

UNDER the Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of hearing submissions and further
submissions on the Proposed
Waikato District Plan
Hearing 25 – Zone Extents

**PARTIES
REPRESENTED** **Z & Z Developments Limited
Partnership (114)**

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SAMUEL WALTER SHUKER

1. This summary addresses the overview of the submission, changes to the relief sought and any additional matters raised in Council's rebuttal in relation to 102 Travers Road, Te Kauwhata (Site).
2. For my qualification and experience, refer back to the original evidence I provided.
3. In regard to the expert witness code of conduct, my stance has not changed from the previous evidence provided, I agree to comply with it.
4. The original submission was to rezone the Site from Country Living to Village Zone. Due to there being services within the vicinity of the Site, a concept plan was shown for 1000m² lot sizes. The intent of the submission was to create a transitional zone between the Residential and Country Living Zones.
5. Due to further developments, which included the 42A Report not supporting spot zoning and the writer suggesting the Site is a candidate for more intensive development by potentially rezoning it to Residential, a change in relief sought to better align with Council's views was proposed.
6. In both the 42A Report and Rebuttal the writer has suggested that a Residential zoning should be sought either through a plan change or the next district plan review. However, I would like to reinforce the issues (which has

been raised by the writer – Paragraph 164(c) of 42A Report) around developing established Country Living land to a higher density.

7. Currently the Site has not been developed to a Country Living density, unlike the adjoining properties to the north. This means it is a good candidate for residential development by providing a blank canvas to work from. The benefits of this would be better integration and urban design can be provided.
8. Also, a public road in general accordance with the indicative road (shown on the planning maps) can be developed which will provide connectivity between the neighbouring residential properties and Travers Road.
9. In my original evidence I addressed all the relevant statutory documents, assessment of effects and submitters concerns. The majority of this assessment is still relevant due to the Village Zone being urban in nature and the evidence referring to a higher density being proposed, which is still the case with Residential.
10. It should be noted that prior to the original submission the neighbouring properties were consulted about a potential plan to reduce the lot sizes to 1,000m² on the site (as per the concept plan attached with the original submission). They were opposed to this, with their submissions being to keep the Site as Country Living. The writer has raised concerns about being speculative, however, their outcome sought would not be changing whether the relief sought was for Village or Residential Zone.
11. Furthermore, the Site adjoins the Te Kauwhata West Residential Area which features a minimum net site area of 650m² and a minimum average site area of 875m². These area requirements are not dissimilar to the 1000m² lot sizes originally shown to the neighbouring owners. To clarify, the Residential zoning now sought is for the Site to be included in the Te Kauwhata West Residential Area.
12. In my opinion the Site is suitable for Residential zoning and disagree with the 42A Report recommendation. Therefore, the Site should be rezoned to the Te Kauwhata West Residential Zone.

Sam Shuker
12 May 2021