











- 1.9 Ms Alec Duncan submitted planning evidence on behalf of the Ministry of Education. Ministry of Education sought to change the activity status of educational facilities in the Rural Zone within the Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct, from discretionary to restricted discretionary activity. Ms Duncan stated that a restricted discretionary activity status is appropriate as educational facilities are considered an essential social infrastructure in rural areas. Ms Duncan also stated that the restricted discretionary activity status would enable Council to have the discretion over the effects educational activities may generate.
- 1.10 Ms Lucy Smith, on behalf of Terra Firma Resources Limited, tabled evidence requesting their submission be formally addressed as part of the Hearing 11 process. Mr Matheson confirmed the submission matter relating to the commercial activity definition for a proposed Puketirini rezoning would be addressed in Hearing 25 (zone extents).<sup>10</sup> As we have zoned the Puketirini block as Future Urban Zone in Decision Report 28G (rather than a live zone), the need for an expanded commercial activity definition in respect of this land does not arise.

#### **4. Panel's Decision and Reasons**

- 1.11 We acknowledge that the Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct area has been subject to a comprehensive structure planning and plan change process, with extensive community involvement. We were informed that the Precinct is to provide approximately 1,600 new homes,<sup>11</sup> in a range of housing typologies. We also visited the Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct area to view the development currently being undertaken in this area.
- 1.12 Given the level of planning work that has been completed to date and the recent nature of this work (PPC20 become operative on 13 July 2018), we consider it important to ensure that the Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct is in general alignment with operative PPC20 provisions. We accept that bespoke provisions, in the form of Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct, are necessary to implement the comprehensive outcomes imbedded in PPC20.
- 1.13 We acknowledge the willingness of LDL and Council to work together to reach an agreed package of provisions for the Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct. We accept the evidence of Mr Matheson and Mr Duthie, that the agreed package of provisions largely enable PPC20 provisions to be rolled over into the PDP. We have included the agreed package of provisions between LDL and Council into the PDP.
- 1.14 We also accept the recommendations of Mr Matheson on submissions which sought detailed technical amendments to the Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct provisions (such as building height, building setbacks, daylight admission, living courts, earthworks etc.). We accept the evidence of Mr Matheson that the intent of the Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct provisions is to enable intensification and its provisions were designed to deliver this outcome. Amending the provisions as sought by these submitters has the potential

---

<sup>10</sup> Paragraph 10 of the Section 42A Report, Rebuttal Evidence dated 12 March 2020.

<sup>11</sup> Paragraph 7 of Statement of Evidence of Mr Duthie, dated 26 February 2020





































































