

**Before an Independent Hearings Panel**

**The Proposed Waikato District Plan (Stage 1)**

**IN THE MATTER OF** the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

**IN THE MATTER OF** hearing submissions and further submissions on the Proposed  
Waikato District Plan (Stage 1) Hearing 10:  
**Topic 10 – Residential**

---

**PRIMARY EVIDENCE OF MARK SEYMOUR MANNERS TOLLEMACHE  
ON BEHALF OF HAVELOCK VILLAGE LIMITED**

**4 February 2020**

---

**BUDDLE FINDLAY**  
NEW ZEALAND LAWYERS

Barristers and Solicitors  
Auckland

Solicitor Acting: **Vanessa Evitt / Mathew Gribben**

Email: [vanessa.evitt@buddlefindlay.com](mailto:vanessa.evitt@buddlefindlay.com) / [mathew.gribben@buddlefindlay.com](mailto:mathew.gribben@buddlefindlay.com)  
Tel 64-9-358 2555 PO Box 1433 DX CP24024 Auckland 1140

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My full name is Mark Seymour Manners Tollemache. I am an independent planning consultant and Director of Tollemache Consultants Limited. I confirm that I have the qualifications and expertise previously set out in my primary planning evidence for Topic 1.<sup>1</sup>

1.2 I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.

### Scope of evidence

1.3 My evidence provides planning assessment and commentary on the submissions (862) and further submissions of Havelock Village Ltd (**HVL**) (FS1291 and FS1377).

## 2. PRECINCT SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR HAVELOCK SITE

2.1 HVL submitted on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (**PWDP**) seeking a site specific approach for residential development and subdivision on its land at Pokeno with a precinct and associated development rules for its primary relief. At the time the submitter was relatively comfortable with the notified district-wide Residential Zone rules.

2.2 However, as alternative relief HVL sought changes to the Residential Zone chapter as a whole (objectives, policies and rules) to give effect to its residential proposal in the event the site specific approach was not adopted.<sup>2</sup> Those general submission points have not been specifically coded to Topic 10.

2.3 HVL continues to seek a precinct specific approach for its site. I consider such an approach is appropriate to rezoning requests such as that sought by HVL, and the PWDP already acknowledges this. For example, the Te Kauwhata Precinct Rule 16.5 relates solely to that precinct and uses location specific rules to address subdivision and development matters which are unique to that location rather than relying solely on the District-wide Residential Zone rules. Similarly, HVL is developing specific

---

<sup>1</sup> See paragraphs 2.1 – 2.4, Tollemache primary planning evidence for Havelock Village Limited for Hearing Topic 1 dated 16 September 2019.

<sup>2</sup> See for example items 28 and 29 on page 24 of the original submission by HVL.

provisions for the Havelock site which will be presented as part of the rezoning hearings in late 2020.

### **3. SINGLE RESIDENTIAL ZONE**

3.1 I note that PWDP contains a single Residential Zone. From my experience, this is not generally the approach in second generation district plans where a more fine grain approach is required to address the wider range of lower to higher density residential outcomes. These may be encouraged in particular towns, along with the enabling of higher densities in locations which support amenity and land use and transport integration, along with the efficient use of the land resource. Where a single Residential Zone is proposed, I consider the use of medium density housing overlays and bespoke precincts are valuable to frame development opportunities and constraints. Consequently, these approaches are being developed for the Havelock site where bespoke approaches are more appropriate than the adoption of a district-wide set of provisions.

3.2 I understand other submitters such as Kāinga Ora are seeking to amend the PWDP to include new residential zones. Its requested amendments may provide a suitable alternative approach and if necessary I will provide rebuttal evidence on this matter.

### **4. RESPONSE TO SECTION 42A REPORT**

4.1 HVL made a number of further submissions (FS1377) on the submissions to the Residential Zone rules, and these are addressed in the section 42A report. Some further submissions have been accepted while others have been rejected. I do not propose to address those in detail. Subject to reviewing the evidence of other submitters, I consider the further submissions have been adequately addressed. Overall, I am comfortable that appropriate residential provisions for the Havelock site can be addressed in the rezoning hearings in late 2020.

**Mark Tollemache**

4 February 2020