

**Before an Independent Hearings Panel**

**The Proposed Waikato District Plan (Stage 1)**

**In the Matter** of the Resource Management Act 1991 **(Act)**

**And**

**In the Matter** hearing submissions and further submissions on the  
Proposed Waikato District Plan (Stage 1):  
**Topic 25 – Zone Extents**

---

**Summary of Evidence of Ian Munro on behalf of Pokeno West Limited (Submitter  
# 97)**

**(Urban Design)**

**Dated 12 May 2021**

---

## Primary evidence

1. In my opinion the land identified in the submission of Pokeno West Limited ("**The Submission**" and "**The Submitter**") merits residential re-zoning in urban design terms and under the applicable Waikato Regional Policy Statement ("**RPS**") (sections 6 and 6A) and Proposed Waikato District Plan ("**PDP**") (chapter 4<sup>1</sup>) planning frameworks.
2. The re-zoning sought is also consistent with the sub-regional Future Proof strategy, and the Waikato District Council's ("**The Council's**") Waikato 2070 growth strategy. The re-zoning sits beyond the urban area identified in the Council's (2008) Pokeno Structure Plan but of note the land identified for growth in 2008 has been effectively consumed. Approximately 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the re-zoning is specifically identified as a 1-10 year residential growth area for Pokeno in Waikato 2070.
3. The relief sought has two limbs. In the first instance, a residential zone in line with that Notified by the Council is sought. In the second instance, the above would be augmented by the addition of a Medium Density Residential zone (primarily as a consequence of the submission made by Kainga Ora), as well as an indicative Neighbourhood Centre. I am comfortable with either scenario, although the refined 'medium density' variant would be the superior of the two in my opinion on the basis of more efficient use of the land and provision for greater housing choice.
4. In either scenario, but particularly if the 'medium density' scenario is supported, I recommend the addition of a Precinct Plan that identifies the approximate locations of key roads through the new zone(s), and indicative locations of future public open space. These will provide what I regard as appropriate design direction to ensure a strategically integrated built form outcome is achieved (such as if the land was developed by way of incremental consent applications

---

<sup>1</sup> **Topic 10**, Council reply version.

over time). A suggested Precinct Plan is included as **Attachment 9** in my primary evidence.

5. The submissions (Kwanghoon Yang (#360); Pokeno Village Holdings Ltd. (#386); Se Gi Noh (#502); Anna Noakes (#524); and Terry Withers (#598)) and further submissions (Hynds Ltd. (#FS 1341); and Pokeno Village Holdings Ltd. (#FS 1281)) that specifically focused on the Submission did not raise what I regard as fundamental issues or potential adverse effects. They did not in my opinion challenge “if” the land is capable of residential development. I instead consider they raised questions of “how” the land might be developed including queries relating to specific technical solutions or constraint responses. In my opinion these are matters that are to be addressed through the very detailed subdivision resource consent process that would come into play after the re-zoning had occurred.
6. In terms of the Council’s s.42A Framework report prepared by Dr. Mark Davey (19 January 2021), and the Future Urban Zone and Residential Medium Density Zone report prepared by Mr. Jonathan Cleese (26 January 2021), these have not raised any issues that have led me to reconsider the conclusions I have reached.

### **Rebuttal of Council s.42A report and expert evidence of submitters**

#### *Limiting development below RL100*

7. Although only very slightly affecting the Pokeno West Ltd (“**PWL**”) land, I disagree with Ms. Rachel de Lambert<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of Hynds Pipes Systems Ltd and Pokeno Village Holdings Ltd) that restricting residential development so as to be below an elevation of RL100 is a properly justified or relevant outcome in urban design terms. In my opinion it would substantially undermine achievement of the compact settlement approach sought by the National Policy Statement: Urban Development (“**NPS: UD**”), Waikato Regional policy Statement (“**RPS**”) and the Proposed Waikato District Plan (“**PDP**”), which is in my view the resource management outcome to be afforded principal weighting.

---

<sup>2</sup> Evidence of Rachel Virginia de Lambert, 17 March 2021, paragraphs 5.1 – 5.11.

8. In my opinion, if the RL100 barrier was a relevant resource management outcome, in urban design / urban form terms, the Council would have included it within the Operative District Plan at the time the 2009 Pokeno Structure Plan was prepared and rolled-into the District Plan through Plan Change 24. 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.

*Medium density residential zone, neighbourhood centre and precinct plan*

9. Mr. David Mead (s.42A report on behalf of the Council) recommends that the land be zoned residential without a medium density residential zone, neighbourhood centre, or precinct plan<sup>3</sup>. I disagree with his reasoning and it appears he seeks a de-facto subdivision consent be resolved before the zoning of land can commence. I regard this as not consistent with the standard practice of zoning land and then enabling more detailed outcomes to be tested and evaluated via resource consents.
10. Although I consider his preference to be less effective and efficient in urban design terms than the more prescriptive outcome I prefer and explained in my primary evidence, I still accept that it is workable given that the residential zone provisions do envisage neighbourhood centres and higher density housing.

**Ian Colin Munro**

12 May 2021

---

<sup>3</sup> Evidence of David William Arthur Mead, 14 April 2021, paragraph 233.