



Future Proof Implementation Committee
c/o Ken Tremaine
Future Proof Implementation Advisor
1601/18 Beach Road
Auckland Central
AUCKLAND 1010

6 September 2012

The Chief Executive Officer
Matamata-Piako District Council
P O Box 256
TE AROHA 3342

Dear Sir

FUTURE PROOF IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 42 TO THE MATAMATA-PIAKO DISTRICT PLAN

This submission is lodged by the Future Proof Implementation Committee (FPIC) in **support** of *Proposed Plan Change 42 to the Matamata-Piako District Plan* (Plan Change 42).

The FPIC is the implementation arm of the Future Proof Growth Strategy (Future Proof, or Strategy). The FPIC includes representatives from the Hamilton City Council (HCC), the Waipa District Council (Waipa DC), the Waikato District Council (Waikato DC), the Waikato Regional Council (WRC) and tāngata whenua (Waikato-Tainui). The Matamata-Piako District Council is also involved as a contributor to the Strategy and its implementation.

The FPIC strongly supports the approach of Plan Change 42 in terms of controlling rural subdivision and also the references to the Future Proof Strategy within the Plan Change. The Plan Change is consistent with the Future Proof Strategy principle of protecting versatile and productive farmland through the provision of limited rural lifestyle development. The detailed matters of support are set out in our formal submissions attached to this letter.

The FPIC acknowledges that the Matamata-Piako District Council has notified Plan Change 42 in advance of decisions being released on the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement (Proposed RPS). The FPIC lodged submissions and presented a comprehensive set of evidence to the Proposed RPS, and some key provisions of the RPS have yet to be confirmed. FPIC encourages Matamata-Piako District Council to monitor decisions planned to be released on the Proposed RPS in October 2012, and ensure the Plan Change gives effect to those decisions.

The FPIC is willing to appear in support of its submission. If others make a similar submission, the FPIC would also be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at the submissions hearing.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink on a light yellow background. The signature reads "Ken Tremaine" in a cursive, flowing script. The first name "Ken" is written in a larger, more prominent style than the last name "Tremaine".

Ken Tremaine
Future Proof Implementation Advisor

General Comments

The Future Proof Partners commend Matamata-Piako District Council on Plan Change 42, which implements key aspects of the Future Proof Strategy, its key principles, and priority actions with regards to controlling rural subdivision, protecting productive land and high quality soils and consideration of the effects on infrastructure.

Consistency with Future Proof and the Proposed Regional Policy Statement

The FPIC supports the high degree of consistency with the Future Proof Strategy and other regionally significant policy documents, as outlined in section 4 of the Plan Change. In particular, the references to the Proposed RPS and the Future Proof Strategy are strongly supported.

The FPIC supports the references in Section 5 of the Plan Change to the proposed changes to the Waikato and Waipa District Plans. These are of relevance to Matamata-Piako District given the importance of achieving cross-boundary consistency in terms of approaches to development and growth management.

It is noted that the decisions version of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement (Proposed RPS) is due to be notified in October 2012. Any changes made to the Plan to reflect the Proposed RPS are supported.

Rural Residential Policies

The FPIC supports the increased level of control Council has placed over subdivision activities in the Rural Zone. The increased minimum lot size to subdivide on high quality soils will aid in the implementation of the Future Proof Settlement Pattern by restricting rural subdivision and thereby encouraging more development to occur within towns and villages.

Future Proof would like the Council to consider whether the minimum lot size for subdivision on low quality soils is appropriate. There may still be a need to maintain larger lots for production purposes and there may also still be adverse effects on the rural environment of allowing subdivision down to 2 ha on low quality soils.

Specific submission points for consideration are provided overleaf.

Specific Submission Points

Point	Proposed Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Submission Detail	Relief Sought
Section 2.4: Sustainable Management Strategy				
1	1. Residential Growth: Objective 1 and Policy 1	Support	FPIC supports the changes to objective 1 and policy 1 which introduce stronger wording in terms of avoiding inappropriate residential growth in the rural environment and ensuring consolidation of residential development within appropriate existing zones. This is consistent with Future Proof Strategy principles and the Future Proof Settlement Pattern.	Retain.
2	2. Controlling Activities: Objective 3 and Policy 3	Support	FPIC supports new objective 3 and policy 3 in this section which seek to ensure that activities do not establish in rural areas which would constrain existing rural activities. This is consistent with Future Proof Strategy approaches to limit reverse sensitivity effects in the rural environment and to also support the rural economy.	Retain.
Section 3.3.2: Land and Development				
3	1. Sustainable Activities: Objective 3 and Policy 2	Support	Future Proof supports new objective 3 and the changes to policy 2. These aim to prevent inappropriate fragmentation of rural land and to protect high quality soils by limiting opportunities for sub-division in the rural zone. This is consistent with Future Proof Strategy principles to protecting versatile and productive farmland.	Retain.

Point	Proposed Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Submission Detail	Relief Sought
Section 3.4.2: Subdivision				
4	Policies 2, 3,4 and 5	Support	Future Proof supports new policies 2, 3, 4 and 5 which provides for limited rural residential development where this does not reduce the ability of the land to be productive, encourages primary production, avoids sub-division around activities that do not have a need to be in the rural environment and encourages efficient and effective rural lots and uses. These policies are consistent with Future Proof Strategy themes, principles and key actions which seek to protect versatile and productive farmland, reduce reverse sensitivity effects and achieve a more compact urban form.	Retain.
Section 3.5.2: Amenity				
5	Design, Appearance and Character of the Built Environment: Policies 7 and 9	Support	<p>These policies are supported as they aim to avoid adverse effects on the environment from subdivision and encourage subdivision to occur predominantly in urban areas. In particular, Future Proof supports the recognition of cumulative effects in policy 7.</p> <p>These policies are consistent with the Future Proof Strategy, including the Future Proof Settlement Pattern which concentrates development around existing towns and villages.</p>	Retain.
Section 3.8.2: Transportation				
6	Policy 1	Support	Future Proof strongly supports the amendments to Policy 1 which recognises the potential impacts of subdivision on the transport network.	Retain.

Point	Proposed Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Submission Detail	Relief Sought
			The changes to this policy are consistent with Future Proof Strategy principles to protect existing and future infrastructure and transport corridors, ensure development is planned to support efficient transport infrastructure and recognising the need for stronger links between land-use and transport in respect of the settlement pattern.	
7	Policy 11	Support	Future Proof supports new Policy 11 which seeks to ensure that the roading network has the capacity to support new subdivision and development. This is consistent with the Future Proof Strategy principle which recognises the need for stronger links between land-use and transport in respect of the settlement pattern and to ensure capacity is matched with development potential.	Retain.
Section 6: Subdivision				
8	6.1.1 Activity Table	Support in Part.	<p>The amendment to the activity table to increase in minimum lot size to 40ha for rural zone areas with high quality soils is strongly supported. This is consistent with Future Proof Strategy principles and key actions. It is also consistent with the approaches taken in Waipa District through the Proposed Waipa District Plan and Waikato District through Proposed Plan Change 2. Having a level of consistency across boundaries is important from a growth management perspective.</p> <p>Future Proof would like the Council to consider whether a minimum lot size of 2 and 8 ha on low quality soils is sufficient to avoid the adverse effects of rural land fragmentation, including the impact on productive land and the effects on infrastructure and servicing.</p>	Retain the 40ha minimum lot size for areas with high quality soils in the rural zone. Consider increasing the 2 and 8 ha minimum lot sizes for areas with low quality soils in the rural zone.
9	6.3.1 Subdivision in the	Support	The matters of control set out in section 6.3.1 are supported. The	Retain.

Point	Proposed Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Submission Detail	Relief Sought
	Rural Zone (matters of control)		matters relating to reverse sensitivity, transportation and servicing are particularly important. These are consistent with Future Proof principles in relation to integrating land use and infrastructure.	
10	6.4.1 Subdivision in the Rural Zone (matters of discretion)	Support	The matters of discretion set out in section 6.4.1 are supported. The matters relating to reverse sensitivity, traffic and access, and servicing are particularly important. These are consistent with Future Proof principles in relation to integrating land use and infrastructure.	Retain.