

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991  
("RMA" or "the Act")

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of a submission pursuant to Clause 6 of  
Schedule 1 of the Act in respect of the  
**PROPOSED WAIKATO DISTRICT  
PLAN** by Pokeno Village Holdings  
Limited (submitter no. 368 / further  
submitter no. 1281)

### **SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF COLIN BOTICA**

1. My name is Colin Botica. I am a Director and Project Manager of Pokeno Village Holdings Limited ("PVHL"). I prepared a statement of evidence dated 10 March 2021. The purpose of this statement is to summarise that statement.

#### **Pokeno Village Holdings Limited**

2. PVHL is developing land at Pokeno as the Pokeno Village Estate and the Pokeno Gateway Business Park. PVHL's vision for Pokeno is to:
  - (a) Create an urban village to thrive within a rural backdrop, offering a mix of residential, employment and recreational opportunities; and
  - (b) Give businesses the benefit of a town that is growing alongside their needs, where employees can live and work in Pokeno.

#### **Pokeno Structure Plan**

3. The PSP has to date provided the framework for the growth and development of Pokeno. Extensive consultation was undertaken with stakeholders during the Pokeno structure planning processes, and has been ongoing during the implementation phase. In my opinion, the principles that have informed the development of Pokeno remain relevant and it would be a great loss if they were simply disregarded in the PWDP decision making process.

#### **PVHL's involvement**

4. PVHL is fully alert to the aspirations of WDC, Futureproof and other parties to grow and expand Pokeno.
5. PVHL has had a dominant role in the growth of Pokeno and is uniquely placed to assist the Panel in making decisions about the expansion of Pokeno. PVHL has a number of

concerns about the submissions seeking rezoning and the guidance provided by WDC about the manner in which they should be considered. The overarching concern is that the PWDP does not provide a mechanism to ensure a holistic approach to consideration of submissions.

### **Concerns about the PWDP and submissions**

6. Although WDC appears to support the rezoning of areas identified for development in Waikato 2070, I am unaware of any analysis of the cumulative impacts in technical areas such as stormwater and transportation. The construction of stormwater and transport infrastructure in Pokeno is already lagging, so significant investment would be required to support growth.

### **Supply of business land**

7. It is important to ensure there is an appropriate balance between residential and non-residential land to ensure there are adequate opportunities to live, work and play locally in Pokeno.
8. However, it is important that a balance be achieved between residential and non-residential land, to ensure a lack of local business land and a consequential lack of proximate work opportunities, does not occur as a result of the rezoning proposals.

### **Landscape and visual effects**

9. PVHL also opposes urban development above RL100, which in my opinion would undermine one of the key principles which has guided development to date – that development sits within the surrounding ridgelines, creating an urban village in a rural setting.
10. The submission by Havelock Village Limited seeks to zone land for residential use immediately adjacent to and elevated above Pokeno's industrial area. The industrial area of Pokeno was carefully located to avoid conflict with residential and other activities and industrial businesses have located there because of this. I am concerned that zoning adjacent land for residential use will undermine the usefulness of employment zoned areas of Pokeno as a result of reverse sensitivity issues. I understand that this is a major concern for a number of the industrial operators, including Hynds Pipe Systems. PVHL owns two warehouse and office facilities in the Gateway Business Park, and is lodging consent for a third facility. PVHL therefore shares Hynds' concerns about the Havelock Village Limited submission as a long-term industrial building owner in Pokeno.

## **Conclusions**

11. PVHL does not oppose in principle the growth of Pokeno. There is clearly demand for growth which should be provided for. However, I am concerned that in providing for that growth, we should not undermine the very things that have made Pokeno such a success to date.
12. This means in particular keeping development off the ridgelines, providing for an appropriate balance of residential and commercial land and only "live" zoning land which can be supported by existing and planned infrastructure.
13. In my opinion, Future Urban zoning could be used where there is uncertainty about the availability of infrastructure to service growth, particularly in terms of stormwater and transport infrastructure.

**Colin Botica**

**12 May 2021**