

Hearing 10: Residential Zone – Miffy Foley for WRC - Summary of Statement of Evidence

This is a summary of my statement of evidence for Hearing 10: Residential Zone, dated 3 February 2020.

Minimum setbacks from waterbodies for earthworks

1. WRC's submission point 81.3 requested that the Permitted Activity standards for all zones for earthworks be amended to provide for a minimum 5 metre distance from any waterbody or overland flow path.
2. This submission point has been rejected by Ms Allwood who suggests an alternative means of managing sediment loadings entering stormwater networks and waterbodies. Ms Allwood's amendment is supported in conjunction with the strengthening of the rule setbacks to waterbodies as outlined in my evidence for Hearing 2. I refer the Panel to that evidence dated 20 September 2019.

Location of multi-unit development close to public transport - Rule 16.1.3

3. WRC's submission point 81.149 requested an amendment to Rule 16.1.3 to include a new condition to require multi-unit development to be serviced by or within 400m walking distance of public transport. This was intended to encourage higher density residential to be located close to public transport to:
 - maximise potential patronage on those routes and minimise private car use;
 - improve the viability of public transport and reduce the need for future transport infrastructure development; and
 - reduce transport impacts on air quality and reduce carbon emissions.
4. This is supported by various regional planning documents including the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS), the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2045, and the Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan 2018-2028.
5. This submission point was rejected on the basis that 'the existing public transport infrastructure across Waikato District is currently limited and a 400m walking distance is not necessarily reflective of high-quality, frequent, public transport.' I appreciate Ms Allwood's point in this regard and acknowledge that public transport routes can be changed in response

to changes in urban density and form. I am also conscious that any increase in complexity and addition of barriers to achieving multi-unit development may be counter-productive.

6. As an alternative, to avoid making multi-unit development a discretionary activity, I suggest inserting an additional area of discretion into Rule 16.1.3 along the lines of:

The availability of alternative transport modes, particularly access to existing and planned public transport, and the ability of the development to reinforce existing and future investments on the public transport network.

Intensification close to the Business Town Centre Zone - Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision

7. WRC's submission point 81.151 requested that Rule 16.4.1 be amended to allow for more intensive subdivision in residential areas directly adjacent to the Business Town Centre Zone at Huntly, Ngāruawāhia, Pōkeno, Raglan, Te Kauwhata and Tuakau. This is supported by WRPS *Policy 6.1 Planned and co-ordinated subdivision, use and development, Policy 6.3 Co-ordinating growth and infrastructure, and 6A Development Principles* and the Waikato District's Draft Growth and Economic Development Strategy.
8. This submission point was rejected by Ms Allwood on the basis that the proposed Waikato District Plan Objective 4.2.16(b) and Policy 4.1.5(a) support and encourage higher density residential close to commercial centres.
9. I request that the Panel consider identifying the areas directly adjacent to the Business Town Centre Zone at Huntly, Ngāruawāhia, Pōkeno, Raglan, Te Kauwhata and Tuakau through a distance standard or via an overlay map, as an area to which subdivision is permitted to a minimum lot size of 350m². Suggested wording to amend Rule 16.4.1 is included in my evidence.
10. Alternatively, a new residential or mixed use zone that provides for more intensive residential development could be applied directly adjacent to the Business Town Centre Zone in these locations.

Other submission points

11. WRC made a number of other submission points in relation to the Residential Zone. I support a number of the recommendations made in the Section 42A Report – see Appendix One of my evidence.