation patterns will be a key factor in softening the visual effects of the change from rural site use to denser residential villas and the future care facility use as a retirement village. The Concept Plan shows significant areas of proposed vegetated space, the composition of which is discussed in detail in Local Collective's Design Statement and Landscape Concept Plan. The provisions have been designed to ensure that key area of shared green space are delivered.

Ms Annan considers that the visual effects of the development will be further mitigated by the proposed boundary setbacks and that the overall design approach is responsive to the existing amenity and character of adjacent residential development. Again, the provisions seek to provide certainty of delivery of these key design parameters.

Having considered Ms Annan's analysis and the design statement and details provided by DGSE and Local Collective, I concur with Ms Annan view that "while the site will change in character with the proposal in place, visual amenity will still be afforded (from a different source) by 'The Orchards' retirement development".

### 8.1.3.3 Landscape Character Effects

Ms Annan provides a detailed assessment of the landscape character of the site and its surrounds and the effects on it generated by the proposed plan change and the development that will be facilitated. She notes that site itself will go through a 'shift' from its predominantly rural open space character, however she acknowledges that the density of the proposed development provided for in the plan change seeks to maintain a level of residential character compatible with its landscape context. Ms Annan also considers that the proposed boundary setbacks and retained vegetation patterns, including some orchard areas, will soften appearance of the proposed development. As discussed in the preceding sections, the provisions seek to ensure that the design parameters that can influence the environmental outcomes on the site are delivered.

### 8.1.3.4 Onsite Amenity

Ms Annan acknowledges that the Concept Plan and detailed design work behind it include spatial considerations such as the retention of orchard and some open space and boundary

setbacks that will ensure on site amenity is provided for. I note that she considers the landscape design approach to provide for a more rural and less fussy aesthetic that is “positive and sympathetic to the landscape character of the setting”.

#### **8.1.4 Noise**

It is recognised that there will be a change in the noise generated from the site going from a rural orchard site to a residential development. There will no longer be the sound of farm machinery and equipment on the site. During the construction phase of the development provided for in the private plan change there will be construction noise associated with site preparation and building construction. This will eventually, in stages, be replaced with the noises associated with people and vehicles living in a residential context. The private plan change request does not propose alternative noise standards to those that currently operate within the Residential Zone as it is anticipated that throughout the development and occupation of the site that the noise standards outlined in the District Plan under Rule 4.5.2(f) will be adhered to. The management of construction noise can be provided for through the consenting process, and a matter of control is provided to ensure this matter can be appropriately assessed and conditioned.

#### **8.1.5 Dust**

A number of activities will take place on site to deliver the retirement village provided for in the proposed provisions. Some of these activities, such as tree felling, removal and stump grinding, could take place as of right under the Operative provisions for the Rural (Primary Production) Zone. A specific provision to manage potential dust effects has not been proposed, however it is included as a matter of control in the proposed Controlled Activity rule for the development of the retirement village. I consider this sufficient to manage dust effects in the manner anticipated by the Residential Zone and General Amenity objectives and policies of the Plan.

#### **8.1.6 Lighting**

The Operative Plan does not include any specific lighting provisions in the Residential Zone. No specific lighting provisions are proposed as part of the performance standards for the Orchards Retirement Village Character Area. Lighting of the retirement village is anticipated to be commensurate with residential activities in the Residential Zone. Lighting is provided for as a matter of control in proposed Rule 5.3.3(c). I consider this sufficient to manage any potential or actual lighting effects generated by the development.

#### **8.1.7 Hours of operation**

The residential nature of the site means that it will be ‘operational’ 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This is commensurate with other activities provided for in the Residential Zone. Some activities on the site may result adverse effects on residents within the Orchards and on sites surrounding the development such as rubbish collection, deliveries (such as linen, food, medical supplies etc). However, these are matters best provided for in the matters of control in proposed Rule 5.3.3(c).

### 8.1.8 Potential effects on Significant Natural or Historic Values

There are no known significant natural areas or areas of the site with historic heritage values and no specific performance standards have been proposed to manage this type of effect. A matter of control is proposed to ensure the Council can assess and provide for landscape and open space through conditions. When assessing any application against the proposed Rule, the Council will also be guided by the proposed assessment criteria for land use development and the Concept Plan. Together, these measures, as well as the developer's obligations under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, will effectively manage potential and actual effects on natural and historic values on the site generated by the requested private plan change.

### 8.1.9 Site servicing

As discussed in the Infrastructure Report prepared by Calibre Consulting Ltd (Appendix X), the development and proposed level of activity provided for in the private plan change request can be satisfactorily serviced in terms of water supply, stormwater, wastewater disposal, electricity and telecommunications. The means of servicing is summarised below. The performance standards for the proposed character area will ensure that the delivery of infrastructure necessary to effectively service the site are in accordance with the Council's standards and NZS 4404:2010.

**Stormwater** will be managed on site through the use of vegetated berm swales which finish at on-site raingardens which will feed the stormwater from the site into the Council's stormwater network beyond the site in accordance with the requirements of NZS 4404:2010. This proposed approach is detailed in the Calibre report under Section 3. It is anticipated that the proposed stormwater soakage system will "reduce the total discharge volume and flow from the property from pre-development levels" during storm events. Sheet C430 of the Calibre report illustrates the proposed overland flowpaths for the site.

It is anticipated that there may be some rainwater capture from the roofs of buildings within the site although the extent of this is not yet know and greater consideration of this will be undertaken at detailed design stage.

**Wastewater** disposal is intended to be discharged into the Council network at two locations along Market Road. Approximately 50% of the development facilitated by the Character Area is at levels that require a sewer pump and rising main to be installed while the remainder of the site will be gravity fed. The Calibre report outlines that this approach meets the requirements of NZS 4404:2010.

**Potable water supply** to provide for water needs of residents and for any firefighting needs on the site have been considered in the Calibre report. I understand that the proposed approach to provision of potable water is that water is stored from the Council supply in underground storage tanks that will be pumped around the site to residents. It is proposed that a maximum water storage requirement of 120,000L is will provided for on the site.

The proposed design has considered against the requirements of NZBC G12: Water Supplies, NZ4509: New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice and NZS 4404:2010. It is also assumed that no rainwater collection will be undertaken although as stated above, this will be considered further at detailed design stage.

#### 8.1.10 Management of contaminated soils

The requester is aware of the obligations placed on him by the NES-SC, the District Plan and, potentially, the Greater Wellington Regional Plans, to ensure that the site is safe for its intended use and does not pose a risk to human health; and that activities on site do not result in the discharge of contaminants to soil, water or air. It is the requester's ultimate intention to ensure the site is registered as having been remediated or managed. The requester has a resource consent to deal with the hot spots of contamination that exist on the site. Conditions on this consent establish how the rest of the site should be managed in order to ensure that any contamination of the site does not adversely affect human health during the construction or eventual occupation of the site. Given the overarching management framework for the management of contaminated land and the obligations this places on the requester, I consider it is unnecessary to include any specific provisions in the Plan Change document to deal with this matter. The AEE for the accompanying land use consent provides more detail as to how this matter can be dealt with at the resource consent stage.

#### 8.1.11 Soils/Productivity

I acknowledge that the proposed development will result in the loss of productive soils from within the Rural Zone. The plans at Appendix 4 show the extent of soil classes I and II across the site (<https://smap.landcareresearch.co.nz>). The plans also show that a significant portion of the Reading Street allotment is classed Soil Type Town.

The site is roughly 13.8ha in size and I consider that the current use is relatively small scale when compared with the scale of other rural land use activities and land holdings in the Wairarapa. Whilst the development of the subject site will remove a portion of land from the primary production land resource, it does not result in the segmentation of the rural environment. This is because the site is located adjacent to existing residentially zoned and developed land and is closely located to existing amenities within the Greytown township. This is supported by Ms Annan's assessment (Appendix 20) which notes:

*Abutting an urban area, the application site's proposed change to this residential zoning is less dramatic than it would be if surrounded entirely by a rural landscape. The composite landscape character of the setting reflects the surroundings of both rural and residentially zoned land. This is not a stretch of a purely rural working landscape but a zone boundary setting at the existing urban edge of Greytown. The mixed characteristics and densities of the surrounds afford capacity for a level of landscape change on the application site to be absorbed here.*

*In considering the existing urban form of Greytown, the site is somewhat 'nestled in' along the town's mideast edge. The site, if zoned for residential development as proposed, would not sit prominently 'out on a limb into the rural environment'. It would be within a setting of property parcels with varying density.*

The site selection process has been detailed in section 3.1. This strongly indicates that there is no vacant residential land within Greytown, or within other residential townships in the Wairarapa, with the range of opportunities and beneficial features of the subject site that would enable the development of a retirement village on the scale proposed. To create a development of this scale elsewhere within existing residential zoning would require the acquisition and redevelopment of potentially several parcels of existing residentially zoned land, that may or may not be developed with existing residential development. This process would be extremely costly and time consuming.

The BERL report (Appendix 15) shows that South Wairarapa, in line with the country as a whole, has an ageing population. Appropriately accommodating and caring for older people is acknowledged as a resource management issue. The BERL reports also demonstrate that while the proposed plan change will result in a loss of productive soils, the economic benefits that area generated by the proposed change are significant and extend beyond the South Wairarapa to include the Wairarapa and the greater Wellington region. The benefits associated with the Plan Change also include environmental benefits, cultural and social benefits (BERL, Four Wellbeings Report). I also acknowledge that the site design process has sought to address the issue of the loss of the productive soils the development would generate. These include:

- A commitment to retaining some of the existing fruit trees on site;
- The provision of community gardens across the site;
- The provision of areas of shared open space;
- A sustainable and multi-purpose approach to stormwater management; and
- Significant new planting across the site.

The applicant has acknowledged that the current zoning of the site is not the most appropriate fit for the proposed development and has prepared a private plan change application concurrently with this resource consent application to rezone the land from rural to residential to better reflect the intended use of the site. The appropriateness of objectives assessment in Appendix 2 also demonstrates that the proposed plan change is consistent with achieving the Plan's objectives in respect of all the relevant matters, including those of the Residential Zone, and transport, tangata whenua, general amenity and land use and subdivision sections.

Overall, I consider that the use of 13ha of productive land in close proximity to the Greytown Village for a retirement village and the associated loss of productive land is outweighed by the benefits to the community associated with the provision of purpose built and well-

designed residential accommodation for older people. I consider that the effects from the loss of 13ha of productive land are less than minor.

### 8.1.12 Natural Hazards

The Orchards site is not located with a known natural hazard area as identified by either the SWDC or GW Regional Council. Flood hazard mapping does not indicate that the site is subject to flood events and the closest fault line is located approximately 5.5km to the North West of the application site at the base of the Tararua Ranges. The independent Report prepared by EQO Ltd and attached as Appendix 26 confirms that the site is not known to be at risk to any significant natural hazard and standard engineering solutions are available to address any geotechnical issues that may arise through detail design. This report also confirms that the site contains soft silt soils for 1.5-2.5m with gravels underneath. EQO Ltd concludes that specific foundation design is likely to be required for majority if not all buildings. This matter will be addressed through at the building consent stage and I do not consider that any mitigation of this matter is required through the resource consent process.

Overall, I consider that the risk to people and property as a result of natural hazard risk generated by the Plan Change is not more than minor. I consider that it is not an issue that needs to be specifically provided for in the proposed Plan Change.

### 8.1.13 Transportation effects

#### 8.1.13.1 Existing Road network

The roading network surrounding site is capable of absorbing the traffic generation anticipated by the implementation of the private plan change provisions. The Stantec report considers that "due to the network of roads available in the area and operational characteristics of the development, it is anticipated that the additional traffic [generated by the development facilitated by the private plan change] is not expected to have any notable impact on the current operation of SH2." The report also considers the suitability of existing intersections at Reading/McMaster Street and Reading Street/Market Road/Church Street intersections. The report concludes that the existing intersections are suitable for the anticipated increase in traffic generated by the development and no upgrading is required. The anticipated level of traffic to be generated by the development will necessitate the following upgrades:

- Upgrading the widths of both Market Road (currently width of 5m) and Church Street (currently width of 6m) to meet minimum road widths of 5.5-5.7m and sealed 0.5m shoulder
- Upgrading Reading Street (existing width 5.4m) to a minimum road width of 5.5-5.7m with 1.5m footpaths on both sides and separate parking including

formalising/sealing the roadsides used for parking adjacent to the Greytown Primary School.

These upgrading recommendations can be delivered as part of the consenting process.

The proposed site design will result in two new intersections are proposed for Market Road and Reading Street as a result of the development. These are proposed to be designed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 4404:2010 and can be constructed to meet the requirements of the development and ensure public safety requirements are met for the level of traffic being generated.

The report also acknowledges that the location of the site and the standard of the existing roading network is such that residents of the Village, employees, and visitors could easily choose bicycles or walking over cars to visit the site or town.

#### **8.1.13.2 Internal private roading network**

Stantec's report and the design statements and concept plans provided to support the private plan change and resource consent process demonstrate that the site is capable of providing a safe and accessible internal roading and footpath network. The internal roading network itself has been designed with the guidance of NZS 4404:2010.

The comprehensive site design also provides for walking and cycling access throughout the site. This is provided for with footpaths and connecting green laneways and with the ability of cyclists to share the internal roading network with vehicles. The Stantec recognises that "the convenience of the location of the site and the good pedestrian connectivity of the site is expected to encourage residents to walk to nearby destination which would in turn reduce car ownership to some degree".

Overall, I consider that the private roadways will adequately meet the needs of the proposed development.

#### **8.1.13.3 Parking**

The parking spaces as shown on the site plan do not strictly comply with the requirements of the District Plan. However, the outcome of provision of parking spaces on sites exceeds the on-site requirements. Ultimately the site is able to ensure that parking for the residential component of the development is adequately provided for, with no adverse effects generated on the public road (e.g. by visitors having to park on the surrounding roading network).

#### **8.1.14 Construction effects**

The proposal has the potential to give rise to potential temporary nuisance effects associated with the earthworks and building construction (for example dust, noise,



disruption to traffic networks) facilitated by the Plan Change request. I consider that these matters are adequately provided for in the plan provisions that would prevail in respect of the proposed Character Area, and in the matters of control in proposed Rule 5.3.3(c).

#### **8.1.15 Reverse Sensitivity Effects**

The proposed location of the plan change site is in what can be described as a semi-rural environment. As a result, it can be anticipated that rural land uses of varying scales are occurring on land adjacent to Boundaries 3, 4, 5 and to some extent 6 and 7, although these boundaries are with Market Road and not directly adjoining rural properties, as indicated on the boundary identification plan attached as Appendix 10d. This means that it can be anticipated that retirement village development facilitated by the Plan Change along these boundaries can expect some effects associated with rural land use such as rural machinery noise as well as potential animal noise and odour. The close proximity of the site to these rural land uses have the potential to give rise to reverse sensitivity effects for residents of the proposed development.

I consider that these effects are sought to be appropriately managed through the proposed landscaped boundary treatments along these boundaries and the proposed building setbacks from external site boundaries. This can also be managed by ensuring that those residents who reside in villas along these boundaries are aware of the rural setting they are going to be residing in so that they can select an alternative location on the site if that is their preference. I also acknowledge that the rural character of the surrounding environment might be sought after by some residents, particularly those who may be moving to the Orchards from a farming environment.

Overall, I consider that the potential for reverse sensitivity effects that would be generated by the implementation of the private plan change provisions will have no more than minor effects for its residents.

## **8.2 Summary**

In summary, while the implementation of the proposed plan change will result in the establishment of a retirement village development that has different characteristics to a typical residential development, it will address a resource management need in the District. The design concept has been carefully and comprehensively thought out and addresses the local urban, rural and open space characteristics of the locality. The proposed provisions seek to ensure that the effects generated by the development can be managed so as to be consistent with that anticipated in the Residential Zone. The proposed plan change will enable the development of a retirement village that will make a positive contribution to Greytown, the South Wairarapa and the wider region economically, environmentally, socially and culturally.

## 9 Part II Assessment

Section 5 of the RMA specifies the purpose of the Act as being:

*"...to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources."*

'Sustainable management' is thereafter defined as:

*"In this Act, sustainable management means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety while–*

- (a) Sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and*
- (b) Safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and*
- (c) Avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment."*

Section 6, 7 and 8 identify 'matters of national importance', 'other matters' and Treaty of Waitangi' respectively.

Section 6 requires that all persons exercising functions and powers in achieving the purpose of the RMA shall 'recognise and provide for' the matters listed in (a) to (h).

The matters of national importance of relevance to this proposal are:

*(e) the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga:*

*(h) the management of significant risks from natural hazards.*

Section 7 lists the matters that all persons exercising functions and powers under the Act shall have particular regard to. Of those matters, the following are considered to be relevant to the assessment of this proposal:

- (a) kaitiakitanga*
- (aa) the ethic of stewardship*
- (b) the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources*
- (ba) the efficiency of the end use of energy*
- (c) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values:*
- (d) intrinsic values of ecosystems;*
- (f) maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment:*
- (g) any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources:*
- (i) the effects of climate change:*
- (j) the benefits to be derived from the use and development of renewable energy.*

Section 8 of the Act requires that all persons exercising functions and powers under the Act shall take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.

It is considered the proposed plan change and the associated provisions have been designed in a way that will result in sustainable management of natural and physical resources once implemented. This is because the development that will be facilitated by the implementation of the private plan change:

- Will give rise to substantial socioeconomic benefits, including the provision of much required housing supply for older people;
- Will offer much needed aged care facilities, including dementia care which is particularly under-represented in the South Wairarapa;
- Is supported by numerous members of the local community;
- Creates housing options that take advantage of the sun for the purposes of creating a pleasant living environment and maximising the opportunities of solar gain;
- Seeks to maximise the development opportunities of the site whilst creating an attractive residential environment;
- Will not put people or property at risk from known natural hazard or soil contamination;
- Provides a sustainable approach to the management of stormwater, which will have environmental and aesthetic benefits to the site;
- Seeks to maintain and enhance many of the natural qualities of the site within a retirement village context, including through the retention of many trees and native plants, innovative and sustainable use of stormwater to create a high-quality environment, and the provision of comprehensive planting;
- Will be satisfactorily serviced without conflicting with or overload infrastructure capacity;
- Is not in a flood hazard area;
- Has sought a resilient approach to the on-site handling of stormwater that seeks to capture stormwater as a resource for use on site;
- Will not adversely affect any significant natural or historic environmental values;
- Will provide high quality urban design outcomes that unites and complements the urban characteristics of Greytown;

- Will maintain amenity and environmental values to a high or reasonable level including rural and open space landscape characteristics when viewed from public spaces and rural open spaces.
- Is part of a strategic approach to the development of land that is well located to support a retirement village development.

These matters have been discussed in detail in the assessment above.

### 9.1.1 Summary of Part II Assessment

Overall, the private plan change is assessed to be consistent with Part II of the Act.

## References

Cox, M. and Groom, M. (2019). *The Orchards at Greytown: Economic Impact Assessment*. Wellington: BERL.

Grant, B. (n.d.). *Retirement Villages: An Alternative Form of Housing on an Ageing Landscape*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.

Hawkes, C. (2018). Massive growth for retirement villages, but they're not for everyone. *Stuff*. [online] Available at: <https://www.stuff.co.nz/life-style/homed/latest/104011047/massive-growth-for-retirement-villages-but-theyre-not-for-everyone> [Accessed 4 Mar. 2019].

Hinchey, Luke (2015). *Accommodating And Caring For An Ageing Population – A Bespoke Planning Solution For Retirement Villages*, Chapman Tripp.

Khawaja, M. and Thomson, N. (2000). *Population ageing in New Zealand*. [online] Statistics New Zealand. Available at: [http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse\\_for\\_stats/people\\_and\\_communities/older\\_people/pop-ageing-in-nz.aspx](http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/older_people/pop-ageing-in-nz.aspx) [Accessed 4 Mar. 2019].

Retirement Villages Association (2014). *Submission to the NZ Productivity Commission on Using Land for Housing*. [online] Available at: <https://www.productivity.govt.nz/sites/default/files/sub-using-land-for-housing-05-retirement-villages-association-93Kb.pdf> [Accessed 11 Feb. 2019].