

**BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL
APPOINTED BY KAPITI COAST DISTRICT COUNCIL**

IN THE MATTER OF | I TE TAKE O the Resource Management Act 1991
AND | ME

IN THE MATTER OF | I TE TAKE O Proposed Plan Change 5 (Private):
100 and 110 Te Moana Road,
Waikanae, Kāpiti Coast District

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SUSAN OLIVIA JONES
ON BEHALF OF ERIC, VINCE AND RAECHEL OSBORNE**

Dated 21 September 2026

Introduction

1. My full name is Susan Olivia Jones.
2. I have prepared a Statement of Evidence regarding Private Plan Change 5 (**PC5**) to the Kāpiti Coast District Plan, in relation to Planning matters. My qualifications and experience along with my involvement in the PC5 request are as set out in that statement.
3. In my opinion, PC5 would give effect to all relevant national and regional policy instruments and be consistent with the relevant Regional Plan and Strategic Direction provisions of the District Plan. Further, Option 4 (preferred option, for rezoning both stages 1 and 2) would be the most appropriate (efficient and effective) option in terms of section 32 of the RMA.
4. With respect to many of the issues raised in submissions, the RFI and officer's report, it is important to understand that PC5 seeks a straight residential rezoning which will preserve the ability for all relevant effects resulting from the rezoning to be further tested at the site-specific level on future subdivision and development of the site. That future consent process will enable and require further detailed assessment of a range of effects including transportation, stormwater and flood management, infrastructure capacity, erosion and water quality issues, ecology, urban design and amenity, as well as adoption of the mitigation measures recommended in the technical reports submitted in support of PC5, and in the technical evidence now before the Panel.
5. Should PC5 be approved, a resource consent to subdivide and develop this site is likely to fall into the category of a Discretionary Activity under the District Plan as a result of a residual flow path overlay mapping (albeit that this mapping is now considerably out of date, as explained in Mr Martell's evidence). Under that activity status, KCDC would be able to consider any and all effects and can grant or decline the application. If granted, conditions of consent could be imposed.
6. Furthermore, regional consents are likely to be necessary from Greater Wellington Regional Council in relation to bulk earthworks and freshwater management.
7. I have also considered the recent amendments to, and new, national direction as relevant to PC5 in **Appendix 2** of my evidence. In relation to consistency with the amended provisions of the NPS-HPL (and in particular Policy 5) I defer to the legal submissions of Mr Williams. Similarly, I have completed an updated assessment against recent changes to the Regional Policy Statement provisions in **Appendix 3** to my evidence, noting that at the time the Plan

Change Request was lodged, Change 1 to the RPS was still subject to hearings and appeals.

8. For the avoidance of doubt, my opinion remains as stated above with reference to the assessment in Appendices 2 and 3 to my evidence, i.e. that PC5 would give effect to all relevant national and regional policy instruments, including as amended after the Plan Change Request was lodged.
9. There is a substantial degree of agreement between my opinion and that of Ms Pascall regarding PC5 as recorded in the s 42A report.
10. This has been confirmed after expert conferencing as recorded in the Planners' Joint Witness Statement.
11. Having now read the Addendum to s42A from Ms Pascall (dated 17 September 2026), I generally concur with the recommendations, as listed below:
 - a) The Development Area approach taken;
 - b) The intent of DEV4-P1(1) in relation to the northwestern boundary (noting that additional refinement could be useful to clarify and simplify this policy further and aid in its implementation);
 - c) The inclusion of DEV4-P1(3 to 5) in that these can effectively guide a Traffic Assessment at the time of resource consent;
 - d) The new wording of DEV4-R1;
 - e) The new wording of DEV4-R2;
 - f) The new wording of DEV4-R4 (noting that where reference is made to Rule GRZ-R43 this should now change to DEV4-R2);
 - g) The inclusion of DEV4-R5; and
 - h) The inclusion of a structure plan (referred to as the DEV4-Figure 1: 100 and 110 Te Moana Road Development Area Structure Plan) as appended to the s42A addendum.
12. I remain of the view that including a 10m planted buffer of ecological site K068 is not necessary as part of this Plan Change. If the Panel is of the view that this should be included, the approach provided by Ms Pascall through the inclusion of DEV4-P1(2) and the associated rules and structure plan would be the most appropriate way to achieve this.

Conclusions

13. Overall, I conclude that:
- a) PC5 appropriately seeks to rezone the entire site at 100 and 110 Te Moana Road for residential purposes;
 - b) The environmental effects of a future subdivision and development on this site can be appropriately addressed and mitigated through the resource consent stage under the existing and new Development Area provisions of the District Plan (alongside Regional Consents where required);
 - c) PC5 is generally consistent with all relevant statutory requirements; and
 - d) PC5 ultimately accords with the purpose of the RMA and the preferred option under the Plan Change request can be confirmed accordingly.

Susan Olivia Jones

21 September 2026