

BEFORE THE WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL INDEPENDENT HEARING PANEL

Harrisville Twenty Three Limited

Highlight Summary by Vanessa Addy

Dated: 31 July 2023

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The subject site is a 2.6 hectare site located at 23 and 23A Harrisville Road, Tuakau. The site is in close proximity the town centre with a convenient walking distance of approximately 3-450 metres. 23A Harrisville Road is a vacant property in pasture. An unnamed stream borders the northwest boundary and a wetland is present at the western corner of the site. The sites topography consists of gentle to moderate slopes within the eastern portion and steeper slopes extending along the gully to the northwest.
- 1.2 Full servicing by Council's water and wastewater infrastructure is readily available to the site. The land is accessible with sufficient room for a new road and footpaths for connectivity to existing development. Rezoning the land is an efficient use of greenfield land in an optimal location that will help increase the housing supply in Tuakau thereby directly responding to the requirements of the NPS-UD.
- 1.3 I have prepared this response summary of evidence to address the matters of concern raised in the Council's s42A Rebuttal Evidence – Enabling Housing Supply dated 19 July 2023 and key points in my Statement of Evidence.
- 1.4 This response summary will address:
 - a) Residential Unit Yield
 - b) Appropriateness of Qualifying Matters
 - c) Consistency with the NPS-UD and RPS

2. Residential Unit Yield

- 2.1 Ms Hill in paragraph 13 of her rebuttal evidence notes that my evidence has not considered the difference in potential number of residential units per lot from the two zones. And highlights that MRZ2 is a significant change from LLRZ with the potential for 75 residential units from 25 lots.

- 2.2 An option 1 plan was previously prepared when considering subdivision options for this site under the LLRZ/Village Zone scenario and this generated a total of 7 lots. Each of these lots under the LLRZ could have one residential unit and one minor unit (total 14 units).
- 2.3 Considering the comments outlined in the Council's rebuttal evidence, we have investigated further into yield and have produced a "Possible Medium Density Residential Concept Plan" (enclosed). The plan illustrates residential unit yield for the subject site based on shape factors as this better reflects the sites potential yield. Each shape factor is colour coded can generate either a possible duplex (red) or triplex (green) development as shown on the referenced photo image on the plan. We have calculated that the total number of residential units that could be realised on the subject site is 31.
- 2.4 Therefore, the potential for "75 residential units based on 25 lots" as outlined in the rebuttal s42A Report could simply not be realised on this site. The duplex and triplex shape factors have been carefully positioned to avoid natural features and topographic constraints. I highlight that the 31 potential residential units calculated is the ultimate maximum and it is highly unlikely that each of the developable shape factors shown would realistically develop at this density. Rather, I expect that there will be a mix of single housing units through to triplex units developed.

3. Qualifying Matters

- 3.1 The site is zoned as Large Lot Residential Zone in the PWDP-DV (and Rural-Residential Zone in the Operative Plan – Franklin Section). Both the zones allow for urban density, albeit at a lower scale.
- 3.2 Paragraph 13 of Ms Hill's rebuttal evidence states that my evidence has not addressed Qualifying Matters for the site. I note that paragraphs 6.2 and 6.3 of my original evidence acknowledges the section 32 cost benefit analysis that was undertaken for the site that includes appropriateness of imposing a Qualifying Matter to the site if a rezoning to MDRZ 2 was to take effect. This analysis discusses inclusion of the Natural Character of the waterbodies and their margins Qualifying Matter as the preferred option for the site.

3.3 The Natural Character of the waterbodies and their margins Qualifying Matter will appropriately provide certainty for the development of the site with setback requirements from the stream and wetland (i.e. zone rules for building setbacks will need to be considered).

4. Consistency with NPS-UD and RPS

4.1 Ms Hill in paragraph 19 of her rebuttal evidence states that my evidence “has not assessed the rezoning of 23A Harrisville Road against this [UFD-P1] policy or the general principles for new development in App11 of the RPS” and further that the area “is not planned for residential development”. I agree that my evidence did not specifically cover App11. Ms Hill notes that principal E and M of this policy are particularly of concern.

Item E - ‘connecting well with existing and planned development and infrastructure’;

4.2 Ms Hill raises concern on how the development will connect with other land zoned large lot residential. I do not consider that this subject site needs to connect to other land zoned large lot residential. This subject site will be directly connected to other MRZ 2 land. There is ample room to connect via a proposed road utilising both 23 and 23A Harrisville Road (both in common ownership). The site is readily accessible to infrastructure including water and wastewater and these can be connected via extension of the pipeline network.

Item M – ‘adverse effects on soil stability, water quality and aquatic ecosystems’;

4.3 Ms Hill raises concerns on this policy item based on information provided for the site. I note that the Qualifying Matter referred to above – Natural Character of the waterbodies will alleviate concern with this policy item in that further investigation will be required at subdivision consent stage. I also highlight that the “Possible Medium Density Residential Concept Plan” (**enclosed**) has identified the possible location of residential units, factoring in the natural and topographic features of the site including required setbacks from the stream and wetland and building line. Inclusion of the Qualifying Matter - Natural Character of the waterbodies, as

addressed above will ensure constraints on the property are appropriately managed.

- 4.4 In conclusion, rezoning to MRZ 2 has significant planning merit and will directly give effect to the NPS-UD. MRZ 2 will consolidate growth and provide a realistic density for a site that is in a prime location being in close proximity to the Tuakau town centre and readily able to connect to infrastructure servicing. Application of a Qualifying Matter on the subject site will provide certainty for the protection of natural features and topographic constraints that some of the site presents. Overall, MRZ 2 will help achieve a well-functioning urban environment in Tuakau.

Vanessa Addy

31/07/2023