

UNDER the the Resource Mangement Act 1991 ("RMA")
IN THE MATTER of Proposed Waikato District Plan: Hearing 22 –
Infrastructure and Energy

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF MATTHEW ARMIN LINDENBERG ON
BEHALF OF KĀINGA ORA (FORMERLY HOUSING NEW ZEALAND
CORPORATION, 749 /FS1269)**

15 October 2020

Instructing Solicitor:

**C E Kirman
Special Counsel
Kāinga Ora - Homes and
Communities
PO Box 14594
Central Auckland 1061
E. Claire.kirman@kaingaora.govt.nz**

Solicitors Instructed:

**ELLIS GOULD
LAWYERS
AUCKLAND
REF: Douglas Allan / Alex Devine

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

1. **Summary Statement**

1.1 My full name is Matthew Armin Lindenberg. I am a Technical Director (Planning) at Beca Limited. I am providing planning evidence on behalf of Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (“**Kāinga Ora**”) in relation to submissions made on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (“**the Proposed District Plan**” or “**PDP**”). The purpose of this summary statement is to summarise my Evidence in Chief (“**EIC**”) dated 29 September 2020 and to comment on rebuttal lodged by the Council and other submitters.

2. **Summary of Evidence in Chief**

2.1 I consider a more tailored and evidence-based approach is required to the identification of the spatial extent of the National Grid Subdivision Corridor. The spatial extent of the National Grid Subdivision Corridor (and thus the associated provisions in relation to the framework for managing potential adverse effects) should better reflect the actual spatial extent of the effects which may be generated (e.g. the application of a variable width corridor, rather than the currently proposed default corridor widths).

2.2 I do not consider there has been an appropriate assessment or qualification of the costs and benefits required by section 32(2) RMA in relation to the need for a more nuanced and tailored approach to the identification of the spatial extent of the National Grid Subdivision Corridor.

3. **Rebuttal**

3.1 I have now reviewed the rebuttal evidence of Andrew Renton and Pauline Whitney on behalf Transpower New Zealand Ltd. In regard to the evidence there is one key issue to address, being the uncertainty of the future of the lines.

3.2 Mr Renton indicates there is insufficient certainty regarding the future of the lines with a decision being confirmed in the next five years.

3.3 The implications of restricting development in proximity to the lines could have potentially have long-term implications on land use patterns and development. Given the medium-term potential for the lines to be removed, I reiterate the importance of a location specific assessment coupled with appropriate mapping within the Plan.

- 3.4 On this final matter, I have noted in reviewing the PDP maps and map legend, that the Council has not sought to spatially identify the extent of either the proposed National Grid Yard or the National Grid Subdivision Corridor. It is my view that both these 'Overlay' notations require accurate spatial identification of the planning maps. Without any such identification of these 'corridors' on the planning maps, I have concerns as to how any plan user would be able to identify whether the PDP provisions relating to either the National Grid Yard or the National Grid Subdivision Corridor impact upon their land holdings, or the degree / extent of the impact on specific land holdings.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 I continue to be of the view that a more fulsome assessment of the costs and broader impacts of imposing the PDP National Grid Overlay package of provisions is required to be undertaken, particularly in relation to urban land. I consider that the currently proposed spatial extent of the National Grid Subdivision Corridor Overlay should be deleted from the PDP and reviewed in full – consistent with the approach which was undertaken through the AUP process.

Mathew Armin Lindenberg

15 October 2020

**ANNEXURE – NATIONAL GRID SUBDIVISION CORRIDOR COMPARISON
EXAMPLE (AUCKLAND)**

