

SECTION 42A REPORT

Rebuttal Evidence Addendum I

Enabling Housing Supply – Addendum I

Report prepared by: Fiona Hill

Date: 20 July 2023



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction	3
2	Scope of Report.....	3
3	Minimum Net Lot Size Area	3

I Introduction

I.1 Qualifications and experience

Report Preparation

1. This report has been prepared by Fiona Hill. I am one of the authors of the original s42A report and addendum I and Section 42A Rebuttal Evidence. My qualifications and experience, Code of Conduct acknowledgements and conflicts of interests are outlined in Section I of the s42A report.

I.2 Conflict of Interest

2. I confirm that I have no real or perceived conflict of interest.

I.3 Preparation of this report

3. I have prepared this Addendum to the Section 42A Rebuttal Evidence.

2 Scope of Report

2.1 Matters addressed by this report

4. This report is Addendum I to the Section 42A Rebuttal Evidence sent to submitters on 20 July 2023. The purpose of this report is to provide additional information in respect of Section 5 of the Rebuttal Evidence on Minimum Net Lot Size Area. This matter is addressed in paras 41 to 50 of the report.

2.3 Statutory requirements

5. Refer to S42A report dated 15 June.

3 Minimum Net Lot Size Area

6. I would like to provide further comment on my conclusions in paragraph 48. In this paragraph I have concluded that a revised minimum vacant net lot size area of 300m² is appropriate. Whilst I did not say in paragraph 48, I agree with the comments of Mr Mead that this site size should be outside floodplains. I noted this site size has the benefit of not precluding the one smaller house per site option in the short to medium term, as there is not projected to be a huge demand for apartment living in the Waikato District over this timeframe.
7. I note Mr. Mead has not commented in his evidence on the matter of an average lot size as he was asked to comment on the vacant minimum lot size.
8. I would like to add to the rebuttal evidence that I think 300m² is an appropriate response as a minimum net lot area. In writing this evidence I did not fully consider the implications of whether 300m² would deliver an appropriate range of intensification options in the longer term. On this I note the evidence of Ms. Fairgray about the importance over the longer term of providing the flexibility to enable redevelopment within a single site. Ms. Fairgray at

paragraphs 99 to 101 considers that whilst 300m² is better than 200m², it could still restrict future redevelopment. I agree with Ms. Fairgray and for this reason I consider there is merit in a minimum and an average net lot area. I consider this approach strikes an appropriate balance of enabling both the short-term benefits of smaller houses on smaller lots and allowing for a better dwelling mix, with a portion of larger lots in subdivisions that could be redeveloped at a higher levels of density in the future. Based on the evidence of Ms. Fairgray I consider an average net lot area of approximately 450m² to be appropriate. I consider this approach to be both enabling and consistent with the direction in Schedule 3A(7). I also consider it will assist in future proofing the ability to intensify in the district.

9. An amended rule is shown below in MRZ2-1a.ii

<p>MRZ2 – Medium density residential zone 2</p>	<p>1. Activity status: RDIS Activity specific standards: a. <u>Except where SUB-R154 (Subdivision – residential) applies,</u> sSubdivision must comply with all of the following standards: i. <u>Except in the minimum vacant lot size restriction area,</u> Pproposed vacant lots must have a minimum net site area (excluding access legs) of 200m², except where the proposed lot is an access allotment, utility allotment or reserve to vest; and ii. <u>In the minimum vacant lot size restriction area proposed vacant lots must have a minimum net size area (excluding access legs) of 300m²-and an average net lot area of 450m² for 3 or more lots, providing lots of 2,500m² or greater are excluded from the calculation, except where the proposed lot is an access lot, utility allotment, or reserve to vest</u></p>	<p>2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: DIS</p>
---	---	---