

**BEFORE THE WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL INDEPENDENT HEARING
COMMISSIONERS**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991
("RMA" or "the Act")

AND

IN THE MATTER of submissions and further
submissions in respect of the
Proposed Waikato District Plan

AND

IN THE MATTER of Ohinewai Rezoning: Hearing Topic
19

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF KENNETH JOHN TREMAINE

**On behalf of the
Future Proof Implementation Committee**

1. INTRODUCTION

A. Qualifications and Experience

- 1.1 My full name is Kenneth John Tremaine. I am the director of Ken Tremaine Consulting Limited, which I founded in Auckland in 2000. Prior to this time I was the Director of the Local Government and Resource Management Unit of KPMG Management Consulting (Auckland) from 1993 to 2000. Before then I was Director of Planning at Palmerston North City Council from 1976 to 1993.
- 1.2 My academic qualifications include a Bachelor of Arts and a Postgraduate Diploma (Credit) in Urban Geography and Political Science from the University of Otago, and a Masters of Town Planning from the University of Auckland. I am also a full member of the Royal Town Planning Institute (United Kingdom), the New Zealand Planning Institute, and the Resource Management Law Association of New Zealand.
- 1.3 I have more than 40 years of professional experience in senior roles in local government, central government, and the private sector, spanning the following areas:
- Planning and resource management, including the development and implementation of regional policy statements and plans, and district/city plans under the Resource Management Act 1991 (“RMA 1991” or “the Act”);
 - Spatial planning and growth management, including the integration of land use¹, infrastructure, transportation, and funding under the RMA 1991, the Local Government Act 2002 (“LGA 2002”), and the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (“LTMA 2003”); and
 - Central Government policy, and statutory and regulatory reform.
- 1.4 I was the sole representative of the planning profession appointed to the Upton Review Group in 1990 which completed the drafting of the RMA 1991 in its final form. I have continued to be involved in Central Government policy and regulatory development since that time.

¹ I will use the term “land use” as an equivalent to the RMA 1991 term “activity”.

- 1.5 I have extensive experience in growth management strategy development and implementation at the regional and district levels, particularly through regional policy statements and district plans. My growth management experience includes:
- The *Future Proof Strategy* in the Future Proof sub-region (being the territorial administrative areas of Hamilton City, Waikato District and Waipa District);
 - The *SmartGrowth Strategy* in the western Bay of Plenty sub-region (being the territorial administrative areas of Tauranga City and the Western Bay of Plenty District);
 - The *Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy* for the Greater Christchurch sub-region (being the territorial administrative areas of Christchurch City, Waimakariri District and Selwyn District);
 - *Taupo District 2050* - the growth strategy for Taupo District;
 - *Sustainable Futures 30/50* – the growth strategy for Whangarei District;
 - *Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy* – the growth strategy for Napier City, Hastings District and Hawke’s Bay Regional Council.
- 1.6 Since 2015 I have also been a project advisor to the Waikato Plan project. This is a comprehensive spatial plan and strategic direction document for the whole of the Waikato region.
- 1.7 Recently, and as part of my Future Proof role, I have also been closely involved with the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan and associated workstreams.

B. Waikato Region and Waikato District Experience

- 1.8 Currently I hold the position of Implementation Advisor for the Future Proof Strategy ("Future Proof" or "Strategy"). The Future Proof sub-region is an area with ongoing population growth as well as significant levels of development. The Strategy was developed by Hamilton City Council, Waikato District Council, Waipa District Council, the Waikato Regional Council, tāngata whenua and the New Zealand Transport Agency ("NZ Transport Agency"). The Strategy was completed in the broad context of the LGA 2002 to look at how the Future Proof sub-region should develop sustainably into the future.
- 1.9 I have been a project and implementation advisor to the Future Proof project since its inception in 2007. I have been responsible for overseeing the Strategy’s

research, drafting, hearings / adoption, implementation and update phases. Future Proof undertook a phase 1 update to the Strategy in 2017 which was adopted by all of the partners. We are currently undertaking a phase 2 update in order to ensure we meet the requirements of the National Policy Statements, in particular the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (“NPS-UD”) and that we incorporate the findings and outcomes of the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor project.

1.10 The Future Proof Implementation Committee (“FPIC”) prepared a further submission on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (“PDP”) in relation to the Ohinewai rezoning requests. The FPIC is a joint committee under Clause 30A of Schedule 7 of the LGA 2002 and is tasked with implementing Future Proof. My evidence will reiterate the FPIC’s further submission points as they relate to the Ohinewai rezoning.

1.11 I have read the Council’s Section 42A Report dated 13 March 2020.

1.12 I took part in the Strategic Planning and Plan Drafting expert conferencing on 25 and 26 June 2020. As a result of that conferencing a Joint Witness Statement of Experts in Relation to Planning² has been produced.

1.13 Given my experience, I have a comprehensive working knowledge of developing and implementing district plans under the RMA 1991. Furthermore, having been involved in the sub-region on a number of issues associated with Future Proof implementation, I also have considerable knowledge of:

- a) Growth issues facing the Future Proof sub-region;
- b) The Future Proof Strategy that sits alongside the Waikato District Council’s policy framework;
- c) The context for the Waikato PDP; and
- d) The role of other key documents, including the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (“RPS”).

1.14 My statement will cover:

² Dated 2 July 2020

- a) The Future Proof Strategy;
- b) The Waikato Regional Policy Statement;
- c) Future Proof's position on the Ohinewai rezoning requests;
- d) Relevant planning matters;
- e) Alignment with the RPS and Future Proof;
- f) Impact on Huntly;
- g) Infrastructure;
- h) Future Proof further submission;
- i) The Section 42A Report; and
- j) Conclusions

Code of Conduct

1.15 I confirm that I have read and am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note (2014) and I agree to comply with it. In that regard I confirm that this statement is written within my expertise, except where otherwise stated, and that I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

2. THE FUTURE PROOF STRATEGY

2.1 The original 2009 Future Proof Strategy was reviewed and updated in 2017. Full public consultation on the updated document occurred using the Special Consultative Procedure of the Local Government Act 2002. The 2017 Strategy updates the Future Proof settlement pattern and includes the areas in the north (Tuakau and Pokeno) that were brought into the Waikato District as part of the Auckland boundary change. This 2017 update represents Phase 1. The revised document has not altered the fundamental principles of the Future Proof Strategy or the overall approach to the settlement pattern.

2.2 A Phase 2 update to the Future Proof Strategy was initiated in 2018 with the aim of addressing the NPS on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) and the Government's Urban Growth Agenda, including the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan. A draft document was completed in December 2018 and submitted to the Ministry for the Environment to meet our obligations, including the requirement to

prepare a Future Development Strategy, under the NPS-UDC. Phase 2 was then put on hold to allow various other processes to further progress. For example, key initiatives under the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan including the Hamilton-Waikato Metro Spatial Plan.

2.3 The Phase 2 update is about to recommence with the aim of completing a draft Strategy by the end of 2020.

2.4 The relevant Strategy for the purposes of this hearing is the adopted 2017 Future Proof document.

2.5 The Future Proof Strategy is focussed on:

- Long term vision and guiding principles
- Growth forecasts for the sub-region
- Identifying a settlement pattern for the sub-region, including distribution and timing of growth in settlements and rural areas
- Identifying strategic infrastructure needs along with timing for growth areas
- Implementation, and in particular a programme of priority actions
- Taking a responsive and adaptable approach through monitoring and review

2.6 Future Proof has been developed within the broad context of the LGA 2002 and it takes a strategic, integrated approach to long term planning and growth management. The Strategy identifies 30-year land supply needs³ in the sub-region and sequences its release and development according to its ability to be serviced by appropriate infrastructure and equitable funding.

2.7 Future Proof seeks to provide a consistent knowledge base and vision for its partner councils and other agencies in order to plan for, and sustainably manage growth in an integrated manner. Therefore, the Strategy's operational and implementation processes have been designed to be consistent with the three major planning statutes relevant to local government being the RMA 1991, LGA 2002 and the LTMA 2003. This approach supports the Future Proof partner councils of the Waikato Regional Council, Hamilton City Council, Waipa District

³ *Future Proof Strategy*, 2017, pages 35-37.

Council and Waikato District Council, in achieving their compliance obligations across all three planning statutes during Strategy implementation.

- 2.8 The strategic approach underpinning Future Proof is a blend of compact settlement and concentrated growth. The Strategy supports a fundamental shift in growth management from focusing largely on accommodating low-density suburban residential development to supporting a more compact urban form. The majority of growth is to be concentrated in Hamilton City and the main townships of Waipa and Waikato Districts. This is the basis for the sub-regional settlement pattern contained in Future Proof⁴. An anchored land use or settlement pattern allows the costs of growth to be identified early which can deliver a more cost-effective form of infrastructure. It also provides land use certainty to the community, developers, local government and central government.
- 2.9 It is important to also point out that the Future Proof settlement pattern was mandated by the sub-regional community. The strategic options for land use were publicly consulted on as was the draft Strategy. The scenarios were also evaluated through a set of criteria derived from the Future Proof Strategy vision. The preferred settlement pattern scenario which forms the basis of the Future Proof Strategy was selected on the basis of the public feedback and the evaluation results.
- 2.10 The sub-regional settlement pattern is the cornerstone of the Future Proof Strategy⁵ and is a key part of the integrated approach to land use, infrastructure and funding.
- 2.11 The Future Proof settlement pattern is also crucial to achieving the sustainable management of growth for the sub-region and the wider region as anticipated by Part 2 of the RMA 1991, in particular section 5(2) of the Act to manage “*the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety...*”

⁴ *Future Proof Strategy*, 2017, pages 26-37. Detailed settlement pattern tables are contained in Appendix 1 of the Strategy.

⁵ *Future Proof Strategy*, 2017, page 26.

- 2.12 The Waikato PDP helps to give statutory effect to the Future Proof sub-regional settlement pattern through its objectives, policies and rules.

3. WAIKATO REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT

- 3.1 The Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement was made operative on 20 May 2016.
- 3.2 The RPS, particularly in Chapters 6 to 6D on the Built Environment, implements a Future Proof priority action to develop and notify a proposed change to the Waikato RPS. The aim was to anchor the Future Proof sub-regional policy framework and long-term settlement pattern. This has now been achieved.
- 3.3 The RPS sets the direction for growth management in the Waikato region. The RPS also provides district plans with policy direction in key areas, including the strategic integration of infrastructure with land use as required by Section 30(1)(gb) of the RMA 1991.
- 3.4 The RPS gives statutory effect to the Future Proof sub-regional settlement pattern through the use of urban limits, outlining growth allocations, providing for target residential densities, and the identification of growth areas and associated timing.
- 3.5 A change to the RPS is scheduled to occur next year which would include updates to implement the updated Future Proof Strategy and the outcomes of other strategic processes such as the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan and key workstreams such as the Hamilton-Waikato Metro Spatial Plan.

4. FUTURE PROOF POSITION

- 4.1 Future Proof's further submission on the PDP Ohinewai rezoning requests supports the industrial component of Ambury Property Limited's ("APL") submission, subject to further evidence being provided and analysis undertaken to allow the proposal to be properly assessed.
- 4.2 The Future Proof further submission requested that additional information in relation to the industrial land component be provided on the following:

- Alignment with the Future Proof Strategy
- RPS analysis
- Impact on other strategic industrial nodes
- Infrastructure capacity and costs
- Impact on the transport network
- Impact on Huntly
- The nature of the economic benefits
- Impact on the environment

4.3 The Future Proof further submission opposes the residential components of all of the Ohinewai rezoning submissions. This includes APL, Ohinewai Land Ltd, Shand Properties Ltd, Ribbonwood Family Trust and Planning Focus Ltd, noting that this last submission has since been withdrawn.

4.4 Future Proof opposes the residential component of the development as we are of the view that it is contrary to the Future Proof Strategy and the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (“RPS”). Further detail on this is provided in the next section of my evidence.

4.5 The Future Proof further submission did not go into detail about the commercial component of the APL development. This is because APL’s original submission only discussed a bulk factory outlet associated with the manufacturing business. This is different to what was later proposed which was a discount factory outlet with a focus on big box retail of all types, drawing on a large catchment. Future Proof is opposed to this aspect of the development as it is inconsistent with the Future Proof Strategy and the RPS. I understand that this aspect of the development has now been withdrawn. Therefore, I am not addressing it further.

Expert Conferencing

4.6 The Expert Conferencing did not produce any significant agreement among the planning experts on many of the key issues for the APL development. However, there was some agreement reached in terms of identifying fundamental issues for the development to address, and relevant policy and document weight which is useful for this hearing.

4.7 In summary the following matters were agreed by the experts which are relevant in terms of my evidence:

- a) The future provision of wastewater services, and the associated certainty including funding, is a fundamental issue.
- b) Ensuring certainty of infrastructure provisions will need further developed plan provisions.
- c) RPS Method 6.14.3 applies to residential and industrial alternative land release.
- d) The APL proposal needs to be assessed against the Future Proof Guiding Principles as well as the Development Principles in Section 6A of the RPS and both require the proposal to be consistent with them as required by Method 6.14.3 and Policy 6.14(g).
- e) Policy 6.14 of the RPS provides sufficient flexibility through the provisions for alternative land release for the APL proposal to be considered.
- f) The Future Proof Strategy 2017 is a relevant strategy to which regard is to be had under section 74(2)(b) of the RMA 1991.⁶

5. RELEVANT PLANNING MATTERS

5.1 Under section 75(3)(c), the Proposed Waikato District Plan must give effect to the RPS. Under 74(2)(b)(i) it shall also have regard to management plans and strategies prepared under other Acts. Future Proof is one such Strategy as it has been prepared under the framework of the Local Government Act 2002.⁷

5.2 Full public consultation on the 2017 Future Proof Strategy occurred using the Special Consultative Procedure of the Local Government Act 2002. The 2017 Strategy updates the Future Proof settlement pattern. The Joint Witness Statement from the Expert Planning Conferencing agreed that the Future Proof Strategy 2017 is a relevant strategy to which regard is to be had under section 74(2)(b) of the RMA 1991.⁸

⁶ Joint Witness Statement of Experts in Relation to Planning, 2 July 2020

⁷ See *Ruakura Board of Inquiry Decision* (vol 1, September 2014) and *A and A King Family Trust v Hamilton City Council* [2016] NZEnvC229 where the Environment Court had regard to the Future Proof Strategy and relied on it in terms of a policy cascade from Future Proof to the RPS and then through to District Plans.

⁸ Joint Witness Statement of Experts in Relation to Planning, 2 July 2020, at page 15

5.3 As outlined in the Joint Witness Statement⁹, the following provisions of the RPS are relevant:

- a) Chapter 2: Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato - Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River; Chapters 8: Fresh water bodies; Chapter 10: Heritage; Objective 3.4 – Health and wellbeing of the Waikato River
- b) Objective 3.9 - Relationship of tāngata whenua with the environment
- c) Objective 3.12 - Built Environment
- d) Objective 3.14 – Mauri and values of freshwater bodies
- e) Policy 6.1 – Planned and co-ordinated infrastructure
- f) Policy 6.3 – Co-ordinating growth and infrastructure
- g) Policy 6.6 – Significant infrastructure and energy resources
- h) Policy 6.14 – Adopting of Future Proof land use pattern
- i) Policy 6.16 – Commercial development in the Future Proof area
- j) Policy 6A Development Principles
- k) Policy 11.2 – Protect significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous flora
- l) Chapter 13 – Natural Hazards

5.4 Section 6 below of my evidence concentrates on the alignment of the APL proposal with the Future Proof Strategy and the RPS. In terms of the RPS I have concentrated on Policy 6.14 and the associated methods given that these are the provisions that are relevant to the Future Proof land use pattern.

6. ALIGNMENT WITH THE RPS AND FUTURE PROOF

6.1 In my opinion, the residential component of the proposed Ohinewai development is contrary to Future Proof principles which seek to encourage development to locate adjacent to existing urban settlements and nodes in both the Waikato and Waipa Districts, ensure that development will not compromise the Future Proof settlement pattern or create demand for the provision of urban services, and encourage development in established settlements to support existing infrastructure.¹⁰

⁹ Pages 8-14

¹⁰ *Future Proof Strategy – Planning for Growth*, 2017, Guiding Principles at pages 10-11

- 6.2 While Huntly is a growth management area and forms part of the Future Proof Settlement Pattern, as updated in 2017, Ohinewai does not. However, for Huntly it is envisaged that economic development interventions aimed at stimulating positive economic and social outcomes are needed.¹¹ Ohinewai does not feature as part of the allocation and staging of growth as identified in Appendix 1 of the Future Proof Strategy.¹² These allocations and staging were updated to reflect changes to the settlement pattern as well as alignment with infrastructure and services.
- 6.3 The industrial component of the development is supported given the strategic location of Ohinewai from an Upper North Island perspective and the need to provide greater levels of employment within Waikato District and for Huntly¹³, provided the criteria can be met. This aspect of the development aligns with Future Proof Strategy principles which aim to recognise the importance of the Future Proof sub-region within the wider Waikato Region and the upper North Island and promoting the sub-region as a place to Live, Work, Play, Invest and Visit – in this context the emphasis is on the invest component of this principle.¹⁴
- 6.4 The Future Proof Strategy 2017 also contains a section on taking a responsive approach to development. The Strategy states that the *Future Proof Settlement Pattern needs to be agile enough to respond to change. A settlement pattern that has some built-in responsiveness provides an ability to capitalise on previously unidentified or emerging opportunities that have potential to contribute significant economic, social or cultural benefits to our communities.*¹⁵ In my view, the industrial component of the Ohinewai development proposal meets the threshold of an emerging opportunity that has the potential to contribute significant economic benefits to the community.
- 6.5 In terms of whether the Ohinewai development goes over and above the projected demand as outlined in the Future Proof Strategy and associated work such as the Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment¹⁶ and the Future Proof Industrial Land Study¹⁷, it does for both industrial and residential. However, for the

¹¹ *Future Proof Strategy – Planning for Growth*, 2017, page 31

¹² *Future Proof Strategy – Planning for Growth*, 2017, Appendix 1 (Allocation and Staging of Growth), page 87

¹³ See Waikato District Blueprint, 2019, at page 34

¹⁴ *Future Proof Strategy – Planning for Growth*, 2017, pages 10-11

¹⁵ *Future Proof Strategy – Planning for Growth*, 2017, pages 39-40

¹⁶ Future Proof Housing & Business Development Capacity Assessment Report, July 2017

¹⁷ Future Proof Industrial Land Study, March 2020

industrial land component in my opinion this is justified given the unique pressures and demand for land placed on the Waikato District from Auckland. Forecasting industrial land demand is not an exact science and can only ever be a guide.

- 6.6 In terms of the RPS, the Ohinewai development is contrary to Policy 6.14, although this policy does note that alternative land release and timing can be considered provided certain criteria are met.
- 6.7 We accept that there will always be developments that come along which may fall outside of the established Future Proof and RPS settlement pattern, and there is some flexibility within these documents to deal with these where they can meet certain criteria.
- 6.8 Policy 6.14 of the RPS contains more direction in relation to industrial land as shown through 6.14(c) through to (h) which all deal with industrial development. Residential development is treated differently and there are only two substantive areas that address this within policy 6.14 – (a) and (b). The presumption is that new residential development shall predominantly occur within the urban limits and in accordance with the staging contained in Table 6-1. Method 6.14.3 does anticipate alternative residential land release.
- 6.9 The provisions relating to industrial land signal situations where industrial land may occur outside of the urban limits and with a different staging and land release to what is in Table 6-2.¹⁸
- 6.10 The criteria for alternative land release as outlined in Method 6.14.3 in the RPS can be summarised as follows:
- a) Maintain or enhance the safe and efficient function of existing or planned infrastructure when compared to the released provided;
 - b) The total allocation identified in Table 6-2 for any one strategic industrial node should generally not be exceeded or an alternative timing of industrial land release allowed, unless justified through robust and comprehensive evidence (including but not limited to, planning, economic and infrastructural/servicing evidence);

¹⁸ Policy 6.14 (c)-(h) & Method 6.14.3

- c) Sufficient zoned land within the greenfield area or industrial node is available or could be made available in a timely and affordable manner; and making the land available will maintain the benefits of regionally significant committed infrastructure investments made to support other greenfield areas or industrial nodes; and
- d) the effects of the change are consistent with the development principles set out in Section 6A.

6.11 In terms of the first criterion, this will be a matter for APL to demonstrate. I have outlined later in my evidence some concerns I have around infrastructure.

6.12 Criterion b) will again be a matter for APL to address through evidence, but again I note that there are concerns around infrastructure and servicing. I don't believe that c) is a particular issue but this will depend on any impacts on regionally significant committed infrastructure investments.

6.13 In terms of the development principles set out in 6A of the RPS, in my opinion the residential component of the development does not meet these. It is not consistent with principles to support existing urban areas in preference to creating new ones, provide a clear delineation between urban and rural areas, connect well with existing and planned development and infrastructure and promote a compact urban form.

6.14 Given both the RPS provisions and the Future Proof principles and settlement pattern, the residential component of the Ohinewai development does not align with these documents. Therefore, Future Proof does not support this aspect of the development.

6.15 In my opinion, the industrial component of the Ohinewai development aligns with Future Strategy principles and the responsiveness approach given that it provides an opportunity to contribute significant economic benefit. Depending on the evidence provided, any further work undertaken and the Proposed District Plan provisions, I am of the view that the industrial component can satisfy the RPS alternative land release criteria. I do however have some concerns around the provision and funding of infrastructure for the development. I discuss this later in my evidence.

7. IMPACT ON HUNTLY

- 7.1 The impact of Huntly is a relevant consideration under Part 2 of the RMA 1991 as well as the RPS through Method 6.14.3(c).
- 7.2 Future Proof is of the view that the residential component of the Ohinewai development has the potential to undermine Huntly regeneration. The regeneration of Huntly has been signalled in the Future Proof Strategy, Waikato 2070 and the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Statement of Shared Spatial Intent¹⁹.
- 7.3 There is a strong focus on redeveloping the town centre to support the social, cultural and economic well-being of the community, social and affordable housing opportunities and progressively improving public transport options including the potential use of passenger rail in the future with a station in Huntly. Work has already begun on upgrading the Huntly rail platform and the establishment of a park and ride service.²⁰
- 7.4 Effective public transport for Huntly will not be achieved without a critical mass of population and employment. Spreading residential development to Ohinewai will undermine efforts to create an effective public transport network for Huntly, particularly for rail.
- 7.5 In my opinion, the residential development proposed for Ohinewai is likely to compete with the regeneration of Huntly. Waikato 2070 contains a high-level plan for the regeneration of Huntly which includes residential development staged over the next 30 years with most of this occurring within the next 10 years. Residential development is envisaged to be mixed use redevelopment, medium density and standalone houses. Some new commercial and industrial land is also proposed.²¹ Of the 1,100 houses proposed by the APL development, at the absolute most 300 of these would be purchased by staff relocating from Auckland. This means that there will be in excess of 800 homes for sale. This will be occurring at the same time that residential development is proposed for Huntly.

¹⁹ *Future Proof Strategy*, 2017, at pages 24 & 31; *Waikato 2070*, at page 34; *Hei Awarua ki te Oranga – Statement of Shared Spatial Intent for Hamilton-Auckland Corridor*, 2019

²⁰ <https://www.waikatodistrict.govt.nz/your-district/district-overview/towns/huntly/huntly-train-station>

²¹ *Waikato District 2070*, 2020, at page 35

- 7.6 Kāinga Ora at present has over 50% of its Waikato District State Housing portfolio in Huntly.²² There is demand for 40 new public houses by 2022 in Waikato District²³ and there is likely to be demand for many more over the next 10-20 years.
- 7.7 At present there is very low land use efficiency in Huntly for public housing. Kāinga Ora is now focussing on redevelopment of existing brownfield land to enable the replenishment of existing housing stock and deliver the form and type of housing that meets people's needs. The approach aims to develop integrated communities and will often involve comprehensive redevelopments with a mix of market, affordable and public housing.
- 7.8 In short, there is significant investment and development plans being channelled into Huntly in order to revitalise the township.²⁴ In my opinion there will be difficulties sustaining this level of development and investment if the focus is on building a new town at Ohinewai.

8. INFRASTRUCTURE

- 8.1 There is now additional information around infrastructure capacity, this includes the recently released Mid Waikato Water and Wastewater Servicing Strategy²⁵.
- 8.2 The Mid Waikato Strategy has found that the existing water and wastewater trunk infrastructure and headworks are not fit for purpose in the study area. The total cost of water and wastewater upgrades as outlined in the Strategy is \$178.4 million. This is a very significant cost for the limited number of households within the mid-Waikato area. This goes to the heart of the Government's current three waters reforms which aim to address the delivery of these services to communities.²⁶
- 8.3 I note that the Mid Waikato Strategy has not yet analysed cultural benefit or impact, therefore from my perspective the work is incomplete. Until the multi-criteria

²² Kāinga Ora manages approximately 200 homes within Huntly. Source: Evidence of Brendon Liggett on behalf of Kāinga Ora, 23 October 2019, Proposed Waikato District Plan Hearing 3,

²³ Public Housing Plan, 2018-2022, Ministry of Social Development

²⁴ See for example the Waikato District Long-Term Plan 2018-2028 and 2020/21 Annual Plan including funding for infrastructure upgrades, a community centre for Huntly and the Huntly Central Interchange and local roading.

²⁵ Prepared by Mott MacDonald & Stantec for Watercare, June 2020

²⁶ <https://www.dia.govt.nz/Three-Waters-Reform-Programme>

assessment includes cultural benefits and/or impact we will not have a full picture of future costs.

- 8.4 From a planning perspective I have concerns about the relationship between the staging of the development and the provision of infrastructure. I am also not clear about the full infrastructure costs associated with the development and how these will be met and/or apportioned.
- 8.5 In the overall scheme of things these costs may not be significant. But unless the existing water and wastewater infrastructure investment deficits can be funded, there is a significant challenge for the Ohinewai development once it moves beyond Stage One and has to connect to reticulated services if these are not available. This is a key issue for the Hearing Panel to address from an integrated planning perspective. Namely the need to align proposed land use with adequate infrastructure, funded in a manner that can be afforded by smaller less well-off communities.
- 8.6 I accept that further information has been provided around the impacts on the transport network. There are still some areas in this regard that are not clear, for example whether a public transport service will be set up immediately between Ohinewai and Huntly, and who will cover this cost.

9. FUTURE PROOF FURTHER SUBMISSION

- 9.1 The Future Proof further submission requested further information on alignment with the Future Proof Strategy, RPS analysis, impact on other strategic industrial nodes, infrastructure capacity and costs, impact on the transport network, impact on Huntly, the nature of the economic benefits and impact on the environment.
- 9.2 In my opinion, and from the information I have read to date such as the expert summary statements and the Assessment of Environment Effects, I believe that in relation to industrial land APL has sufficiently addressed a number of the matters that the Future Proof further submission has set out.
- 9.3 I do not believe that APL has sufficiently addressed the impacts on Huntly. I have outlined my concerns about the potential undermining of Huntly earlier in my

evidence. I acknowledge the social impact work of Robert Quigley for APL²⁷, however I do not believe the full social, environmental and cultural impacts on Huntly have been fully explored. This includes the economic impact of locating a substantial residential activity at Ohinewai.

9.4 I am satisfied that the economic benefits have been well covered by APL. The Assessment of Environment Effects covers the environmental impacts. It does not contain much information in relation to potential contamination, discharges and air quality.

9.5 In short, I am of the opinion that most of the criteria relating to the industrial component of the development can be met but it will be up to APL to demonstrate this through evidence at the hearing and appropriate District Plan provisions. There is reasonable agreement between Future Proof and APL in relation to the industrial component, although as outlined I have concerns around the provision and funding of infrastructure.

9.6 The main area of contention for Future Proof relates to the residential aspects of the development since I am of the view that it is contrary to the RPS and the Future Proof Strategy. This has the potential to undermine the role of Huntly including its role in a Hamilton to Auckland Corridor context, create a significant settlement outside of the planned Future Proof areas, and create demand for infrastructure and services that cannot be sustainably met.

10. SECTION 42A REPORT

10.1 I have read the Council Section 42A Report dated 13 March 2020. I agree with its findings.

10.2 In particular I agree with the finding in relation to infrastructure constraints. The Section 42A report concludes that while the development is technically feasible it is subject to multiple constraints. The most significant of which is around water and wastewater servicing. I agree with the concerns around the potential for the

²⁷ Assessment of Social Effects of the Ohinewai Masterplan for APL, prepared by Quigley and Watts Ltd, November 2019

development to result in a substantial expenditure of public funds where these could be used more efficiently to support existing areas identified for growth.

10.3 I also concur with the Section 42A Report finding that there is insufficient planning justification for establishing a new Residential Zone at Ohinewai.

10.4 I am also in agreement with the Report's conclusion that the new Industrial Zone sought by APL should be accepted because of the lack of large industrial sites in suitable locations. It will create significant economic benefits for the District, including providing employment to people in nearby towns.

11. CONCLUSIONS

11.1 Future Proof generally supports the industrial component of the APL Ohinewai development, provided the criteria as set out in the RPS can be met and the information requested in the Future Proof further submission can be addressed. In my opinion, I think the RPS criteria and the Future Proof further submission requests can be met in terms of the industrial development provided sufficient evidence and appropriate District Plan provisions are provided. I do have outstanding concerns relating to infrastructure and the ability to service the development.

11.2 Future Proof is not supportive of the residential component of the Ohinewai rezonings. These are contrary to the RPS and the Future Proof Strategy and could have significant long-term implications for Huntly, the Waikato District and the Future Proof sub-region as a whole. It would create a significant settlement outside of the planned Future Proof areas and create demand for infrastructure and services that cannot be sustainably met.

11.3 Future Proof is of the view that the industrial component of the development will have significant economic benefits for the Waikato District by creating much needed employment opportunities. This is in line with key Future Proof Strategy principles and the responsiveness provisions.

Ken Tremaine

13 August 2020