

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of a submission by Hamilton City Council in respect of
the PROPOSED WAIKATO DISTRICT PLAN pursuant to
Clause 6 of Schedule 1 to the Act

**REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF
LAURA JANE GALT
ON BEHALF OF HAMILTON CITY COUNCIL**

3 May 2021

Hearing 25: Zone Extents – Rest of District

INTRODUCTION

1. My full name is Laura Jane Galt. My qualifications and experience are set out in my primary statement of evidence (10 March 2021).
2. My rebuttal is in response to the following s42A report for Hearing 25: Zone Extents:
 - a) Rest of District – Hamilton Fringe, prepared by Catherine Boulton
 - b) Rest of District, prepared by Susannah Tait
 - c) Rest of District – Addendum, prepared by Catherine Boulton.
3. In general, HCC supports the approach and recommendations made in the s42A reports.
4. My rebuttal addresses matters only where my primary did not address the submission as no evidence was received or it is felt further commentary would be of assistance. This rebuttal specifically responds to the s42A for the following areas:
 - Rest of District – Hamilton Fringe**
 - a) Urban Expansion Area (UEA)
 - b) Ruakura
 - c) Puketaha
 - Rest of District**
 - d) Martin Lane, Horsham Downs
 - e) Gordonton.

URBAN EXPANSION AREA

5. HCC supports the s42A author's analysis and recommendation regarding the land identified as R2 to retain the Rural zone with the UEA overlay.

RUAKURA

6. In error, at paragraph 101, the s42A report states that there is only one submission point (341.2¹) that relates to the rezoning of the Tainui Group Holdings (TGH) land at Ruakura. Submission 341.1², on which HCC made a further submission, should also be part of the analysis. HCC only made a further submission on 341.1; subsequently, the s42A report does not address my primary evidence³, which in summary sets out that:

HCC is unable to support full industrial rezoning of this land at this stage as the necessary work in relation to Future Proof and the Metro Spatial Plan (**MSP**) in this area is ongoing. In the alternative, however, HCC considers that it could support the land becoming:

- a) a Deferred Industrial Zone (provided appropriate infrastructure and staging triggers are put in place); or
 - b) a Future Urban Zone (**FUZ**), provided the identified urban land uses are limited to industrial activities
7. While this option was proposed in my primary evidence, I now take note of the s42A report, which identifies that the site is located on high class soils. Subdivision, development and use, which would take place if the industrial rezoning proceeded, would be inconsistent with the WRPS Objective 3.26, which seeks to protect high class soils from inappropriate uses.
8. The s42A author also questions whether the effects will be able to be managed in the absence of even a high-level assessment of effects. The author concludes, in the absence of suitable technical reporting, that rezoning the land would be inappropriate.
9. HCC still supports a conditional deferred industrial zone or FUZ. However, it may be that – in the absence of the higher order documents supporting such a change and/or evidence to support the zoning change – it is still premature to rezone through the PDP process.

¹ 341.2 – requests the introduction of Ruakura Industrial provisions in the Industrial Zone.

² 341.1 – requests the rezoning the TGH lots east of the Waikato Expressway from Rural to the New Ruakura Industrial Zone.

³ At paragraphs 46 – 54 HCC primary evidence for Zone extents – Rest of District

10. HCC acknowledge that further analysis of this land is supported and is best pursued as part of the Tier One Implementation Initiative for the Central Corridor Priority Development Area set out in the Metro Spatial Plan which states:

Investigate alternative land use arrangements for the long-term development of Ruakura, including to the east of the Waikato Expressway.

PUKETAHA

11. HCC supports the s42A author's analysis and recommendation to reject the submission of the Burton Trust (344.3) seeking the identification of land at Puketaha as Future Urban.

HORSHAM DOWNS

12. The Village Church Trust sought either the rezoning or an extension of the UEA overlay of properties south of Marin Lane and bounded by the Waikato Expressway and Resolution Drive designations to the south and east.
13. The s42A author identifies that the submission is relatively broad in scope and outlines (in paragraphs 187 – 201) four potential options for the area.
14. HCC supports the s42A author's preferred approach to retain the Rural zone in this area.
15. In addition to the s42A analysis of the options, HCC also notes that the UEA overlay applies only to land that has been identified in the Strategic Agreement 2020, as it will become part of Hamilton City Council's jurisdiction in the future. Areas not identified as part of the Strategic Agreement cannot have the UEA overlay applied through the District Plan.

GORDONTON

16. D & B Yzendoorn (292.4 and 292.5) sought the rezoning of 1002 and 1012 Gordonton Road from Rural to Residential. The s42A report recommends that 1002 be rezoned to residential, but 1012 retains its Rural zoning.
17. The submitters' evidence was received late, and I did not address it in my primary evidence. HCC supports the s42A author's recommendation; in particular, HCC has no specific objection to the rezoning of the smaller lot (1002 Gordonton Road) as it will confirm the status quo.

CONCLUSION

18. HCC supports the s42A recommendations regarding retaining the notified Rural zone for the UEA, Puketaha, and Horsham Downs.
19. HCC supports rezoning 1002 Gordonton Road to Residential and retaining the Rural Zone for 1012 Gordonton Road.
20. HCC proposed a deferred industrial zone or FUZ as another option to TGH's full Industrial rezoning request. However, I am now cognisant of the matters raised by the s42A author, lack of evidence and support of high order documents, to allow any rezoning through the current WDC PDP process.

Laura Jane Galt

3 May 2021