



## STAFF REPORT

**TO:** Environment & Planning Committee

**FROM:** Rose Biss, Policy Planner

**REFERENCE:** L314

**SUBJECT:** **FEEDBACK ON AND REVIEW OF DRAFT MAPUA STRUCTURE PLAN – REPORT EP08/06/04 – Report prepared for 25 June 2008 Meeting**

---

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The Council approved the release of the draft Mapua Structure Plan for consultation at its meeting on 4 March 2008. Since then the following consultation has been undertaken. I attended a meeting of Tiakina Te Taiao on 1 April. An open day and display was organised for Friday, 4 April at the Mapua Bowling Club. Planning and Engineering staff attended a meeting of the Mapua and Districts Community Association on 14 April. The plan and background report were also placed on the Council's website.

### 2. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

An estimated 90 persons attended the open day and there were approximately 30 persons at the Community Association meeting. A wet night may have reduced attendance at the latter.

Thirty eight written responses have been received, four of which are from community groups.

Most of the responses have come from Mapua residents with a smaller number from Ruby Bay and Seaton Valley Road and from other parts of New Zealand. Direct quotes from responses used in this report are indicated in italics. Staff comment is given in a text box.

### 3. RESPONSE THEMES

There are ten main response themes. Each response has been allocated under the following main themes:

1. Vision for Mapua / Ruby Bay
2. Boundary and scope of structure plan
3. Character
4. Movement Networks
5. Productive Land

6. Open Space /Walkways
7. Coastal Protection
8. Deferments
9. Services
10. Commercial/Industrial / Business

### 3.1 Vision / Principles

While there is strong support for the principles expressed in the structure plan, especially growth within specified limits there are comments that more effort is needed to match the plan with the principles. One response does not support expanding the urban area at all. Another response considers the vision and values behind the structure plan are unclear. The Mapua and Districts Community Association (MDCA) seeks a more comprehensive and holistic plan and community visioning. Other responses seek to avoid urban sprawl taking up productive land and suggest that an increased density of housing on selected sites (such as the ex FCC site) could be part of the vision.

There is support to retain two separate commercial nodes for the Mapua wharf and the Mapua village although some in the Business Association would like to see more linkage of the two areas.

An urban design view is that the Coastal Highway corridor should be identified and protected to retain rural character. Intersections such as the school corner could also be identified for design attention.

**Comment:** The visioning that has been occurring at Mapua has been done in a protracted way and some more recent residents may be unaware of earlier processes. The principles for Mapua and Ruby Bay have been clearly expressed since 2004 with the circulation of the Mapua-Ruby Bay Development Study (attachment 1). The values embodied in the structure plan were derived from the descriptions included in that earlier study.

However it is agreed that other matters such as increased density of housing on selected sites could be added to the vision as they were not included in 2004. There are some limited sites in central Mapua where intensification may be appropriate. It would be useful to show these on the structure plan and include a statement in the vision. The Council itself could take up a unique opportunity to carry out a sustainable housing project on land it owns at Mapua.

The school/ hotel corner could be identified as an area requiring specific design as an entry point or gateway to Mapua.

The appropriate location for further commercial development is discussed in section 3.11.

### 3.2 Boundary and Scope of Structure Plan

The draft structure plan presented to the public extends from Brabant Drive in the north to the north side of the Bronte Road peninsula in the south.

The boundary of the structure plan is queried by several respondents including the MDCA. *“Mapua serves a much larger area than that defined in the study”*. Another response supports the “structure plan” concept of planning ahead for community infrastructure but opposes rezoning before infrastructure is in place. There is also a request to show “hard” and “soft” infrastructure separately on the maps.

While there is support for extension of future rural residential development on to the slopes south of Pomona Road (apart from one dissenting view) there is widespread dissatisfaction with spreading residential development west across the Coastal Highway on to the hillslopes on the western side of Seaton Valley Road.

The owners of coastal land south of Higgs Road oppose future urban development of their land and wish to retain it as a lifestyle block and enhance the indigenous forest remnants on it.

**Comment:** The boundary of the structure plan released in April 2008 was reduced in extent from that included in the Mapua Ruby Bay Development Study 2004. The Mapua Rural Residential Zone was not included because no change is proposed to that zone. However respondents have made a valid point that the boundary should be widened to acknowledge the different needs and requirements of the greater Mapua/ Ruby Bay area and incorporate this rural residential location. The Ruby Bay Bypass would make a suitable boundary to the west. The Rural 3 Zone area is too extensive for its impacts to be solely on Mapua but it is acknowledged that it will have some impact. It is not proposed to include it in the structure plan but it is relevant to include the Mapua Rural Residential Zone (2 hectare minimum lot size) because of its close proximity to Mapua. Residents of the Mapua Rural Residential zone consider themselves to be Mapua residents.

Hard and soft infrastructures have not been separately mapped. Existing pipework for stormwater, wastewater and water is marked on the structure plan in solid green, red and blue lines with future routes shown with dashed lines. Indicative roads are shown as dashed grey lines.

Soft infrastructure such as the school is shown as a designated site on the structure plan. Growth will bring about additional needs and there is a local perception that the school’s growth may be greater than that anticipated by the Ministry of Education. However that is a matter that should be resolved by the Ministry.

The inclusion of areas south of Nile and Apple Valley roads in the structure plan solely to show indicative esplanade strips is probably unnecessary at this stage. Deletion is recommended.

### 3.3 Character

There are many comments on the character of Mapua. There is support for reinforcing the village character by having containment and having a centre for Mapua as well as keeping separation between Mapua and Ruby Bay. Ensuring separation of development from the water's edge and taking care on ridgelines is raised in another response.

There are several responses seeking that productive landscapes are kept - as part of Mapua's character is rural outlook. The Community Association response summarises the desirable characteristics of Mapua/ Ruby Bay as *"knowing your neighbours, being safe, (being) accessible to the coast, estuary, cafes and crafts and tourism."* Another response defines Mapua character as *"plenty of open space and a lack of high rise development."*

While high rise development is unwanted there is some support for intensification within 400 metres of the village centre (ie within walkable distance). Another response suggests intensification will only work if it is in small pockets. These latter responses reflect a growing interest in the form of our towns as energy costs increase and the population ages.

Another response notes the importance of avoiding strip development along the Coastal Highway and concludes the Bypass offers the chance to develop the Coastal Highway as a scenic route and recommends that more open space is retained along this route. The same response also highlights the important role of the Leisure Park and McKee Domain for open space and as contributors to the local economy.

Retention of historic buildings relating to the apple industry is also described in some responses as part of the "Mapua character."

**Comment:** The current draft structure plan allows for a coalescing of Mapua and Ruby Bay - at least along the Coastal Highway route. More attention to containing the extent of business development shown on the plan along the Coastal Highway would help define Mapua from Ruby Bay.

The Coastal Environment Area (CEA) rules require wider setbacks along the coast. It is intended to continue to require wider coastal setbacks for dwellings in the Rural 1 and 2 Zones (minimum setback distance 100 metres) and minimum setback distance 30 metres in the residential zone. The Coastal Hazard Area on the active Ruby Bay coastline also requires buildings to be set back at least 25 metres inland of the CHA. Where the CEA and CHA both apply – as occurs on some seafront properties - the most stringent of the two setback applies.

Some productive land will be removed from production by the structure plan proposals. However other productive land will be retained in the coastal buffer areas to the north east and west of Mapua and on the Seaton Valley flats.

### 3.4 Movement Networks

The most frequently commented on matter relating to movement networks is the need to upgrade the safety of and enhance the amenity of Aranui Road.

Ease of access to the Mapua wharf and the water's edge and parking at Aranui Road / Tahi Street also feature in several comments. Some responses also express unease at the amount of carparking shown on the proposed waterfront park land.

While the Community Association wishes the Council to consider the implications on local roading of the Coastal highway being superseded by the Ruby Bay Bypass others want the upgrading of Pomona Road and Seaton Valley Road deferred.

There is support for ensuring new streets are well connected in to the existing network. Also strong support is shown for the indicative walkways and cycleways network that will enhance walkability and cycling to key public places and reduce car trips and promote healthy lifestyles. The Seaton Valley Stream upgrade project is praised as a good example of the latter. Another refers to the need for adequate funding for early construction of the walkway network.

Rough Island is suggested as an alternative location for a boat ramp to reduce congestion at the Mapua ramps.

Another response describes Stafford Drive footpaths as needing an upgrade.

On a more detailed note there are several supporting responses to extend pedestrian access around the channel side of the Mapua wharf.

**Comments:** The Mapua Village Upgrade Concept Plan for part of Aranui Road is not in the 2006 LTCCP. As the structure plan moves to the next stage it would be appropriate for the Council to include the Upgrade Concept Plan in the 2009 LTCCP. The extension of the Mapua wharf to allow continuous pedestrian access should also be included in the 2009 LTCCP.

Carparking for visitors is an integral part of planning for the new waterfront park. However sensitive design will be needed to ensure it does not become a dominant feature of the new park.

The roading studies for the Rural 3 zone and the changed traffic patterns likely to result from the Ruby Bay Bypass indicate that Pomona Road and Seaton Valley Road will both need to be upgraded. Higgs Road is also likely to need upgrading.

### 3.5 Productive Land

There are several sub-themes raised about using productive land for future urban development in Mapua.

Several responses oppose the rezoning of productive land to accommodate growth when that land generates employment opportunities for the local area. Others seek mechanisms to defer rating of farmland where it has been identified for future urban purposes.

Other responses are concerned to ensure there are buffers created between farmland and residential areas. One response from Seaton Valley Road has noted that the current buffer setback from orchards rule does not address the situation where an orchard is in a rural residential zone. Currently no special setback is required if there is an existing orchard in a rural residential zone and a new adjoining residential zone is proposed.

There is a request that Council recognises the significant opportunity cost of rezoning farmland in terms of the loss of jobs and food resources. Another response notes that productive land is a current and future asset that is a finite resource to be managed and retained in viable quantities.

**Comment:** Some productive land will be used to accommodate future growth of Mapua. The Council should consider whether it wishes to defer rating on such land.

However there will be some rural land retained on the coastal plain to the north east and on the coastal strip to the west as well as the flats of the lower Seaton Valley.

It would be helpful to have a short report on the impact on productive values foregone in urbanising part of the Mapua hinterland as proposed in the draft structure plan.

An option may be to reduce the amount of land proposed to be zoned deferred Residential on the northwestern side of the Coastal Highway. This would give the existing Lynch orchard in the Rural Residential Zone protection from reverse sensitivity effects.

### 3.6 Open Space / Walkways /Wetlands

Several responses ask the Council to consider purchasing more land for playing fields on the flat land between Seaton Valley Road and Stafford Drive. There is also a request that the Mapua Leisure Park site should be purchased. Another response states that too much land in existing Mapua reserves is given over to access and carparking – Grossi Point is cited as an example.

There are some specific properties where the landowner does not want the walkway shown on his / her property (e.g. the Darling property and the Lynch property and at 142 and 154 Stafford Drive but generally there is support for the walking circuits linking the estuary with other public spaces as shown on the plan. There is also support for Open Space zoning on the Mapua wetland. The Mapua and Districts Walkways Group favour the proposed Seaton Valley stream walkway as the core of the Mapua village network. The group's preference is for offroad rather than on-road pathways.

A Higgs Road landowner asks that new reserves created in new development area such as between Higgs Road and Aranui Road are not too small and isolated. Another view asks for more pocket parks.

Other areas where walkways are requested are along the west side of Grossi Point peninsula and in association with a wide cycleway linking the school to the east side of the main village. This walkway is identified by the Mapua Walkways group as the core part of the Mapua village network. The Group has also asked that rural walkways be wider than urban walkways to reflect the different type of usage.

Wetlands south of the newly restored Mapua wetland should not be developed - in the view of an adjoining landowner.

There is a request for viewpoints shown on the Mapua Ruby Bay Development Study 2004 to be incorporated in the Structure Plan. At a more detailed level a Mapua Domain and Hall upgrade are sought. More seating on and planting of walkways is also requested.

Some Ruby Bay residents have queried how the Council will acquire reserves along the Ruby Bay foreshore where land is already developed. There is a concern about overlooking and privacy if access is allowed along the top of the many private coastal protection structures.

**Comment:** The Council is considering its future open space needs in Mapua Ruby Bay including the need for further playing fields. The Seaton Valley flat is a possible area and negotiations are continuing in that area.

It is unlikely the Council will ever purchase the Mapua Leisure Park as the land has become too highly valued.

The comments on the size of reserves in the structure plan in the area between Higgs Road and Aranui Road have been considered by the Community Services Department. It is noted that the new Engineering Standards (effective 1 July 2008) now require open space reserves to have a minimum area of at least 2500 m<sup>2</sup>.

As the Ruby Bay residential area is proposed to be closed for subdivision, on coastal hazard grounds, the Council will not be able to acquire an esplanade strip or reserve by the subdivision process. The Council needs to consider whether it is prepared to purchase a strip of land for all tide access or whether it will retain the status quo low tide access.

There is an alternative to the walkway on the Darling property using Korepo Road and the existing walkway near the Mapua Store. The walkway on the Lynch property provides a direct route from Dawson Road to Ruby Bay.

### 3.7 Coastal Hazard Risk Protection

Quite strong views are expressed on how the Council should manage coastal protection at Mapua Ruby Bay. These range from not allowing any new dwellings and subdivision on the low lying land between the coast and the Coastal Highway and Aranui Road, and allowing nature to take its course, to supporting the Residential Closed Zone at Ruby Bay and a request for Council to get on and complete the entire length of the Old Mill Walkway protection structure.

Some responses consider the future business zone should be located on higher ground.

There is some dissatisfaction with “*the growing number of ugly walls and arbitrary rating system*”. Rock material dislodged from some walls in storm events is impeding low tide access. Another view is that the preservation of the Old Mill Walkway is paramount and time is running out to achieve that.

One response opposes the Mapua Leisure Park having any tourist development zoning on it when there is a risk of inundation and coastal erosion.

**Comment:** The Council has committed to hard edge coastal protection along the Mapua Ruby Bay foreshore for the last 10 years and has allowed adjoining owners to do likewise. It would be extremely difficult to now reverse that position and allow nature to take its course. With sea level rise as a consequence of global warming the existing walls will need ongoing top up maintenance.

It is unwise to allow any further dwellings and subdivision in the area as inundation and coastal erosion will continue to be a risk along the Mapua Ruby Bay foreshore. The Council’s TRMP has insufficient controls on coastal protection structures at present and provisions need to be strengthened. We await confirmation of ground levels to support an expansion of the CHA.

### 3.8 Deferment of Zoning

There are two opposing views on the deferment of residential zoning on the north side of the Coastal Highway. The major landowner’s view is that there should be no extension of the deferment beyond the period that is required to get services available at the site. The landowner considers a 20 year deferment is unreasonable in view of agreement between the landowner and the Council and seeks provision for the deferral only in respect of the services matter.

The other view expressed by some Mapua residents is that deferment of growth areas across the Coastal Highway is inappropriate now or in twenty years time. The Coastal Highway is seen as an appropriate boundary.

**Comment:** The landowners are correct in that the Council entered into an agreement to zone their land residential subject to services becoming available. However the rate of development has slowed at Mapua and despite the landowners view it would be undesirable to leap the highway at an early stage. The agreement binds us to deferral only in respect of services. If there is to be a timeframe specified, then this could be considered as an option post-notification (decisions on submissions).

### 3.9 Stormwater

Stormwater is referred to in several responses. One urges the Council to commit to minimising and managing stormwater runoff at Mapua Ruby Bay. Another strongly supports the work the Council is doing to improve drainage and amenity value of the Seaton Valley Stream and Mapua Inlet.

Several responses from Ruby Bay residents support the proposed upgrade of stormwater outfalls in that area.



**Comment:** The Council is considering introducing provisions that will require on site retention of stormwater.

Stormwater pipe upgrades at Ruby Bay are included in the current LTCCP.

### 3.10 Water

There are also several responses about water supply. One view is that the Council should be requiring water storage on individual properties. There is also the view that reticulated water supply should be required to all new urban development at Mapua with use of local ground water not permitted.

**Comment:** The Council has been considering a proposal to require on site storage of stormwater which would have the joint benefits of slowing stormwater runoff and providing some additional water supply to supplement the existing Council reticulated supply which is at capacity over the summer months.

It is important that all deferred development areas include recognition that water, as well as stormwater and wastewater, is a constraint. The current reason in the TRMP for deferment at Mapua, which is stormwater only, is inadequate.

### 3.11 Commercial

There are various views on how the future commercial area should be laid out. While the Business Association asks for consideration of linkage of the village centre and the wharf along the east side of Aranui Road with retail development an urban design viewpoint is that the structure of two separate nodes for the village centre and the wharf area should be retained. Toru Street is not favoured for further commercial development by MDBA. Another response suggests that existing zoning and what is proposed should be more clearly identified. It is suggested the medical centre could be relocated to the underutilised part of the Mall. A further suggestion is to relocate the tennis courts towards the Bowling Club and extend the Commercial zone to the northwest.

The owner of land on the west side of Aranui Road near the intersection with Higgs Road opposite the current village centre favours that land as a possible extension to the Commercial zone.

There is a view that it is premature to identify specific boundaries for commercial development on the ex FCC site. Another view is that there should be no commercial space on the eastern side of Tahi Street. One response also seeks less commercial on the western side of Tahi Street.

A small extension of the existing commercial zone at Ruby Bay is sought.

Clarification is sought on the difference between "Commercial" and "Business." The owner of land north of Warren Place Industrial Zone seeks more emphasis on commercial rather than industrial development and suggests commercial on the road frontage with industrial behind.

**Comment:** To begin with the last first the difference between “commercial” and “business” is primarily in scale and density of development. Commercial activity is defined in the TRMP as:

*“ the use of land and buildings for the display, offering, provision, sale or hire of goods, equipment or services, and includes shops, markets, showrooms, restaurants, takeaway food bars, commercial, professional and administrative offices, service stations, motor vehicle sales, tourist accommodation, the sale of liquor and associated parking areas; but excludes recreational and community activities and home occupations.”*

“Business” is not defined in the TRMP but is likely to include trade related supply outlets, light industries and large format retail.

Separation of the wharf commercial area from the village centre which caters for day to day shopping needs is preferred to coalescing the two areas eastwards along Aranui Road. The latter has the potential to generate adverse cross boundary effects with residential neighbours. A high standard of pedestrian access between the two areas is desirable.

The statement about “prematurity” of commercial zoning on the ex FCC site is unfounded given that the urban design exercise undertaken in 2002 indicated some commercial development on the eastern side of Tahi Street was to be encouraged.

Further commercial zoning to extend the Ruby Bay commercial zone is not recommended because of its location between the road and sea.

A further reduction in the amount of future commercial zoning in Toru Street is recommended. Demand projections indicate a need for extra commercial zoning, the Toru Street location adjoins the current commercial zone the option exists to reduce the depth of new zoning to reduce the impact of existing residential amenity.

### 3.12 Business

While there is some support to extend the business zone immediately north of Warren Place (with smaller lot sizes than in the Richmond Business Zone), there is little support for extending the business development area north across Seaton Valley Stream towards Ruby Bay. One of the existing industrial owners suggests extending east over the Seaton Valley Stream towards the coast and at a later stage extending in to lower land west across the Coastal Highway.

**Comment:** There is general support to extend the business zone immediately north of the current light industrial zone but not to extend it across the stream north to the proposed Ruby Bay Residential Closed Zone boundary. Because the Rural Residential zone has been enlarged more houses will overlook the Business zone north of Seaton Valley Stream. Part of the land is subject to inundation and would have to be built up to be used for business. There are no reasonable alternatives for business space in the Mapua – Ruby Bay area. The decision therefore is to remove the proposed Business Zone north of the stream for amenity or hazard reasons or retain it. Extension eastwards across the Seaton Valley stream or across the Coastal Highway is not supported for amenity and hazard reasons.

#### 4. TIMETABLE

The time line for the TRMP change needed to implement structure plan needs to be adjusted to take account of the Council's recent decision to make the TRMP operative by October 2008 and not to proceed with any more Variations other than the Moutere Water Variation between now and October.

#### 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

##### 5.1 it is recommended the Committee:

1. **Agree to amend** the structure plan (copy attached) by:
  1. Including the Mapua Rural Residential Zone (2 hectare minimum lot size) and excluding the Bronte and Apple Valley Road peninsula areas.
  2. Deleting the future business zone located north of Seaton Valley Stream.
  3. Deleting the indicative walkway on Darling property.
  4. Adding viewpoints at Mapua wharf, Grossi Point, high points on Crusader Drive and top of Seaton Valley Road.
  5. Deleting the indicative esplanade strip from draft Ruby Bay Residential Closed Zone.
  6. Deleting structure plan outer growth boundary from Freilich property and show as future residential.
  7. Adding provision for compact density residential development on Council land west of Tahi Street presently shown as future residential.
  8. Reducing the extent of future commercial in Toru Street.
2. **Agree** that the amended structure plan be used as a basis for preparing a draft change to the TRMP.
3. **Note that** the related infrastructure projects will need to be included in the relevant asset management plans and the LTCCP including for reserves, Aranui Road streetscaping and the Mapua Wharf

Rose Biss  
**Policy Planner**

## PRINCIPLES FOR MAPUA DEVELOPMENT

1. The character of Mapua will be maintained and enhanced by accommodating growth within specified limits and managed in a way that retains the village scale and identity.
2. Any further growth in the Ruby Bay area will be accommodated on the hillslopes above the Bay, within limits, to retain a transition between urban and rural landscapes, and to avoid exacerbating the risks from coastal erosion / inundation.
3. Mapua wharf will be retained as a vibrant and active waterfront visitor destination incorporating the eastern part of the ex Fruitgrowers Chemical site to provide for a limited expansion of visitor attractions in a manner that complements the low key maritime atmosphere and allows for further public access to the foreshore.
4. The existing Mapua village will be developed and enhanced as the centre of retail and community facilities and services.
5. Further building development within those parts of the coastal margins and cliffs which are at risk from erosion will be avoided, while development in areas at risk from inundation / flooding will be controlled.
6. A network of open spaces and accesses will be developed through and around Mapua and Ruby Bay to facilitate alternative connections between places including a walkway network) as well as to maintain the quality open space and natural character.
7. The edges of the Waimea Inlet will be retained to act as a buffer between surrounding land uses and the ecological resource.
8. Generally, industrial development will be encouraged to locate outside the township.
9. To minimise stormwater runoff through catchment wide management.
10. To provide water and wastewater services to an adequate standard throughout the urban and rural residential area.

