

From: info@waipadc.govt.nz
Sent: Monday, 19 September 2022 8:49 pm
To: Policy Shared
Subject: External Sender: Waipā District Plan - Plan Change Submission Form 5 - Jason Uden

CYBER SECURITY WARNING: This email is from an external source - be careful of attachments and links. Please follow the Cybersecurity Policy and report suspicious emails to Servicedesk

Full name of submitter Jason Uden

Contact name (if different from above) Jason Uden

Email address [REDACTED]

Address for service [REDACTED]

Contact phone number [REDACTED]

This is a submission on the following proposed plan change to the Waipā District Plan

Plan Change 26

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? I could not

Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter that - (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition? I am not

Do you wish to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of your submission? I do

If others make a similar submission, will you consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing? Yes

Do you support the proposed change(s)? I support

The specific provisions of the plan change my submission relates to are (give details):

The ability to build up to 3-storeys high

My submission is

The Council should support the plan change for the following reasons:

The Council have greatly overstated the impacts of this legislation, specifically with regard to the impact on the Waipa townships. The Councils own future planning projects a moderate growth in population and the current planning accommodates these projections. The Council representatives have also said in a Webinar on August 22 that it was their belief that the plan change would not result in more affordable housing. It is highly unlikely there will be a substantial increase in medium density development unless there is a demand for it and that this demand may be driven by market participants seeking more affordable housing.

The suburb of Rotokauri North in Hamilton is an example of how putting all the medium density housing in one location creates an suburb that lacks economic diversity. The narrative of 'not in our back yard' that is repeated by home owners in established streets creates an 'us' and 'them' division. A recent study in the United States has shown that children of poorer economic backgrounds who grew up in neighborhoods with greater wealth were more likely to be in a higher earning career as an adult than their peers who didn't grow up in more affluent locations. Allowing some different building categories will give families the opportunities to live in established streets and can foster aspiration in children. The lifestyles that everyone within society lead is not homogenous. There will be market participants who seek the ability to leave in some of the options that medium density housing will offer, for instance, not everyone wants a lawn to maintain. These people are as entitled to live in an established location as anyone.

The Council made repeated comments about the new legislation not requiring developers to provide carparks with the direct implication being that we will have more cars parked on the street when the reality is that the Council already do

not require minimum off-street carparking as part of consent issued.

We cannot continue with urban sprawl eating into the productive farmland that surrounds Te Awamutu, Cambridge and Kihikihi and having the ability to provide medium density housing is a key tool to combat this.

The Council have overstated the impacts by saying we will lose the look and character of our towns. The streets with the most 'character' are largely the most desirable streets where land values will still be the biggest obstacle to development and there is little to no evidence that supports the argument that these streets will become the focus for developers. Developers will focus on areas where land is cheaper and these areas will typically have 1970's to 1990's fibrecement houses that can be found in most towns.

As the Councils own FAQ page states, the Council will still have the ability to require Resource Consent where the existing infrastructure is insufficient to handle new developments. The development cost of infrastructure for a one off build is likely to deter a developer.

The Councils webinar used a picture of a 'sausage house' from Auckland has an emotive way of painting a negative picture of medium density housing. The development at 531 Alexander Street in Te Awamutu is an example of how such housing can be a positive addition to our landscape.

Lastly, I own a home that is in a very pleasant street. We have mature trees, we have some very well presented homes and it is a great environment to bring up our children. It would be elitist to deny others the opportunity to enjoy living here just because we like our character. Society changes, it adapts, it becomes accommodating and as it does, it benefits us all.

I seek the following decision/s from Council

The adoption of Plan Change 26.

Attachments