

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF CHRISTOPHER JAMES SCRAFTON ON BEHALF
OF POKENO VILLAGE HOLDINGS LIMITED (SUB NO. 368 / FS NO. 1281)**

PLANNING

Approach to future urban growth

1. Pokeno Village Holdings Limited ("PVHL") is concerned with the Proposed Waikato District Plan's ("PWDP") overall approach to providing for future urban growth. I agree with these concerns and consider that significant amendment to the strategic direction of the PWDP is required to encourage and manage urban growth in the manner required by the higher order planning documents.
2. In my view, additional planning methods (such as structure planning requirements and guidance) are required to enable the appropriate co-ordination of urban development and infrastructure capacity in a manner required by both the National Policy Statement: Urban Development Capacity (NPS:UDC) and the Regional Policy Statement (RPS).
3. Such methods (notwithstanding the merits of specific details) were previously included in the Draft Waikato District Plan (Draft WDP) prior to notification but these methods (the Deferred Zone) were deleted without consideration of modification prior to notification of the PWDP as they were correctly deemed to be ultra vires. In my view, the lack of consideration of an alternate approach which requires structure planning and a first schedule RMA process to change zoning within the PWDP constitutes a significant flaw of the section 32 analysis.
4. As a consequence, land that was identified with the Deferred Zone in the Draft Plan has been live zoned in the PWDP. I am unaware of any additional technical analysis undertaken by Council prior to notification to justify the decision to live zone what was previously "Deferred" Zone (or areas under discussion such as Pokeno West).
5. I consider that the application of live zoning at Pokeno West does not meet the requirements of the NPS:UDC or the RPS for the following reasons:
 - (a) There is insufficient evidence to suggest that the area can feasibly be developed;
and
 - (b) There is insufficient evidence to suggest that there is sufficient infrastructure capacity to service the proposed development.
 - (c) The PWDP does not give effect to Policies 6.1 and 6.3 of the RPS.
6. I have provided a section 32AA evaluation in my primary statement of evidence which evaluated two additional options for providing for future urban growth that were not considered in Council's section 32A analysis. In my opinion, either additional option from

my section 32AA evaluation constitutes a more appropriate way of achieving the requirements of the RPS and the NPS:UDC. In this regard, I consider that additional methods should be included in the PWDP to encourage and guide future urban development and that Objective 4.1.1 should be appropriately amended to reflect this.

7. I note that this inclusion of a Future Urban Zone in the PWDP has not been addressed by Mr Matheson in his rebuttal statement of evidence for Waikato District Council.

Reinsertion of the Pokeno Structure Plan

8. PVHL's submission point (386.6) on the inclusion of the Pokeno Structure Plan (PSP) in the PWDP has been allocated to Hearing 26 Other Matters. I consider that Hearing 10 on the Residential Zone is better suited to consider incorporation of the PSP. This is because the track change provisions can be considered along with the Residential Zone. Therefore, I propose to provide track change provisions of the precinct at Hearing 10. However, I have raised this matter in this hearing, to support my recommended changes with regard to structure plan requirements and including structure plans in the PWDP.
9. By way of background, the PSP formed the basis for a private plan change that was prepared by the landowners' consortium and adopted by the Franklin District Council in October 2008. This plan change became PC24 to the Franklin District Plan. The decision enabled the urban expansion of Pokeno from a village of approximately 500 people to an "urban village" with a town centre, public reserves, and a population of approximately 5,000 people and approximately 80 hectares of industrial land. PVHL has been implementing the PSP for over a decade in accordance with the provisions introduced through PC24. In 2018 an additional 26 hectares of land was added to the PSP area pursuant to Plan change 21 ("PC21") to the Waikato District Plan: Franklin Section.
10. The PSP and associated provisions (the Pokeno provisions) have not been included in the PWDP. I have found no justification for the decision to not to include the Pokeno provisions or the PSP in the PWDP. Instead the Residential Zone has been applied to the PSP area.
11. As there are still approximately 1,000 sections to be developed within the PSP area (including 650 PVHL sections and 350 other developers), I consider that the PSP and specific Pokeno provisions should be reintroduced into the PWDP as a precinct and applied to the PSP area as per PCs 24 and 21.
12. In this regard, in his rebuttal statement of evidence Mr Tollemache has raised concerns with my recommended addition to Policy 4.1.11, in particular that I am suggesting:
 - (a) That the inclusion of reference to "approved structure plans" suggests that structure plans are outside of the District Plan; and
 - (b) That development in Pokeno can only occur in general accordance with the PSP.

13. With regards to (a), this is not the intention of the recommended amendment to Policy 4.1.11 and I agree with Mr Tollemache that having structure plans sitting outside of the District Plan is not good planning practice. My proposed amendments to Policy 4.1.11 are proposed as part of a wider suite of amendments relating to the inclusion of structure plans as District Plan methods. In this scenario, an approved structure plan is intended to be a structure plan that has been brought into the PWDP by way of a first schedule RMA process as discussed above. In this regard, Mr Tollemache and myself appear to be in agreement that it is appropriate for subdivision and development to be in general accordance with a structure plan where it is included in the District Plan. In my view, this approach should be reflected in the policy framework of the PWDP.
14. With regards to (b), it is not the intention of the proposed amendments to Policy 4.1.11 to limit all urban development of Pokeno to just development that is in general accordance with the PSP, however it is the intention that development within the PSP area should be in general accordance with the PSP. The intention of the proposed amendment is to reintroduce the PSP into the PWDP and for the PSP to be applied to the PSP area as per PCs 24 and 21. I would anticipate that any development outside of the PSP area would require an additional structure planning and associated first schedule RMA process to enable urbanisation. In this regard, I note that currently the PSP is the only structure plan in Pokeno that has been through a first schedule RMA process and I consider that new structure plans should equally be expected to go through a similar process and rigour.
15. I note that this reinsertion of the Pokeno Structure Plan into the PWDP has not been addressed by Mr Matheson in his rebuttal statement of evidence for Waikato District Council.

Density Targets for Pokeno

16. PVHL sought that the density targets for Pokeno (as contained in Policy 4.1.5(b) Density) be deleted or amended to "greater than 10 dwellings per hectare" in accordance with the WRPS.
17. I note that this matter was addressed through the PC21 hearing in 2018 and that the decision concluded that a density of "greater than 10 dwellings per hectare" was appropriate for Pokeno. This decision was informed by a number of factors, including the fact that the most developable land within the PSP has already been recently developed at a density of around 10 dwellings per hectare meaning that achieving higher average density targets across the PSP area would require a much higher density of development in the areas least suited to it. I therefore consider that the PC21 decision should be retained in the PWDP as it relates to Pokeno.
18. Mr Matheson in his rebuttal section 42A report has accepted my recommended amendment.