

**BEFORE A PANEL OF INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS IN THE
WAIKATO REGION**

I MUA NGĀ KAIKŌMIHANA WHAKAWĀ MOTUHEKE WAIKATO

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

AND

IN THE MATTER of Proposed Variation 3 to the Waikato Proposed
District Plan (PDP)

**STATEMENT OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF KATJA HULS FOR WAIKATO DISTRICT
COUNCIL
PLANNING (THREE WATERS)**

Dated 19 JULY 2023

TOMPKINS | WAKE

Bridget Parham (bridget.parham@tompkinswake.co.nz)
Jill Gregory (jill.gregory@tompkinswake.co.nz)

Westpac House
Level 8
430 Victoria Street
PO Box 258
DX GP 20031
Hamilton 3240
New Zealand
Ph: (07) 839 4771
tompkinswake.com

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Katja Huls and I am a Senior Principal Planner at Stantec.
2. My qualifications and experience are set out in my statement of evidence in chief (EIC) dated 20 June 2023.
3. I reaffirm the commitment in my EIC to adhere to the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023.
4. I have read the evidence provided by the submitters to the Independent Hearing Panel that is relevant to my area of expertise.
5. This statement of rebuttal will respond to the evidence of:
 - (a) Katrina Andrews on behalf of the Waikato Regional Council (WRC);
 - (b) Alec Duncan on behalf of Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) in relation to capacity assessments and connections;
 - (c) Sarah Nairn on behalf of Hynds Pipe Systems (Hynds) in relation to stormwater effects;
 - (d) Michael Campbell, Phil Jaggard and Gurv Singh on behalf of Kāinga Ora in relation to stormwater management;
 - (e) Jake Deadman and Nicola Rykers on behalf of Synlait Milk Ltd;
 - (f) Mark Tollemache on behalf of Havelock Village Ltd (HVL);
 - (g) Sarah Nairn on behalf of GDP Developments Ltd;
 - (h) James Oakley on behalf of Pokeno West, West Pokeno, CSL Trust and Top End Properties Ltd (together Pokeno West);

- (i) Melissa McGrath on behalf of Pokeno Village Holdings Ltd (PVHL);
 - (j) Campbell McGregor on behalf of Hynds and the Hynds Foundation;
 - (k) Anna Noakes and Matthew Davis on behalf of the Anna Noakes and MSBCA Fruhling Trustees Company Limited (together Noakes Et al.); and
 - (l) Andrew Wood on behalf of Next Construction.
6. The fact that this rebuttal statement does not respond to every matter raised in the evidence of a submitter within my area of expertise should not be taken as acceptance of the matters raised. I have focused this rebuttal statement on the key points of difference that warrant a response.

SUMMARY

7. This rebuttal evidence sets out that in my expert opinion:
- (a) Development in the flood plain should be discouraged;
 - (b) The use of non-statutory flood mapping is problematic within the scope of Variation 3 and the PDP rule framework;
 - (c) The use of a minimum site size, setback controls and building coverage may not be the most effective way of managing stormwater effects. Submitters have suggested the use of a building platform control which would ensure that new development will have a building platform that is outside of the flood plain;
 - (d) Useful amendments could be made to the matters of discretion for SUB-R153 and matters for control for SUB-R154. These could

also be reflected in an additional rule in the natural hazards chapter. The criteria should direct consideration of Waikato District Council (Council) approved catchment management plans, Low Impact Design and stormwater issues that are specific to rural land uses;

- (e) As above, drafting amendments can be usefully made to include rules in the Natural Hazards chapter and abandon rules recommended in the s32AA to better reflect the assessment of large-scale greenfield development and smaller scale brownfields development;
- (f) The matters of discretion agreed and discussed in conferencing remain helpful for assessments of developments on sites affected by flooding as identified in the Stormwater Constraints Overlay;
- (g) I continue to support the inclusion of reference to Te Ture Whaimana – Vision and Strategy in matters of discretion but support the recommended alternative wording by submitters and the author of the s42A report;
- (h) In addition, network modelling to support explicit pipe capacity rules is not available, and advice notes with regard to three waters pipe capacity checks will be helpful; and
- (i) I remain concerned that the wording of WWS-R1 is uncertain, and that the primary concern raised by the stormwater technical review was the permitted activity status; which we have been advised cannot be amended through Variation 3. I recommend a new rule is introduced to address water quality (WWS-R1A) and manage this risk for developments of four or more residential units or subdivision of four or more lots.

8. The further amendments that I support are included in Appendix A to the section 42A rebuttal report and described in my evidence below.

RESPONSE TO MICHAEL CAMPBELL ON BEHALF OF KĀINGA ORA

9. Michael Campbell in paragraph 8.10, 8.17, 8.25 discusses the merits of preventing intensification in the flood plain and the use of a precautionary approach to manage development in the flood plain. I acknowledge that there has been confusion with regard to the minimum lot size restriction which has been proposed within the stormwater constraints overlay and the minimum lot size that has been proposed more generally to encourage denser development closer to the town centres. In my view a minimum lot size control is not required for stormwater management purposes. Ms Hill addresses the use of minimum lot sizes more generally.
10. In my opinion, development should be discouraged in the flood plain and the flood plain should be allowed to function naturally wherever possible. The long-term impact of this generates both risk and cost to the people that come to reside in the flood plain and can also generate cost to Council and insurers. I consider there is a need to take a precautionary approach. Intensification in flood hazards should be discouraged and not enabled.
11. In paragraph 8.26 of Michael Campbell's evidence, he suggests that flood hazards are better dealt with under the Natural Hazards Chapter of the PDP. I support this approach. I note that this approach was considered but discounted (in error) due to the limited scope of Variation 3. However, due to the way the Stormwater Constraints Overlay was ultimately mapped, I support the rules being included in the Natural Hazards Chapter rather than the MRZ2 Zone. I continue to support matters of discretion in the subdivision rules to reflect water quality and stormwater management considerations because these are relevant even in the absence of flooding.

RESPONSE TO KATRINA ANDREWS ON BEHALF OF WRC, TO GURV SINGH AND PHIL JAGGARD ON BEHALF OF KĀINGA ORA AND TO ANDREW WOOD ON BEHALF OF NEXT CONSTRUCTION

Consistent approach to flood hazards in the PDP

12. The submitters seek that consistent flood controls are applied to all zones including the Medium Density Residential Zone 1 (para 67 and 68 of Katrina Andrews evidence, Jaggard at 1.7, Singh at 10.1). I acknowledge that this is sensible, but this change is out of scope for Variation 3 and a decision to undertake a new plan change or variation is subject to a Council resolution, funding and resourcing.
13. The addition of planning provisions to Variation 3 to reduce the risk of inappropriate development in the flood plain is warranted because the risks are significant and the probability of them occurring is also high. It is also consistent with the RPS. I acknowledge that they may not occur immediately, but the probability of harm occurring during the life of the buildings and structures located in the flood plain is relatively high. In addition, it will be more straightforward to remove planning provisions specific to the scope of Variation 3 with more consistent, region-wide provisions than it will be to remove buildings and structures in inappropriate locations.

RESPONSE TO KATRINA ANDREWS ON BEHALF OF WRC

Naming of Overlay

14. Katrina Andrews at paragraphs 71 to 73 questions the naming and clarity of the Stormwater Constraints Overlay. I acknowledge that there was inconsistent terminology in the s32AA report. This resulted from iterative discussions on the planning approach which resulted in missed edits in the final version of the report. The intent was to create one overlay with a consistent set of rules relating to housing density that related to

medium to low-risk flood plains, and another set that related to high-risk flood plains, regardless of the origin of the flood modelling.

15. I note that the modelling to support the PDP mapped flood plains was carried out by the WRC and the modelling by Te Miro was carried out in accordance with the WRC guidelines. I note that the flood maps included in Mr Boldero's rebuttal evidence will be converted into updated Stormwater Constraints Overlay maps which will be available in the next few days.
16. Amendments to the drafting of MRZ2s-1a are recommended (paragraph 77) for consistency so that MRZ2s-1a (b) reads "Two or more" rather than "More than two". I agree with the purpose of this amendment but note MRZ2-S1a is no longer supported.
17. An additional standard is proposed in the new Natural Hazards rules to ensure that floor levels are at least 0.5m above the 1% AEP (evidence para. 81) within the Stormwater Constraints Overlay. I support this recommendation but note that expert conferencing explored and generally supported encouraging all building platforms to be located outside of the Overlay.

RESPONSE TO MARK TOLLEMACHE ON BEHALF OF HVL AND JAMES OAKLEY ON BEHALF OF POKENO WEST

The use of a minimum site size and the use of a building platform shape factor

18. Mark Tollemache objects to the use of a minimum site size to manage stormwater effects. As set out above, the minimum site size of 450m² was imposed for reasons unrelated to stormwater. Due to drafting errors, this was not clear. James Oakley recommends using a shape factor or minimum building platform size instead of the minimum site size. I support this approach for subdivision of a site with the Stormwater Constraints Overlay to require a building platform to be identified completely outside the flood plain area. A platform of with the minimum

dimensions of 8m x 15m is proposed in accordance with discussions at the expert stormwater conferencing.

19. The minimum site size was originally proposed to ensure adequate space was available for proposed buildings and for stormwater management. However, the need for space on the site to manage stormwater is site specific. As discussed in 11 above, the building platform requirement may be best inserted into the Natural Hazards chapter as a new rule that relates to the Stormwater Constraints Overlay.
20. In my opinion, the matters of discretion for subdivision of sites in the Stormwater Constraints Overlay should reflect those discussed in expert conferencing and set out in paragraph 24 below.

RESPONSE TO KATRINA ANDREWS ON BEHALF OF WRC, JAMES OAKLEY ON BEHALF OF POKENO WEST, MICHAEL CAMPBELL ON BEHALF OF KĀINGA ORA AND MATTHEW DAVIS ON BEHALF OF NOAKES ET AL.

Additional matters of discretion

21. Katrina Andrews recommends that additional matters of discretion be added to SUB-R154 to match those of SUB-R153 (evidence paragraph 79). I note that SUB-154 is a controlled activity, so the matters of control must relate to matters that the Council can control through conditions as consent cannot be declined.¹ I agree that additional matters of discretion would be useful in SUB-153 because a land-use application that is determined concurrently will rely on assessments made under WWS-R1 Stormwater systems for new development or subdivision. This rule is under appeal in the Waikato Proposed District Plan² and concerns have been raised by Andrew Boldero of Te Miro Water who completed the stormwater technical review to support Variation 3; and a submitter (Noakes Et al.) and their expert witness (Matthew Davis representing

¹ I understand that a controlled subdivision consent can still be refused under section 106 of the RMA.

² ENV-2022-AKL-000076

Noakes Et al.) regarding the effectiveness of this rule. The outcome of the appeal is unknown.

22. Therefore, I support the additional matters of discretion, as set out in the Joint Expert Statement, I also recommend including them into the new proposed WWS-R1A rule.
23. I also consider that an additional matter of control can be added to SUB-R154 to refer to stormwater quality and quantity effects.
24. Michael Campbell recommends an amendment to the matters of discretion to read “where located within the catchment of the Waikato River the extent to which the application enhances or benefits the Waikato River and its tributaries, having regard to any proposed Stormwater Management and Low Impact Design Methods”.
25. Matthew Davis in an Appendix to his evidence suggested an amended matter of discretion (k) “Stormwater management and the use of Low Impact Design methods including avoiding adverse stormwater effects on downstream properties, including erosion/scour and alteration of run-off, frequency, volume and duration”.
26. Expert conferencing held on the 11th, 12th and 13th of July 2023 also discussed the matters of discretion for SUB-R153 in detail.
27. The amendments to the matters discussed and the draft text was supported by the experts at conferencing subject to review by the Council’s Resource Consent team lead and further consideration of additional technical guidance regarding the effects related to stormwater discharges on rural land. Andrew Wood, Fiona Hill, Giles Boundy, Mark Tollemache, Matthew Davis, Ryan Pikethley attended both expert conferencing sessions, and Bill Birch and James Oakley and Katrina Andrews only attended the second session, Andrew Boldero only

attended the first session. The experts agreed further refinement was required to the following draft wording (additions to the s32AA in underline and deletions in ~~striketrough~~):

- (e) Avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards, particularly in the Stormwater Constraints Overlay;
- ~~(j) Flooding effects including safe access and egress~~
- ~~(k) stormwater management and the use of Low Impact Design methods~~
- (j) *the objectives and policies in Chapter 2-20 Te Ture Whaimana – Vision and Strategy;*
- (k) The effectiveness of the stormwater system to manage flooding (including safe access and egress), nuisance or damage to other infrastructure, buildings and sites, including the rural environment;
- (l) The capacity of the stormwater system and ability to manage stormwater;
- (m) The potential for adverse effects to the environment in terms of stormwater quantity and stormwater quality effects; and
- (n) The extent to which low impact design principles and approaches are used for stormwater management.

- 28. I note that further amendments have now been proposed to item (j) which are discussed below.
- 29. It was agreed that these need further refinement but are a reasonable representation of the issues that need to be considered at the time of subdivision.

RESPONSE TO SARAH NAIRN AND JAMES MCGREGOR ON BEHALF OF HYNDS

The inclusion of Catchment Management Plans as a matter of discretion

- 30. Sarah Nairn at paragraph 13.3 and James McGregor at 6.4, 7.13 and 7.14 recommend additional assessment criteria related to Council endorsed Stormwater Catchment Management Plans in addition to the new proposed assessment criteria in MRZ-S1, MRZ-S4, MRZ-S5, MRZ2-S10(2),

SUB-R153. I agree that this assessment criteria would be helpful to planners processing resource consents by directing them to catchment specific issues and outcomes. Catchment Management Plans can help refine stormwater solutions so that they respond to catchment specific issues and conditions. Mr Boldero also supports this proposal. I note that this was not addressed in expert conferencing, but it has merit and I have included it in the revised provisions.

RESPONSE TO ALEC DUNCAN ON BEHALF OF FENZ

31. Alec Duncan at paragraph 27 suggests that an amendment is made to MRZ2-S1 to add an activity specific standard to make water supply capacity check requirements clear by adding an item (b) “a water and/or stormwater connection approval from the network provider”.
32. I agree that clarification of network connection requirements is helpful for the plan user, but I think this can be achieved by using an advice note due to the recommendations set out in the s32AA infrastructure report supporting Variation 3 which sets out that capacity checks are intended to be managed using non-statutory processes for water and wastewater. Capacity checks are included in the assessment matters for stormwater (WWS-R1). Accordingly, I recommend that an advice note be added to MRZ2-S1 and SUB-R153 and SUB-R154 to alert plan users to this requirement.

RESPONSE TO MICHAEL CAMPBELL, GURV SINGH AND PHIL JAGGARD ON BEHALF OF KĀINGA ORA, JAMES OAKLEY FOR POKENO WEST, KATRINA ANDREWS ON BEHALF OF WRC

Including flood mapping as a non-statutory layer and referencing the 1% AEP

33. Phil Jaggard, Gurv Singh and Michael Campbell (evidence paragraphs 9.12, 10.2 and 8.27 respectively) seek to remove the proposed rules (MRZ-S1, MRZ-S4, MRZ-S5, MRZ2-S10(2), SUB-R153) that limit development potential within areas that are subject to flooding and to replace them with a non-statutory layer and a comprehensive district-

wide approach. This approach would require reference to the 1% AEP flood plain (Oakley paragraph 8.35). I acknowledge that this is a sensible approach.

34. James Oakley at paragraph 8.32 and Katrina Andrews at paragraph 67 also request that flood hazards be included as a non-statutory layer.
35. Non-statutory flood plain mapping is more responsive to climate change and the realities of flood modelling. Flood modelling is time consuming and expensive and requires constant updating to reflect current land use and zoning. When flood mapping is included in the plan maps, any updates require a full plan change process, which is time consuming and not responsive to real world changes.
36. I continue to recommend including the flood plains as a mapped overlay for Variation 3. The PDP already has flood maps included in the planning maps, and therefore the approach of introducing a new Overlay is consistent with the current PDP approach. In addition, the activity status for subdivision in the GRZ (SUB-R11) and MRZ2 is (SUB-R153 and SUB-R154) Restricted Discretionary or Controlled (subject to standards) and the approach to subdivision within the flood plain in the PDP is to apply a Discretionary Activity status (NH-R10, NH-R19) in the flood plain, with the exception of the Defended Area (Restricted Discretionary, NH-R24). The current approach links restrictions to the planning maps to give homeowners certainty with regard to the activity status of activities on their site. I am concerned that moving to a non-statutory layer will be confusing.
37. While using a non-statutory layer is pragmatic, the approach to flooding in the PDP would need to be reconsidered as a whole to make the planning framework legal. If the Stormwater Constraints Overlay were non-statutory, but the other flood hazard maps were still in the PDP, it would make the plan less legible in my view.

38. I recommend that the Council consider the benefits of a non-statutory layer if a comprehensive plan change is undertaken. I accept that the experts prefer this approach, and other Councils have started to use this approach. I understand that ideally the flood hazard maps would be updated every few years, especially where there has been land use change. Including the current Overlay into the PDP and recommending a plan change within this time frame to introduce a non-statutory layer, would mean that the overall benefits of the non-statutory layer will be achieved anyway.

RESPONSE TO NICOLA RYKERS ON BEHALF OF SYNLAIT MILK LTD:

39. Nicola Rykers (paragraph 30) recommends adding the wording to SUB-R19 matters of discretion to (g) Ponding areas and primary overland flow paths to add “within and adjoining the precinct”. I support this amendment because it directs a more holistic assessment.

RESPONSE TO MELISSA MCGRATH ON BEHALF OF PVHL

40. Melissa McGrath at paragraph 2.15 and 10.3 discusses network modelling and seeks the inclusion of pipe capacity maps as has been completed for Hamilton City Council; with an associated Restricted Discretionary Activity status.
41. Network models do exist, but in various stages of completion. According to the Asset Management Plan (Three Waters Asset Management Plan 2021) some areas are still undergoing asset data collection which is needed to inform modelling.
42. Watercare has advised that if network models were to be developed that reflect the MDRS, pipe capacity would be “red” (not available) in all locations. This is because the network was not designed for the development intensity that the MDRS enables. However, as set out in the s32AA report for Variation 3, the number of connections is relatively low,

and the asset provider and Council intend to check pipe capacity via internal processes. Adding a resource consent requirement will be less enabling of development and cannot be implemented fully within the scope of Variation 3 in all areas where intensification is enabled. That is, the MRZ1 zone could not have such a rule applied via Variation 3. For these reasons I do not support this recommendation.

RESPONSE TO ANNA NOAKES AND MATTHEW DAVIS ON BEHALF OF THE ANNA NOAKES ET AL.

43. Matthew Davis seeks that explicit objectives, policies and rules related to the alteration of flow, frequency and duration; and that specifically address potential damage (erosion/scour) from urban stormwater runoff to farm drainage and infrastructure and the breadth of flood effects are added to the PDP (paragraph 94). That the stormwater provisions are standardised (paragraph 100). That the method for determining high-risk flood plains is too high (para. 101), infilling in the flood plain should not be allowed (para. 102) and that Te Ture Whaimana should be linked with chemical contamination and stormwater quality (para. 103).
44. I agree that specific consideration of downstream stormwater effects of urbanisation on rural land, including rural infrastructure such as farm crossing and drains; and the saturation of soils (affecting stocking levels) should be addressed by the PDP so that they are specifically considered at the time of development and assessed and mitigated appropriately. I also agree that a consistent approach is helpful, that the definition of a high-risk flood plain in the RPS relates to an excessively high risk (especially for children, the elderly or persons with mobility difficulties) on which the flood modelling is based; and that Te Ture Whaimana requires that stormwater quality is managed effectively.
45. I note that many of the amendments sought in the annexure to Matthew Davis' evidence are out of scope and are also matters that can be

addressed via appeals to the PDP. However, the amended matters of discretion for SUB-R153 (and SUB-R154 if the evidence of Andrews on behalf of WRC is supported by the Panel) go some way to addressing to these concerns. The exception is the way that the high-risk flood plain is defined and modelled. While I acknowledge this issue, and understand that Mr Boldero agrees, I don't have a planning recommendation to address it at this point in time. I think this is a topic that requires further technical work and likely amendments to the Regional Policy Statement and the definitions chapter and mapping already included in the PDP

RESPONSE TO PHIL JAGGARD ON BEHALF OF KĀINGA ORA AND JAMES OAKLEY ON BEHALF OF POKENO WEST

The merit of building setbacks and building coverage to manage stormwater

46. James Oakley in paragraphs 8.41 to 8.45 and Phil Jaggard in section 12 and in paragraph 12.9 of their evidence oppose the use of setbacks and building coverage to manage stormwater effects.
47. I agree that building setbacks may be narrower if there are appropriate controls and matters of discretion for sites affected by flooding. If the Natural Hazard rules were to be amended to ensure that building platforms are outside of the flood plain, then building set-backs could be the same as those set out in the MDRS. Similarly, if the building platform is outside of the floodplain then the building coverage could be the same as the MDRS. These statements are made on the proviso that stormwater management measures are considered appropriately during the design phase of any subdivision or development, or an alternate rule (WWS-R1A) is inserted into Variation 3 to manage stormwater quality for subdivision entailing four lots or more.
48. In order to manage uncertainty with regard to the ultimate drafting of WWS-R1, I also recommend that the matters of discretion address stormwater considerations for any subdivision in MRZ2 and for

development of any land affected by the Stormwater Constraints Overlay and the flood hazards that it depicts.

RESPONSE TO MICHAEL CAMPBELL ON BEHALF OF KĀINGA ORA AND MATTHEW DAVIS ON BEHALF OF NOAKES ET AL.

Te Ture Whaimana, waterway set-backs and water quality

49. Michael Campbell in paragraph 8.18 to 8.20 seeks to remove reference in the matters of discretion to Chapter 2-20 of the PDP, Te Ture Whaimana – Vision and Strategy; and replace it with “where located within the catchment of the Waikato River the extent to which the application enhances the benefits of the Waikato River and its tributaries, having regard to any proposed Stormwater Management and Low Impact Design Methods”.
50. I disagree that the concepts added at the end of the suggested wording amendment are replacements for Te Ture Whaimana. I note that this is not my area of expertise, however, what I have heard from submissions, conferencing and evidence is that the Waikato River holds the same value as an ancestor including the tributaries to it and the groundwater, lakes and springs that are connected with it. These features contribute to or detract from the life force of the river. I’ve also heard that the life force of the river contribute to and support tangata whenua.
51. I acknowledge that the concepts of Low Impact Design (LID) support water quality outcomes, which support Te Ture Whaimana. However, it is beyond my area of expertise to say whether they do so comprehensively. Further, LID is referenced in WWS-R1 already. Therefore, I support amended wording but recommend that it be shortened to avoid narrowing the interpretation of Te Ture Whaimana as follows “where located within the catchment of the Waikato River the extent to which the application enhances the benefits of the Waikato River and its tributaries”.

52. With regard to waterway setbacks, I acknowledge that submitters have not explicitly supported or opposed them. Rather, they have generally supported or opposed the suite of rules I have recommended. I continue to support wider set-backs where the flood modelling indicates the site is affected by flooding. This is, in part, due to the principles embodied by Te Ture Whaimana (as I understand them), and in part due to the uncertainties that we face with regard to climate change. Therefore, I recommend that MRZ2-S13 include the recommended amendments as set out in the s32AA be included in the Natural Hazards chapter of the PDP rather than the zone as set out above.
53. With regard to water quality, as noted above, there is uncertainty pertaining to the effectiveness of WWS-R1. Therefore, I recommend an additional rule WWS-R1A applying to the subdivision of four or more lots in the MRZ2 as a Restricted Discretionary activity requiring a stormwater management plan which complies with the relevant comprehensive discharge consent, the Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications and (RITS).

CONCLUSION

54. Submitters have provided useful evidence and approaches to managing the effects of intensification on three waters infrastructure and outcomes.
55. In general, there is support the recommended approach by the Council for water and wastewater infrastructure.
56. There are a number of useful recommendations with regard to the location of the rules in the PDP with regard to sites affected by flooding and assessment criteria.
57. There are related recommendations regarding the extent to which building set-backs and building coverage can contribute to stormwater

and flooding outcomes. These recommendations lead to an approach that manages flooding issues primarily in the Natural Hazards chapter rather than wholly within the zone; and focusses on the building platform rather than site size.

58. Nevertheless, assessment of stormwater and flooding outcomes at the time of development is crucial even if the site is not affected by flooding. In addition, there may be gaps in assessment if rule WWS-R1 is ineffective.
59. An additional rule is recommended to complement WWS-R1 ensure that stormwater management plans are appropriately assessed and that consent can be declined if the stormwater management plan is inadequate. It is proposed to add a new WWS-R1A rule applying to subdivision of four or more lots and/or units in the MRZ2.
60. Assessment of outcomes related to Te Ture Whaimana cannot be included in assessment matters that are centered only on stormwater management because the concept is much broader. This concept extends to tributaries of the Waikato River.
61. Updated planning maps reflecting the Stormwater Constraints Overlay will be provided by the 20th of July.

Katja Huls
19 July 2023