

# SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF MARK SEYMOUR MANNERS TOLLEMACHE ON BEHALF OF HAVELOCK VILLAGE LIMITED

## PLANNING

### Chapter 1: Strategic Directions

1. I am concerned that the PWDP is unclear as to the purpose and use of the Strategic Directions and Strategic Objectives identified in Chapter 1.12. It is unclear how these would affect the drafting of objectives and policies, along with the consideration of the appropriateness of policies and plan provisions (or future plan changes of resource consents). Mr Davey for WDC, as submitter, has also proposed new strategic objectives.
2. My preference is that these strategic directions are deleted as I do not consider they provide a significant level of value beyond the objectives and policies of the PWDP. If they are to remain, I consider that caucusing by the planning experts would assist the Hearing Commissioners in identifying those amendments that are supported. More importantly, there is also a lack of clarity between various submitters as to the role and function of these Strategic Directions and the Strategic Objectives and how the policy cascade is intended to operate. Conferencing may resolve some of these concerns.

### Urban Environment and Urban Development Capacity Objectives 4.1.1 and 4.1.2

3. I consider that the growth management provisions need to be amended to be more flexible to account for additional information, changing growth projections and updates to strategic planning documents. I agree with Mr Matheson's proposed amended wording of Objective 4.1.1 (proposed to be numbered as 1.13.2 in the section 42A report) identified in paragraph 42 of his rebuttal evidence.
4. My rebuttal evidence suggested amendments to the recommendations on Objective 4.1.1 made by Ms Foley for the Waikato Regional Council. I still consider those two additional clauses to be appropriate. These amendments are:
  - c) Most of the District's new housing is located in or around towns and villages.*
  - d) Urban development is integrated with infrastructure.*
5. I am comfortable with the amendments Mr Matheson has proposed to Objective 4.1.2 in the section 42A report. I consider the addition of 'compact urban form' complements

the consolidation of growth in and around existing towns and villages. I support the cross-reference to specific towns and villages identified in Policies 4.1.10 to 4.1.18.

6. I also consider my suggested amendments to Ms Foley's recommendations on Objective 4.1.2 to be appropriate. These amendments are:

*b) New urban growth and development is enabled where it co-ordinated so that the nature, timing and sequencing of new development is provides appropriate infrastructure or where development aligns with the provision of infrastructure by Council or relevant agencies. ed with the timing, sequencing, funding, implementation and operation of necessary infrastructure.*

### **Policy 4.1.3 Location of Development**

7. I am concerned that policies reference external documents such as *Future Proof Strategy: Planning for Growth (2017)*. This is because Future Proof 2017 contains a significant range of issues and guidance, but is in itself not a document formulated and adopted under the first schedule process of the Resource Management Act. My preference is the Policy is deleted.
8. If the Policy is to be retained, a possible drafting suggestion to clarify the Policy is to reference the locations identified in Policies 4.1.10 to 4.1.18 rather than an externally referenced document.

*(b) Locate urban growth areas in and around the existing towns and villages of Tuakau, Pokeno, Te Kauwhata, Huntly, Taupiri, Ngaruawahia, Horotiu, Te Kowhai and Raglan only where they are consistent with the Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth 2017.*

9. I do not agree with the amendment proposed by Mr Matheson in his rebuttal evidence. These do not address the principal concerns raised with the policy.

### **Policy 4.1.4 Staging of Development**

10. I consider my suggested amendments to Ms Foley's recommendations on Policy 4.1.4(a) to be appropriate. These amendments are:

*(a) Ensure that subdivision, use and development in new urban areas is:  
(i) located, designed, and efficiently and effectively integrated and or where necessary staged so it is supported by to adequately support existing or planned infrastructure, community facilities, open space networks and local services; and*

~~(ii) efficiently and effectively integrated and staged to support infrastructure, stormwater management networks, parks, and open space networks.~~

#### **Policy 4.1.5 Density**

11. The references to density in Policy 4.1.5 are not consistent with the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (**WRPS**), and to a degree inconsistent with Future Proof 2017. Policy 4.1.5 reads as an absolute, and does not reference an 'average gross density' target to be achieved over time as is outlined in the WRPS and Future Proof 2017.
12. The drafting nuance of WRPS and Future Proof 2017 is missing from Policy 4.1.5. The current wording would result in proposals being contrary to the policy if the density target is not achieved, and could in itself create confusion as to how the density target is to be measured.
13. My proposed wording is:

##### **4.1.5 Policy – Density**

- (a) Encourage higher density housing and retirement villages to be located near to and support commercial centres, community facilities, public transport and open space.
  - (b) Progressively achieve an average gross density ~~Achieve a minimum density~~ of 12-15 households per hectare in the Residential Zone.
  - (c) Progressively achieve an average gross density ~~Achieve a minimum density~~ of 8-10 households per hectare in the Village Zone where public reticulated services can be provided.
14. I note that Mr Matheson in his rebuttal evidence has proposed amendment identifying that Pokeno should "*Achieve a minimum density of greater than 10 households per hectare in the Residential Zone within Pokeno*". I support this amendment but only on the basis that my other concerns identified with Policy 4.1.5 are also addressed (i.e. it is reworded to require *an average gross density* not a minimum density).

#### **Policy 4.1.11 – Pokeno**

15. This Policy relates just to Pokeno but represents a serious missed opportunity to provide strategic direction about the growth of the town. The potential for growth in Pokeno and the ability to provide for a variety of housing densities should be recognised. At a minimum, I consider the policy should include some of the same matters as the policy for Tuakau (4.1.10). My proposed amendments are:

#### **4.1.11 Policy – Pokeno**

(a) Pokeno is developed to ensure;

(i) occurs in a manner that promotes the development of a variety of housing densities, diversity of building styles and a high quality living environment

(ii) Subdivision, land use and development of new residential and industrial growth areas does not compromise the potential further growth and development of the town;

(iii) Walking and cycling networks are integrated with the existing urban area; and

(iv) Reverse sensitivity effects from on the strategic transport infrastructure networks are avoided or minimised.

16. Further amendments to the policy are likely to be required in the future in light of new information and the rezonings.

#### **Policy 4.7.7 – Achieving Sufficient Development Density To Support The Provision Of Infrastructure Services**

17. I do not consider that the drafting of the policy is appropriate. For example, it directs the 'maximum potential yield' for the zone be achieved with subdivision and development. For subdivision this means that the minimum lot sizes is the only lot size available, with no opportunity for a variety of lots to achieve a variety of housing types and price points.