IN THE MATTER	of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA" or "the Act")
AND	
IN THE MATTER	of a submission in respect of the **PROPOSED WAIAKATO DISTRICT PLAN** by **AMBURY PROPERTIES LIMITED** pursuant to Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Act

JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT OF EXPERTS IN RELATION TO ECONOMICS DATED 12 JUNE 2020

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 On 11 and 12 June, 2020, expert conferencing sessions in relation to economic matters were undertaken by:

- Dr Brent Wheeler (**BW**);
- Tim Heath (**TH**);
- Phil Osborne (**PO**);
- Dr Douglas Fairgray(**DF**);
- Dr Derek Kemp (**DK**); and
- Blair Keenan (**BK**).

1.2 This Joint Witness Statement is a record of the outcome of these sessions.

1.3 The sessions were facilitated by Hearing Panel members, Dr Phil Mitchell and Paul Cooney and undertaken by video conference.

1.4 Also in attendance as observers were:

(a) Chloe Trenouth, planner for Waikato Regional Council;

(b) John Olliver (**JO**); planner for Ambury Properties Limited;

(c) Miffy Foley, planner for Waikato Regional Council

(d) Sandra Kelly, planner Waikato District Council; and

(e) Giles Boundy, planner for Waikato-Tainui.

1.5 Notes were taken by Chloe Trenouth and Miffy Foley.

1.6 The issues identified as forming the agenda for the economic conferencing are included in Appendix 1:

STRATEGIC ISSUES

2. **ISSUE ONE**

Is the proposed development simply redistributing expected economic growth?

- PO disagrees - not just distributing expected economic growth but unanticipated, so net gain.
- DK also disagrees and agrees with PO. Clustering gives quantum shift. Furniture and soft furnishings cluster, along with ancillary businesses that would locate here that would not exist without the localisation and agglomeration advantages of the cluster.
- BK shouldn't be confined to the Waikato. Would expect activities to locate somewhere so is largely redistribution.
- DF – any clustering not significantly different from what is occurring elsewhere, and a lot of components are imported.
- DF cheap land that is accessible by rail is the focus for TCG itself. An issue then whether other businesses would co-locate with TCG, and therefore shift from an existing location. Alternatively, those businesses could service TCG from their existing location.
- DF – the primary impact is Sleepyhead Factory because that is the net addition to the economy. Additional business activity impacts are less, because some/all of any potential re-location to co-locate with TCG likely to be from within district or Future Proof sub-region.
- BW investor wouldn't be shifting if economic efficiency was not being improved. Over time the regional/district share in economic benefits. Additional net component greater than transfer.
- BW agrees with DF, is it just a shift? A bit more than just a shift so need to address potential issues.
- BK considers it is unlikely to be large. Depends where the boundaries are drawn
- DK believes the sleepy head catalytic benefits will be very large
- PO agrees with BK. Will be significant but depends on the boundaries.
- **Agree that it is more than simply redistributing expected economic growth.**
- **Differing opinions as to the magnitude of the additional economic growth.**

3. **ISSUE TWO**

What significance do the likely effects of the pandemic have on the proposal?

- DK doesn't think this will affect the way the proposal is considered.
- DF agreed there will be some negative effects but the scale of impact is unknown, and unlikely to alter structure of the economy.
- BW common ground that level of uncertainty increased significantly. Important to acknowledge that any estimates are more uncertain.
- PO primary impact uncertainty – long term impacts unlikely to be structural changes in terms of the OSP.
- TH the relative benefits of the proposal to the district increase in the post-covid environment
- BK sustained period of decreased demand but this is a commercial issue.
- BW rational response – to place a greater premium on not closing off options post covid.
- **Agreed that timing will be impacted but the bigger picture view of the proposal is unchanged.**

4. ISSUE THREE

What is the anticipated size of the labour force?

- DF referred to base facts discussed earlier and will run with those numbers.
- **Agreed that the assessments will be based on a total maximum figure of 2600 employees in the OSP.**

5. ISSUE FOUR

What is the anticipated origin of the labour force, in terms of shares per location?

- DF confirm the proportions of labour force by area, where they live and would likely commute from. Refer to base facts summary sheet <Geography>. Issue is What would pattern look like if OSP residential didn't go ahead and some / everyone had to commute.
- DF - is important to understand the dimension of an "all or nothing" proposal including the relationship between the different components. Strength of relationship between Sleepyhead and housing would be materially affected by incentive of subsidized housing costs for employees. If housing is more affordable in Huntly then employees may choose to live there rather than Ohinewai.
- DF - not much information about price points or number of dwellings that might be provided (incentivized) at Ohinewai.
- DF could have a couple of scenarios, and need to understand the implications of different scenarios. Not determining a resource consent but a zoning change and therefore need to consider the implications of different outcomes.
- DF zoning enables type of development (scale and nature) at Ohinewai.
- DF new location for residential so expect a solid rationale for this. If affordability component is not there and the direct link to Sleepyhead employment is not there, then is this an appropriate location for residential.
- TH difficult to determine, haven't assessed an alternative scenario without housing

- BW agree with value of the exercise but difficulty beyond broad estimates.
- TH no point in having scenario without residential because if the residential doesn't go ahead then the development won't happen.
- Access to housing (incentives) will impact on origin of labour as encourages employees to locate at Ohinewai. Particularly those they are bringing down from Auckland.
- BK provision of affordable housing key determinant of market at Ohinewai, determining demand for residential component. Need to know how affordable housing will be achieved to understand whether residential development is viable.
- BW why are we looking at affordability of housing – what is relevance?
- BK if affordable housing is achievable easily then residential could work, but if price point too high then what is the demand.
- BW uncomfortable with scenarios – demand is dictated by the market. For the purposes of considering effects it may be ok.
- TH if land is zoned how relevant is the timing of development.
- APL propose 1100 dwellings with expectation that Sleepyhead workers will occupy 300 dwellings, and as a minimum develop the Sleepyhead Factory
- **Agreed Housing and Business Scenarios would be useful tools for the purpose of analysis:**

  - agreed housing scenarios to include the following range of dwellings that would be occupied by OSP workforce 0, 300, 600, 1100
- **Agreed Business scenarios:**
  - **Full development proposal**
  - **Sleepyhead Factory only**
  - **Sleepyhead + Industrial (no Discount Factory Outlet)**

6. ISSUE FIVE

To what extent are the various costs reflected in the analysis to date?

- BK to what extent have peripheral costs been taken into account.
- TH can't answer that question specifically because have taken the costs provided by APL. All costs provided by APL have been included. TH confirmed rail siding costs included in the analysis.
- BW developer faces number of costs, wider costs by tax payers – if viable then costs included within it
- BK costs of hooking up to water at Huntly not small, if included ok but fully allocated catchment already; wastewater similar
- BK and DF agree that costs are relevant to economics, would be useful to have these costs
- JO development tied to staging plan and aspects of costs for infrastructure that have to be paid by APL. Fully for development then APL pays, if shared the APL pay share.
- TH infrastructure costs may have multiple solutions and understands still being worked through – can't answer
- BW consent stage will be time when details are addressed
- DF - the costs are identified in Property Economics Report (Table 11) in terms of the development site rather than wider area implications.

Therefore, question are they all the costs, or are there other costs to be considered.

- PO the costs that have been provided by client to date.
- DF there will always be an engineering solution and a dollar amount to that. Then does $1.2 billion include everything.
- DK only location where wet industries could be located in the district.
- Don't have the information available at this session on what external public costs there could be for infrastructure so can't comment – but would be useful to have this information (e.g. water and wastewater, transport)
- **Agreed – provided infrastructure costs internalized and born by developer then not an issue**
- **Disagreed – if additional infrastructure needs to be funded externally (public purse)**

7. **ISSUE SIX**

How likely are the full benefits of the proposal to be achieved?

- BK this is likely to be covered elsewhere - referred to summary statement paragraphs 6.2-6.4.
- DK concerned about the DFO which he considers has few benefits and many disbenefits
- DF agrees BK points relevant – if absence of various components would result in the proposal not going ahead. Is the proposal everything or nothing.

Agreed this issue is addressed across the other questions.

8. **ISSUE SEVEN**

Is Ohinewai an appropriate location for a new town, or the most appropriate location for expansion of Huntly town, at the large scale proposed?

- DF poses this question in terms of the urban economy of district and region
- BW compared with what is it appropriate? What is the counterfactual.
- DF district and regional plans provide for activities to occur elsewhere, including NPS for urban development capacity assessments.
- BW is the comparator what is contemplated already as well as what is excluded by that?
- TH where does Waikato 2070 Strategy sit? Should be part of the consideration of the appropriateness of location.
- DF Waikato 2070 part of the information that is relevant.
- BW need to focus on the specific
- TH site chosen because of rail siding. Huntly expansion is irrelevant because can't go to Huntly.
- DF reference to expansion of Huntly came from the residential growth and its relationship to Huntly
- DK industrial has nothing to do with expansion of Huntly
- BW vast swathe of things that are involved and needs to be from an economics perspective

- **Agreed that need to address this question from an economic perspective and the scenarios will assist with this**

  Agreed the focus should be on whether the proposal is the most appropriate location from an economics perspective taking into account the implications on Huntly and other towns

9. **ISSUE EIGHT**

How does the proposal address its role in the wider integrated employment node identified at Ohinewai in the Blueprint and Waikato 2070?

- DK proposal well designed from its own context but doesn't appear to integrate with the rest of the wider industrial cluster – including road connections to the north and reverse sensitivity with adjacent residential.
- DK this area was identified through analysis – wider integrated employment node at Ohinewai.
- DK referred to Working Paper 4 – importance of protecting strategic land for future business uses. 1. Best location for certain industries (i.e. wet); 2. Ability to provide large sites; 3. Business advantages – flat land, expressway access, exposure; 4. Ability to establish locations where business would want to go.
- DK this proposal for industrial is consistent with his studies
- DK confirmed that the study considered assessment of bulk water and wastewater servicing and cost effectiveness
- PO looked at Working Paper but did not look at structure of how the APL proposal would integrate with the wider integrated employment node.
- TH the wider integrated employment node is broader than just the district directly - relevant to Hamilton to Auckland Corridor in the future as well
- DF need to look at existing economies and how they have developed. Concern that "wider node" is significantly greater than projected growth, and related requirements (eg land for other urban activities) and infrastructure etc not considered. Provided additional growth doesn't result in under provision in other locations.
- BW doesn't see anything inconsistent with what is proposed.
- DK as demand is revealed then land should be rezoned
- DF and BK note concern about implicit assumption that OSP would be part of a wider integrated employment zone and that further substantial industrial development is identified for the Ohinewai locality in the Blueprint and Waikato 2070

  Note there are different perspectives on this

10. **ISSUE NINE**

Does the residential significantly constrain future industrial development of the wider integrated employment node?

- DK residential is a reverse sensitivity issue – implications for industrial activities
- DK it's an issue if there is nowhere else for industry to go and won't go to Ohinewai because of additional mitigation required to address reverse sensitivity

- DK is concerned about noise levels in the residential zone and the potential for noisier ndustrial uses permitted in the industrial zone to adversely affect residential amenity and the character of the whole area.
- BK not persuaded that pattern of development to north is relevant to this proposal and reiterates that Waikato catchment is fully allocated for water and wastewater therefore impacting development requiring these resources
- TH and PO have not assessed any integrated employment node as part of analysis
- **Agreed other than DK that this development stands and falls on its own merit**

  DK disagreed for reasons set out above

RESIDENTIAL ISSUES

11. ISSUE TEN

Is there a long term or short-term shortfall in housing capacity in this part of the Waikato district?

- DF work done on NPS for urban development capacity – capacity for housing growth until early to mid-2030s beyond that there would be a shortfall unless the plan-enabled capacity was supported by expenditure on infrastructure.
- DF capacity assessment based on when plan-enabled capacity becomes available
- TH the proposal would result in additional housing demand that was not previously considered in the capacity analysis (unanticipated)
- DK if there is already sufficient housing planned in the area then wouldn't be need for additional housing
- DF is the proposed residential required to meet a shortfall in housing capacity.
- TH this proposal will bring the identified mid-2030s shortfall forward
- DF if the proposal residential doesn't go ahead then it would bring forward the need to upgrade infrastructure to enable identified growth
- DK need residential to support Sleepyhead development
- TH increase in demand as a result of the plan change will be in the next 3 years, whereas some of capacity in greenfield land identified would not be available within the timeframe
- BW take up of housing will be dependent on market factors including price
- DF does the residential provide a dual purpose of providing for Sleepyhead as well as capacity.
- TH considers there is an identified short fall without the APL proposal, land zoned but not serviced and timing of enabling that capacity difficult to confirm, therefore APL proposal assists with shortfall
- **Agreed that NPS for urban development capacity is basis for figures and that APL proposal will result in additional demand for housing.**
- **Disagreed that housing only required to support Sleepyhead Factory rather than meeting short fall in capacity**

12. ISSUE ELEVEN

What level of demand for housing would be generated by the commercial and industrial development provided for in the Ohinewai structure plan?

- DF if roughly 2600 employees then approximately 2000 households or dwellings and not all will be located in Ohinewai or Huntly
- PO better to set some scenarios
- DF referring to scenarios above could provide estimates
- DF what is the level of demand in Ohinewai / Huntly area and what is required at Huntly. What is the proportion of employees that will live at Ohinewai and elsewhere
- DF if proposal goes ahead there will be more capacity for growth. Does approving the zoning meet housing needs of development proposal going ahead. What are the implications for infrastructure.
- DF Downsides of too much capacity are generally less than not enough capacity
- DF offered to share his figures over the next couple of weeks but not available now.
- BW skeptical of usefulness of this information given uncertainties – speculative
- DK ability of council to provide social services and the costs of them if the scale of population is not large enough
- TH OSP is the only major proposal that exists that will generate demand for housing in the area
- **No agreement**

  Agreed further discussion could continue outside conferencing and could reconvene conferencing if necessary.

13. **ISSUE TWELVE**

Is there sufficient demand for residential product priced around $500k and where does that price point sit in the wider market?

- DK $500k isn't affordable
- TM $500k is an average and there is likely to be a range in price and typologies from potentially low $400s-mid $500s. This average is the figure provided by APL
- DK this is a high price for the area, there is a lot of housing that is cheaper
- TM average needs to be compared to new home prices, not existing older homes. Need to compare similar products.
- BK hard to see what demand is like at this stage, without knowing what arrangements there are to make housing affordable
- TH these arrangements are still being developed, with various options being looked at.
- JO density will help determine price point
- DF a major attraction of the residential development is housing that is affordable. The other main incentive is the proximity to work.
- DF existing stock in Huntly is 2500 dwellings on Core Logics database. 6-7% of dwellings sell each year, but no way of calculating how much of the stock is available for sale at any one time. Older and modest stock in Huntly.

- TH many of the older / lower priced homes in Huntly need a major upgrade / investment, so housing product in Ohinewai will be attractive
- DF would expect people to move in during the development phase and after, but would also be commuting
- BW reasonable to assume that APL will not be developing a factory that they can't operate successfully. Staging plan addresses this. Parallel stages of industrial and residential development are anticipated. Provision for early residential stages (year 3)
- DK convenience for work only applies to the single person in the household, not necessarily others in the household. DF agreed.

  No agreement or disagreement reached – complex multi variate issue

14. **ISSUE THIRTEEN**

Is there a mechanism or will there be a mechanism by which the proposed dwellings would be made affordable to the TCG workforce and if so what are the consequences?

- JO TCG looking at rent to own schemes. TCG working on a number of scenarios to assist employees into home ownership but this is a work in progress.
- DF when would the information be available such as a proportion of the total dwellings which would be affordable ?
- JO could provide information on the proportion of affordable dwellings.
- BK need to understand this to know whether it is reasonable to expect people to move there.
- PO whether there is an acceptable mechanism plays to the realism of the housing scenarios and should deal with it there.

  Agreed that this will be taken into consideration through the housing scenario analysis.

BUSINESS ISSUES

15. **ISSUE FOURTEEN**

What are the travel implications of the proposed development (numbers of persons/trips according to origin), in the context of RPS travel efficiency objectives for:

(a) Journey to work

(b) Household travel

(c) Business travel

(d) Shopping travel

- DF travel costs are not covered, important to acknowledge it is relevant and if it doesn't exist the information would be helpful. Significant enough to be requested and is an important consideration. Of itself this issue is not likely to be a fatal flaw but needs to be considered in combination with other matters.

- JO there are raw numbers in the ITA, but not specific purposes and not specific destinations.
- DK not a major issue, and not a reason not to approve development
- BK cumulatively the costs of time and fuel could be large but it would be good to see this as this assumption is not based on evidence. Agree with DF.
- PO unlikely to be a fatal flaw and questions how accurately we can model this

  BW & PO & DK in any event, this issue is unlikely to be material. DF and BK cannot agree with this position, absent the data.

16. **ISSUE FIFTEEN**

Will the DFO retail development at Ohinewai have any significant adverse effects on the townships of Huntly and Te Kauwhata?

- DK four issues:
  - The overall size of DFO is big @ 28,000m^2
  - The range of retailing that will be allowed and the impact that this type of sales will have, but also the potential for failure
  - If it were to be built and fail, what is the impact of an empty or reused DFO building
  - Impact of Pokeno village transitioning to a town centre given the residential within the Pokeno catchment
- Adverse impacts – yes? DF adverse effects from the scale of activity and the nature of the relatively limited retail and services in Huntly and Te Kauwhata, and future role of Pokeno.
- DK because Huntly,Te Kauwhata and in the future Pokeno are competing on convenience and price, this is going to be discounted with a wide range of product. If it fails, then there will be an enormous vacant building on a gateway location. Already have large vacant buildings around Huntly which blights Huntly. A very large vacant or inappropriately used building at Ohinewai will adversely affect the future economic and employment prospects for Huntly, the Ohinewai area and by implication the District and wider regional economy.
- Adverse impacts – no significant impacts? TH due to provisions narrowing down what can happen on the site and the DFO are not duplicating Pokeno, Huntly or Te Kauwhata. BK fairly ambivalent but would err on this side on the basis that it is a different offering. Whole development including extra people then that's extra demand. BW net beneficial, not adverse as it is a natural part of the evolution of retail structures.
- **No agreement**

17. **ISSUE SIXTEEN**

Does the proposal represent the most appropriate land uses given the prominence of the site?

- DK prominence of site, gateway location, great opportunities but is planned to be used for truckstop. Of all the Waikato Expressway interchanges this is the only one with the advantages outlined in Issue 8, point 3

- TH nothing has happened on this site previously if demand existed so can't suddenly be selective
- **Agreed that answers to all the other questions assists with answering this question.**
- **Agreed other than DK that a final opinion is therefore not possible at this time.**
- **DK believes the points made in his Working Paper 4 and** Issue 8, point 3 above provides the answer to his question.

  Also agreed that this is broader than just an economics question and would need to be interpreted in the appropriate RMA context

18. **ISSUE SEVENTEEN**

Is having 46,400m2 of DFO and ancillary retailing (@ 10%) to the Industrial activities at Ohinewai appropriate?

- DK 28,000m^2 for DFO but additional ancillary retailing permitted from industries in the OSP Industry Zone. Potential for additional retailing not restricted to the types of retailing permitted in the DFO.
- **Yes: BW as it is part of the evolution of the economy (#15). TH for the same reason in #15.**

  No: DK because of the effects. DF for the reasons given in #15. BK but will depend on extent of competition with existing businesses, which we do not know *a priori,* nevertheless the risk is that it is more likely to have significant effects elsewhere.

19. **ISSUE EIGHTEEN**

Does office space need to be limited at Ohinewai?

- DK confirmed 200m2 office space restriction
- **No: BW, BK, DK**

  Yes: TH needs to be and has been, PO, DF needs to be as it is not intended as an office park. The issue is that it has been limited, but subject to confirmation.

20. **ISSUE NINETEEN**

Should the types of goods for sale at the DFO be more closely prescribed?

- DK confirmed that DFO plan rules restricts DFO to a. sale of goods manufactured in OSP **or**to b. 50% of products –discounted to 40% off normal price

  For clarity: 17.5.11 Ohinewai Structure Plan Proposed Planning Provisions for the Business Zone P4 states:

  "Outlet and Discount Retail activities shall either: (i) sell goods manufactured by a manufacturing activity located within the Ohinewai Structure Plan; or (ii) must offer goods for sale where at least 50% of the stock must have a discount of at least 40% off the recommended retail price including clearance, damaged, seconds and/or end of line goods.

For clarity, there is no gross floor area cap on Outlet and Discount Retail activities in the Ohinewai Structure Plan Business Zone"

No: all agreed they are closely prescribed

21. **ISSUE TWENTY**

What are the issues of locating the neighbourhood centre away from the DFO?

- DK notes this is not an issue but DFO's often have cafes
- **Agreed: Not an issue any more as it is beside it**

22. **ISSUE TWENTY ONE**

How much food and grocery retailing and other retailing would be permitted at the DFO or on in the Industrial zone? Competition for retail of manufactured food.

- DK: totally unknown as any food products being manufactured in the OSP can be sold from the DFO and will be selling at a discounted rate. DF agrees with this concern. As a consequence there will be adverse effects on existing activities in Huntly. And the potential for those activities to expand with population growth.
- TH: why would this site be any different from other sites? Why are we concerned about this. Sale of food and groceries have been restricted through provisions.
- BK: in two minds. On one hand could be significant implications for local businesses, but convenience and less travel to Huntly for local needs of OSP residents
- BW: not in favour of a restriction. The function of the zone is not to manage competition

No agreement on this matter

23. **ISSUE TWENTY TWO**

How much of the large format retail spend from the catchment would the DFO need to capture to be successful if it only sells furniture, floor coverings, houseware and textile goods?

- BW boardroom question and investors question rather than RM issue
- DK viability is not an issue, but what if it becomes vacant?
- Agreed that the catchment stretches from South Auckland to Hamilton
- Concern of undermining existing town centres
- DK main issue is that it is a big vacant building if it fails and negative economic consequences
- DF location means that it depends on drawing custom long distance and generates transport issues. BK agrees with this point.
- BK DF and DK are concerned that a DFO of this scale would impact on similar activities elsewhere in the wider region. TH doesn't agree.

- BK notes that, *if* the DFO is able to capture enough market share to make it successful, then it is likely to have a significant effect on retailers elsewhere

  No agreement on this matter

24. **ISSUE TWENTY THREE**

If the DFO does not happen what are the likely retail activities (I.e. broad based retail) that would occur and how would this impact on local centres?

- DK it is unknown for the reasons outlined above. TH & PO & DF & BK agree
- BW agrees but not concerned
- DK suggests no DFO and increase ancillary retailing to 20%. In an industrial zone you often have warehousing, but not allowed to sell from that site. Provisions that restrict sale to manufacturing is problematic.
- DF no DFO will reduce impacts on town centres and limiting to 10% will mean less impact on town centres but still has concerns about that scale of impact
- TH hasn't considered if the DFO fails, any other would need consent for change of use. Not particularly concerned.
- BK agree with the view above that it is unknown and hasn't got a good basis for saying if it's a good or bad thing

  No agreement on this matter

25. **ISSUE TWENTY FOUR**

Can the retail activities be appropriately restricted by the plan provisions proposed in OSP to mitigate potential adverse effects on nearby centres?

- DK – no because there is no way of establishing that products sold are manufactured locally, or that there has been a 50% discount on price, not clear what 50% is of (products in any store, any type of product, or 50% of all sales of the DFO) – impossible to police and enforce. DF agrees
- **Yes: TH, PO, BK (subject to uncertainty about the issue of monitoring and enforcement)**

  No: DK, BW, DF

26. **PARTIES TO JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT**

26.1 The signatories to this Joint Witness Statement confirm that:

(a) They agree with the outcome of the expert conference as recorded in this statement;

(b) They have read Appendix 3 of the Environment Court's Practice Note 2014 and agree to comply with it; and

(c) The matters addressed in this statement are within their area of expertise.

SIGNATURES:

Dr Brent Wheeler — Date: 15 June 2020

Tim Heath — Date: 15 June 2020

Phil Osborne — Date: 15 June 2020

Dr Douglas Fairgray — Date: 15 June 2020

Derek Kemp — Date: 16/6/2020

Blair Keenan — Date: 16 June 2020

Hearing 19: Ohinewai Rezoning

Expert Conferencing – Economic

11 – 12 June 2020

Strategic:

- Is the proposed development simply redistributing expected economic growth?
- What significance do the likely effects of the pandemic have on the proposal?
- What is the anticipated size of the labour force?
- What is the anticipated origin of the labour force, in terms of shares per location?
- To what extent are the various costs reflected in the analysis to date?
- How likely are the full benefits of the proposal to be achieved?
- Is Ohinewai an appropriate location for a new town, or the most appropriate location for expansion of Huntly town, at the large scale proposed?
- How does the proposal address it's role in the wider integrated employment node?
- Does the residential significantly constrain future industrial development of the wider integrated employment node?

Residential:

- Is there a long term or short term shortfall in housing capacity in this part of the Waikato district?
- What level of demand for housing would be generated by the commercial and industrial development provided for in the Ohinewai structure plan?
- Is there sufficient demand for residential product priced around $500k and where does that price point sit in the wider market?
- Is there a mechanism or will there be a mechanism by which the proposed dwellings would be made affordable to the TCG workforce?

Business:

- What are the travel implications of the proposed development (numbers of persons/trips according to origin), in the context of RPS travel efficiency objectives for:

  a) Journey to work

  b) Household travel

c) Business travel

d) Shopping travel

- Will the DFO retail development at Ohinewai have any significant adverse effects on the townships of Huntly and Te Kauwhata?
- Does the proposal represent the most appropriate land uses given the prominence of the site?
- Would the proposal permit in excess of 62,600m^2 of diverse retaining at Ohinewai?
- Does office space need to be limited at Ohinewai?
- Should the types of goods for sale at the DFO be more closely prescribed?
- What are the issues of locating the neighbourhood centre away from the DFO?
- How much food and grocery retailing and other retailing would be permitted at the DFO or on in the Industrial zone?
- How much of the large format retail spend from the catchment would the DFO capture need to capture to be successful if it only sells furniture, floor coverings, houseware and textile goods?
- If the DFO does not happen what are the likely retail activities (I.e. broad based retail) that would occur and how would this impact on local centres?
- Can the retail activities be appropriately restricted by plan provisions to mitigate potential adverse effects on nearby centres?