

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA")
IN THE MATTER of Proposed Waikato District Council's ("WDC") Proposed
District Plan ("PDP"): Hearing 16 – Raglan

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF PHILIP JOHN STICKNEY ON BEHALF OF
KĀINGA ORA (FORMERLY HOUSING NEW ZEALAND
CORPORATION) (749, FS1269)**

PLANNING

27 May 2020

**ELLIS GOULD
LAWYERS
AUCKLAND**

**Level 17 Vero Centre
48 Shortland Street, Auckland
Tel: 09 307 2172 / Fax: 09 358 5215
PO Box 1509
DX CP22003
AUCKLAND**

REF: Douglas Allan / Alex Devine

1. Summary Statement

- 1.1 My full name is Philip John Stickney. I am a Senior Associate at Beca Limited. I lodged a statement of planning evidence dated 11 May 2020 on behalf of Kāinga Ora- Homes and Communities (“**Kāinga Ora**”) in relation to its submission points that have been allocated to Hearing 16 on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (“**the Proposed District Plan**” or “**PDP**”). This statement provides a summary of that evidence.
- 1.2 I acknowledge that the relevant matters to be considered in this hearing relate primarily to Raglan. However, in my opinion the intent of the higher level Strategic Directions and Objectives in Chapters 1 and 4 of the PDP will also need to be considered in the context of the specific relief sought on matters pertaining to Raglan. In addition, Kāinga Ora has an interest in the objectives, policies and provisions which govern the Business and Business Town Centre Zones and those provisions which enable and manage residential activities, which are relevant within the Raglan context.
- 1.3 In summary, the key points addressed in my evidence are:

Submissions seeking to protect the status quo in the context of higher order planning documents

- 1.4 The overarching Strategic Directions and Objectives of the PDP as well as the higher order documents such as the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity and the Regional Policy Statement envisage growth and change over time, whilst promoting the efficient use of land and infrastructure as a means to achieve positive social, economic and environmental outcomes. This is not zone-specific direction and applies to the Raglan settlement in the same way it applies to all the other settlements in the District.
- 1.5 In addition, if the population demand increase set out in the “Development Plan” for Raglan included in the Draft Waikato Economic and Urban Growth Strategy (“**Waikato 2070**”) is to be accommodated with minimal expansion of Raglan as a desired outcome, then the planning framework will have to make provision for the creation of higher density housing in and around the Town Centre as well as within the Residential Zone.
- 1.6 It is within the context of achieving the intent of these higher order documents that the relief sought in submissions should be assessed. Contrary to this direction, the relief sought by a number of submissions seek to provide a greater degree of protection and management of existing amenity and character in Raglan through mechanisms including the imposition of Conservation Overlays, restrictions on development heights and

specific provisions for resource consent processes for developments that infringe PDP standards.

- 1.7 In my view many of these submission points seek relief, which if not further refined and assessed carefully will erode the intent and direction provided by higher order planning documents which seek to enable the creation of a compact urban form and enhance the efficiency of the use of physical infrastructure and amenities already present in Raglan.
- 1.8 In relation to the submissions seeking the introduction of Raglan specific character controls, I agree with the reporting planner Ms. Salmon that further analysis via a subsequent planning process would be required prior to any tailored controls being considered to specifically target the character and amenity of Raglan. To do otherwise would in my opinion potentially frustrate the ability of Raglan to contribute to the sustainable growth and development of the District as a whole.
- 1.9 While growth and a resulting change to existing character is envisaged, if managed well, such changes such changes in character need not result in an adverse effects and will avoid progressively eroding the qualities of Raglan that the relief in the submissions seek to protect. In my view, the PDP can achieve an appropriate balance between enabling growth and managing effects on the identified landscape and built form qualities of the settlement.

Town Character Statements

- 1.10 Kāinga Ora's submission requests that the reference to Town Centre Character Statements from the Town Centre policies be deleted and replaced by a suite of provisions (drawn from the Character Statements) which could guide the intent of the future form of each respective Town Centre in the District. Previous evidence presented to the Panel highlighted concerns with the PDP's notified approach to guiding future development in this manner, namely that:
 - (a) There is an inherent "disconnect" between the more enabling Strategic Directions and Objectives which envisage change, growth and consolidation in existing urban areas and the structure of the more detailed and prescriptive Character Statements which effectively represent a "snapshot in time";
 - (b) The resulting effectiveness and useability of the Character Statements and Urban Design Guidelines as they are currently drafted in the context of a policy framework; and

(c) The administrative and user benefits to be gained from the inclusion in a policy framework.

- 1.11 I consider the relief sought in Kāinga Ora's submission point 749.10 to be important in achieving planning provisions that achieve an appropriate balance between enabling growth and managing potential for adverse outcomes. Deleting the reference to the Town Centre Character Statements within Policy 4.5.15 and including the key outcomes sought by that Character Statement instead avoids unnecessary duplication for an applicant having to address Assessment Criteria, Character Statements (and Urban Design Guidelines) as well as relevant Objectives and Policies.
- 1.12 Consistent with this, Ms. Salmon has recommended removing the reference to the Town Centre Character Statements and incorporating the outcomes of character statement into the Policy. I therefore generally support the recommended changes set out in Part 95 of the s.42A report and in particular the removal of the reference to the Town Centre Character Statements in the Policy (although I record my concern with the inclusion of subjective terms such as "eclectic" and "artistic" within the Policy). As noted by Ms. Salmon in her s42a assessment, if this recommendation is adopted, this will result in an inconsistent approach throughout the PDP for the remaining Policies dealing with the same issue for each settlement in the District. In my view, this approach should be adopted for the equivalent Policies for all other settlements across the District and note Kāinga Ora's submission provides scope for this to occur.

Philip John Stickney

27 May 2020