

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):

Topic 25 – Zone Extents

**REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF ROBERT JAMES PRYOR
ON BEHALF OF POKENO WEST LTD**

(Landscape and Visual)

9 May 2021

Counsel Instructed:

Peter Fuller
LLB, MPlan, DipEnvMgt, BHortSc.
Barrister
Quay Chambers
Level 7, 2 Commerce Street
PO Box 106215
Auckland 1143
021 635 682
Email: peter.fuller@quaychambers.co.nz

1. SUMMARY OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE

- 1.1 Development enabled by the proposed urbanisation of the Pokeno West land (the '**Munro Block**') could be visually accommodated within the Pokeno landscape without adversely affecting the character, aesthetic value and integrity of the surrounding urban and wider rural environment. I consider that the site topography and indicative concept plan for the Munro Block allows for a suitable retention of the visual and landscape components identified through previous plan change processes, namely the rural backdrop and the ridgeline as visual containment to Pokeno.
- 1.2 Given the small area of land exceeding RL100 in the site, I do not consider that there is any merit from restricting these areas from being rezoned as sought in Ms de Lambert's evidence. With the extent of the RL100 contours encroachment being minimal, restricting development in this area (by maintaining the Rural Zone) is not warranted on landscape or visual merits.
- 1.3 I concur with the Section 42A Hearing Report that notes that the RL100 principle is not part of the PWDP and concludes that the proposal will appropriately retain the visual and landscape components identified¹.
- 1.4 Any potential adverse landscape and visual effects on the environment will be acceptable within the surrounding landscape context.

2. INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 This rebuttal statement relates to the evidence in opposition filed by Rachel de Lambert for Hynds Pipe Systems Ltd ('**Hynds**') and Pokeno Village Holdings Limited ('**PVHL**').
- 2.2 I confirm that I have the qualifications and expertise previously set out in paragraphs 1.1 – 1.3 of my primary evidence dated 17 February 2021.
- 2.3 I repeat the confirmation given in my primary evidence that I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and that my evidence has been prepared in accordance with that Code.

¹ Section 42A Report, paragraph 242

3. EVIDENCE OF RACHEL VIRGINIA DE LAMBERT FOR HYNDS PIPE SYSTEMS AND POKENO VILLAGE HOLDINGS LIMITED

3.1 Ms de Lambert expresses concern that a portion of the Munro Block extends on to higher land that defines the rural backdrop and visual containment of Pokeno to the north and north west. She considers that the retention of a rural backdrop and protection of the ridgelines and land above RL100 from urban development was a key tenant in the overall structure planning for Pokeno.

3.2 I consider that the site topography and the indicative concept plan prepared for the Munro Block allows for suitable retention of the visual and landscape components identified through previous plan change processes. Only a very small portion of the Munro Block sits on or above RL100 with the adjacent rural property to the west comprising the majority of land above RL100 as it rises up to Ridge Road extending along the skyline ridge up to approximately RL150.

3.3 As Mr Ian Munro has noted in his rebuttal evidence, if development was not intended to occur above RL100, Council would have included it within the Operative District Plan at the time the Pokeno Structure Plan was prepared and rolled into the District Plan through the subsequent Plan Change. The alternative would have been to identify these landforms as an Outstanding Natural Landscape, which I understand neither the ODP or PDP has done or sought to do, respectively.

3.4 I concur with the Section 42A Hearing Report that notes that the RL100 principle is not part of the PWDP and concludes that the proposal will appropriately retain the visual and landscape components identified².

3.5 Given the small area of land exceeding RL100 in the site, I do not consider that there is any merit from restricting these areas from being rezoned as sought in the Ms de Lambert's evidence. With the extent of the RL100 contours encroachment being minimal, restricting development in this area (by maintaining the Rural Zone) is not warranted on landscape or visual merits.

4. CONCLUSION

4.1 Having read the statement of evidence of Ms Rachel de Lambert I remain of the opinion that development enabled by the urbanisation of the Munro Block can be visually

² Section 42A Report, paragraph 242

accommodated within the landscape without adversely affecting the character, aesthetic value and integrity of the surrounding urban and rural environment.

4.2 I consider that appropriate mechanisms have been adopted within the indicative concept plan to ensure the retention of a rural backdrop and protection of the ridgeline will be achieved in addition to the landscape and visual provisions within the PWDP.

4.3 In my opinion, any potential adverse landscape and visual effects on the environment will be acceptable within the surrounding landscape context.

Robert James Pryor

9 May 2021