

**UNDER**

the Resource Management Act  
1991 ("**RMA**")

**IN THE MATTER**

of the Proposed Waikato District  
Plan: Hearing 25 – Zone Extents.

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CAMERON WALLACE ON BEHALF OF  
KĀINGA ORA-HOMES AND COMMUNITIES**

**URBAN DESIGN**

**12 MAY 2021**

---

---

**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. Introduction

- 1.1 My full name is Cameron Wallace. I am an Associate Urban Designer at Barker and Associates. I am providing urban design evidence on behalf of Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities (“**Kāinga Ora**”) relating to their submissions and further submissions on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (“**PDP**”). My qualifications and experience are set out in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.6 within my Evidence in Chief (“**EiC**”) dated 27 January 2021. The purpose of this statement is to summarise my EIC and Rebuttal Evidence (“**Rebuttal**”).
- 1.2 My EiC and Rebuttal for Hearing 25 addresses various provisions relating to Kāinga Ora’s proposed Medium Density Residential Zone (“**MDRZ**”) and its spatial extent across various settlements within the Waikato District.
- 1.3 A review of the various s42a reports covering individual settlements across the District and subsequent rebuttal evidence by s42a report authors indicates that Council officers are broadly in agreement with the proposed provisions and spatial extent of the MDRZ as advocated by Kāinga Ora and refined through the spatial analysis I undertook and set out within my EiC.
- 1.4 The primary matter with which I disagree with the recommendations of the Council in the s42A as it relates to the proposed MDRZ is the inclusion of additional development controls and matters of discretion deliberately designed to reduce flexibility in typology choice and yield as well as its spatial extent around the margin which I consider is inconsistent with the strategic direction of the PDP and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (“**NPS-UD**”).

## 2. Summary of Evidence

- 2.1 My EiC and Rebuttal sets out the methodology I undertook to spatially analyse and refine Kāinga Ora’s proposed MDRZ extent as set out in its primary submission in a manner which I consider to be consistent with the relevant policy framework and good urban design practice. In particular, the methodology and analysis took into

account changes in national policy direction as a result of the gazetting of the NPS-UD as well as the notification of the natural hazards provisions of the PDP in July 2020 subsequent to notification of the PDP and Kāinga Ora's primary submission. The result of this further analysis saw a reduction in the proposed extent of the MDRZ between submission and the preparation of evidence for Topic 25 from 712ha to 372ha.

### ***MDRZ Provisions***

- 2.2 I address Kāinga Ora's submissions relating to the introduction of a new MDRZ in section 5 of my EiC and section 2 of my Rebuttal. Paragraph 5.4 of my EiC highlights a range of refinements to the proposed matters of discretion to provide more specificity to applicants and Council officers, remove matters which would be duplicated with matters of discretion relevant for infringements to the core development controls, and more clearly link back to the expected design outcomes set out within the objectives and policies of the MDRZ. Paragraphs 2.6 – 2.8 of my Rebuttal then set out the rationale for further modifications in response to matters raised by Council which, based on my experience, I consider to be useful in informing or assessing more intensive residential developments.
- 2.3 Section 2.9 – 2.15 of my Rebuttal addresses additional development controls Council have sought to apply to the MDRZ. I consider that these issues can largely be addressed through refinements to Kāinga Ora's proposed controls, matters of discretion and policies rather than a wholesale insertion of new additional controls.
- 2.4 Overall, from an urban design perspective, I consider the changes to the proposed provisions as set out within my EiC and Rebuttal to be positive and more reflective of the strategic objectives of the PDP and aligned with relevant regional and national policies as they relate to urban design matters.

### ***MDRZ Extent***

- 2.5 I address the methodology used to determine a refined extent of the MDRZ within section 6 and 7 of my EiC. Sections 8 – 15 of my EiC

and sections 3 – 8 of my Rebuttal then provide more detailed settlement specific comments regarding the spatial extent of the zone. These are supported by a series of analytical maps within Appendix 3 of my EiC.

- 2.6 In general, the proposed extent of the MDRZ as established in my EiC is broadly aligned with that of Council officers. Key differences between myself and Council relate to the underlying zoning of schools, the need to safeguard potential expansion to business zones at some undefined point over the next 50 years, a response to natural hazards and the zoning of recently developed land. Many of the concerns raised by Council do not directly relate to the most appropriate use of the land from an urban design perspective but appear more focussed on procedural matters in terms of a site's contribution towards housing assessments required under the NPS-UD.

### **3. Conclusion**

- 3.1 Overall, it is my opinion that the notified provisions of the PDP are not the most appropriate or effective methods, in urban design terms, of achieving the higher order objectives of the PDP and the purpose of the RMA. The relief sought by Kāinga Ora, as well as the related changes I have discussed in my EiC and Rebuttal are, in my opinion, more appropriate means for achieving strategic objectives of the PDP, objectives and policies of the NPS-UD and the purpose of the RMA. I am happy to take any questions you may have.

**Cameron Wallace**  
**12/05/2021**