

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 – Te Kowhai, Horotiu, Ngaruawahia and Taupiri

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 reports for Hearing 25:
Zone Extents:
 - a) Ngaruawahia, Taupiri and Horotiu, prepared by Justine Ashley
 - b) Te Kowhai, prepared by Jonathan Clease
 - c) Te Kowhai – Addendum, prepared by Jonathan Clease.
3. Overall, HCC supports the approach and recommendations made in the s42A reports.
4. The following matters addressed in my rebuttal relate either to late evidence that was lodged and not responded in to in my primary evidence or where it is felt that further commentary will be of assistance. This rebuttal specifically responds to the s42A report for the following submissions:

Ngaruawahia, Taupiri and Horotiu

- a) Perry Group Limited (464.12)

Te Kowhai

- b) Te Kowhai Village – Future Urban Zone (FUZ), Village Zone and Country Living Zone (CLZ)
- c) Kilroy Investment Group (original submission made by Hounsell Holdings Limited).

PERRY GROUP

5. In my primary evidence, I supported Perry Group's submission and evidence to rezone the 1.3ha section of land adjoining the Waikato Expressway (WEX) from Rural to Residential; however, I did note that it

appeared to form part of the WEX designation. The s42A report confirms that the designation does indeed remain on this site.

6. As identified by Mr Wood on behalf of Waka Kotahi, the submitter did not identify in their evidence the constraints on this area, including stormwater drainage and noise issues.
7. In reviewing the evidence and the s42A report, I now concur with the s42A author's recommendation to oppose the rezoning. I also note and support Waka Kotahi's suggestion that if the outstanding matters are resolved, a plan change or consent process could be undertaken in relation to this portion of land in the future.

TE KOWHAI VILLAGE

8. As set out in the s42A report (FUZ (part ii)) the extent of land enabled for development at Te Kowhai does not meet the outcomes of the NPS-UD. Several iterations for zones/rules have been proposed through the various hearings.
9. As outlined in my primary evidence, HCC supports the introduction of a FUZ as the preferred option to enable a consistent approach to managing growth in the Waikato District. HCC also supports the extent of the proposed FUZ at Te Kowhai as recommended by the Te Kowhai s42A report author.
10. HCC opposed the extension of any CLZ in the District; however, given the analysis in the s42A report, I support the conclusion and recommendation to amend the CLZ boundary at Bedford Road, Te Kowhai.
11. HCC's original submission also opposed any additional Village Zoned land, including at Te Kowhai.

12. The Te Kowhai s42A report records¹ that if the Te Kowhai Airpark is confirmed, it would result in 176 and 158 Limmer Road forming an incongruous zone boundary and therefore should be rezoned Village zone from Rural zone.
13. I agree that rezoning the land up to SH39/Limmer Road would provide a more logical boundary. However, I find it hard to reconcile the rezoning of 176 and 158 Limmer Road with the arguments put forward (by multiple s42A authors) as to why Village Zone² is not appropriate in terms of the outcomes sought by the NPS-UD.³ This is not addressed by the s42A author with regard to these properties.
14. HCC still opposes any additional Village zoning at Te Kowhai. In the absence of any scope to consider an alternative zoning, HCC seeks that the Rural zoning is retained for 176 and 158 Limmer Road.

KILROY INVESTMENT GROUP (original submission by Hounsell Holdings)

15. Late evidence was lodged by the submitter and omitted in error from the Te Kowhai s42A report. An addendum was issued on 21 April 2021 to address the submitter's evidence.
16. In the evidence, the submitter sought that the Rural zone be retained, and the Hamilton Urban Expansion Area be applied to the submitter's land.
17. I have read and completely concur with Mr Cleese's analysis and recommendation to reject the submission point and retain the Rural zoning of the land.

¹ At paragraph 161 – S42A report - Hearing 25: Zone Extents Te Kowhai

² Te Kowhai s42A report; Rest of District – Hamilton Fringe s42A report in respect of Matangi

³ compact urban development, develop that can be serviced with reticulated services and housing affordability

CONCLUSION

18. HCC now supports the s42A recommendation to retain the rural zoning, considering the evidence and the s42A report in relation to the Perry Group submission to rezone the 1.3ha block to residential.

19. HCC supports the extent of the proposed FUZ at Te Kowhai and the extension of the CLZ at Bedford Road. HCC opposes the rezoning of 176 and 158 Limmer Road to Village zone.

20. HCC supports the s42A author's recommendation to retain the Rural zoning of the Hounsell Holdings block of land.

Laura Jane Galt

3 May 2021