

**UNDER**

the Resource Management Act  
1991 ("**RMA**")

**IN THE MATTER**

of the Proposed Waikato District  
Plan: Hearing 10 – Residential

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CAMERON WALLACE ON BEHALF OF  
KĀINGA ORA-HOMES AND COMMUNITIES**

**URBAN DESIGN**

**20 FEBRUARY 2020**

---

---

**ELLIS GOULD  
LAWYERS  
AUCKLAND**

**REF: Daniel Sadlier / Alex  
Devine**

**Level 17 Vero Centre  
48 Shortland Street, Auckland  
Tel: 09 307 2172 / Fax: 09 358  
5215  
PO Box 1509  
DX CP22003  
AUCKLAND**

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 My full name is Cameron Wallace. I am an Associate Urban Designer at Barker and Associates. I have been commissioned to provide urban design evidence on behalf of Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities (“**Kāinga Ora**”) relating to their submissions and further submissions on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (“**PDP**”). My qualifications and experience are set out in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.5 within my Evidence in Chief (“**EiC**”) dated 3 February 2020. The purpose of this statement is to summarise my EIC.
- 1.2 My EiC for Hearing 10 addresses various provisions relating to the Residential Zone for which Kāinga Ora made a number of detailed submission points.
- 1.3 The primary matter with which I disagree with the recommendations of the Council in the s42A as it relates to the residential zone is the rejection of a new Medium Density Residential Zone (“**MDRZ**”) within the PDP.

## 2. Summary of Evidence

- 2.1 From an urban design perspective, my EiC supports the overall strategic direction of the PDP as it relates to urban environments across the District. In particular, consolidation of existing towns, provision for a variety of housing forms, and encouraging higher density housing near commercial centres. However, as set out in my EiC, I am of the opinion that the detailed provisions of the Residential Zone will perpetuate a status quo approach to managing growth in a manner that is inconsistent with good urban design practice and the strategic direction of the PDP.

### ***Medium Density Residential Zone***

- 2.2 I address Kāinga Ora’s submissions relating to the introduction of a new MDRZ in section 3 of my EiC. Paragraph 3.2 of my EiC briefly highlights a range of urban design related benefits that can arise through the provision of more intensive forms of residential development. Paragraphs 3.6 – 3.13 of my EiC then provide a brief

assessment of what I believe are some of the practical design issues with the detailed provisions of the PDP as notified.

- 2.3 In summary, Council's approach as notified for the provision of a single residential zone is poorly aligned to higher order objective and policies and in urban design terms is inflexible and will not enable the development of more intensive forms of housing along with the associated benefits that these can help to deliver. Paragraphs 250-255 of Council's s42A report concurs with this assessment.
- 2.4 For these reasons I support the recommendation of the Reporting Planner that further work be directed to develop a suite of MDRZ provisions.

### ***Proposed Multi-Unit Development Standards***

- 2.5 I address Kāinga Ora's submissions on the various development standards it seeks to apply to multi-unit development within the MDRZ in section 4 of my EiC. I acknowledge that more intensive forms of living can give rise to adverse effects under the RMA such as visual dominance or reduced on / off site amenity.
- 2.6 In my opinion, potential adverse effects associated with more intense development can be appropriately avoided through the key development standards sought by Kāinga Ora. From my experience, similar provisions that have been adopted in other jurisdictions across New Zealand are producing positive urban design outcomes.

### ***Residential Zone Provisions***

- 2.7 I note that Council's Reporting Planner has recommended a number of changes to various development standards and activity statuses within the Residential Zone in response to Kāinga Ora's submissions. These include:
- (a) Enabling up to two dwellings as a permitted activity and removal of minimum site areas for minor dwellings;<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Waikato District Council Rebuttal Evidence sections 9 and 10.

- (b) Amendment to the daylight admission angle to 45 degrees<sup>2</sup>;
- (c) Various amendments to the conditions which must be met to enable multi-unit development (land-use activity and subdivision) as a restricted discretionary activity<sup>3</sup>; and
- (d) Notwithstanding my previously stated position on the reference to the Urban Design Guidelines, a more enabling policy approach to outdoor living courts as part of multi-unit development.<sup>4</sup>

2.8 From an urban design perspective, I consider these changes to be positive and more reflective of the strategic objectives of the PDP.

### **3. Conclusion**

3.1 Overall, it is my opinion that the notified provisions of the PDP are not the most appropriate or effective methods, in urban design terms, of achieving the higher order objectives of the PDP and the purpose of the RMA. The relief sought by Kāinga Ora, as well as the related changes I have discussed in my EiC are, in my opinion, more appropriate means for achieving strategic objectives of the PDP and the purpose of the RMA. I am happy to take any questions you may have.

**Cameron Wallace**  
**20/02/2020**

---

<sup>2</sup> Waikato District Council s42A report paragraph 130.

<sup>3</sup> Waikato District Council s42A report paragraph 255 and Rebuttal Evidence section 14.

<sup>4</sup> Waikato District Council Rebuttal Evidence section 4.