

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

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF LAURA GALT FOR HAMILTON CITY COUNCIL

3 February 2020

Hearing 10: Residential

INTRODUCTION

1. My full name is Laura Jane Galt. I am an Intermediate Planner at Hamilton City Council (HCC), a position I have held for approximately three years. Prior to this I held a planning position at HCC.
2. I have over 13 years' policy planning experience in local government under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).
3. My qualifications include a Masters in Environmental Planning from the University of Waikato. I am an intermediate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

4. My experience spans a variety of planning practice including:
 - a) making submissions to other organisations' district plans and resource consents;
 - b) Environment Court mediation on cross-boundary resource consents;
 - c) Section 42A author for various district plan chapters and plan changes;
 - d) participating in various district plan hearings.

CODE OF CONDUCT

5. I have read the Environment Court Code of Conduct for expert witnesses and agree to comply with it. I confirm that the opinions expressed in this statement are within my area of expertise except where I state that I have relied on the evidence of other persons. I have not omitted to consider materials or facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I have expressed.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

6. The purpose of this evidence is to:
 - a) describe and analyse the submissions made by HCC in its submission to the Waikato District Proposed District Plan (WDPDP) dated 9 October 2018 that are relevant to this hearing;

- b) address the response to the HCC submission points in the S42A report for Hearing 10.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

7. The S42A report, in offering amendments to the Residential Provisions of the WDPDP, has addressed some of HCC's submission points.
8. I support in part the recommended changes to the rules 16.1.3 – Dwellings, 16.3.1 – Multi-unit Development and Definition of Multi-unit Development.
9. I seek further amendment to Policy 4.2.17 to clarify the location of areas with public reticulation.

DOCUMENTS AND MATERIAL CONSIDERED

10. Within the preparation of my evidence, I have considered the following information:
 - a) The RMA;
 - b) National Policy Statement for Urban Development Capacity 2016 (NPS-UDC);
 - c) Draft National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2019 (NPS-UD);
 - d) Operative Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS);
 - e) The Waikato District Operative District Plan 2011 (WDODP);
 - f) The WDPDP and Section 32 analysis;
 - g) Section 42A reports for Hearings 3 and 5;
 - h) Future Proof Growth Strategy 2009 and the 2017 review;
 - i) Statement of evidence of Luke O'Dwyer dated 15 October 2019;
 - j) Statement of evidence of Alice Morris dated 15 October 2019;
 - k) Statement of evidence of Loren Brown dated 25 November 2019.

HCC SUBMISSIONS – RELEVANT TO HEARING 10

11. The S42A report supporting this hearing addresses two submission points made by HCC, summarised as 535.20 and 535.21 in the Waikato District Summary of

Submissions document. These submissions will be addressed in Table 1 in paragraph 22 below.

12. However, HCC also made a variety of submissions that I consider to also be relevant to this hearing and for the future hearings. As per verbal instructions to submitters at Hearing 3 – Strategic Objectives on 6 November 2019, the Hearings Panel mentioned it was useful to highlight these now, although recognising that these too will need to be addressed again during other relevant upcoming hearings. The other submissions I consider to be relevant are submissions 535.12 and 535.16 (both allocated to Hearing 3 – Strategic Objectives).
13. Each of these will now be covered, not necessarily with any expectation that they will be addressed through the remainder of the Hearing 10 process, but merely as they help provide the bigger picture as to why HCC has an interest in the Residential Zone and how I consider the Residential provisions are related to other parts of the WDPDP.
14. The suite of HCC submissions made on the Residential Zone and the Strategic Objectives of the WDPDP, when all considered in their entirety, paint a better picture of strategic context of the issues raised than the individual points in isolation.
15. Submission point 535.12 supported the notified Objective 4.1.2 (a) *'Future settlement pattern is consolidated in and around existing towns and in the district'* but sought the inclusion of a table or map that identified the specific growth areas within the Waikato District.
16. The S42A report for Hearing 3 – Strategic Objectives recommended the rewording of Objective 4.1.2 (a) to *'Future settlement pattern is consolidated in and around existing towns and villages listed in Policies 4.1.10 - 4.1.18 of the district to support a compact urban form for each urban area*' and that a map or table is not necessary as all the areas have been zoned.
17. HCC addressed this in Hearing 3 with evidence by Alice Morris (paragraph 35) where the proposed rewording was supported *"as it provides a stronger link to the expectations*

set out under the Future Proof Growth Strategy, WRPS and the NPS-UDC". However, as stated in HCC primary submission, the objective could be further strengthened by including a table or map to identify the specific growth areas within the Waikato District.

18. HCC also made submission point 535.16 to support Policy 4.1.5 – Density. However, HCC sought that the policy be expanded to include a full range of densities to support residential growth within existing towns. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS) seeks residential growth to be directed to existing towns, in preference to new ones¹. In line with this approach, HCC's submission to seek a range of densities within identified (and mapped) growth locations was to make it easier and more attractive to provide for infill, duplexes and other multi-unit development within the towns. This approach would then, in turn, be accompanied by WDPDP provisions which would give a high level of scrutiny and essentially make it harder for growth in other areas such as the Rural Zone or the Country Living Zone.
19. Providing for an expanded range of densities and by identifying the locations where growth is anticipated will strengthen the WDPDP's ability to achieve the principles of the Future Proof Strategy to deliver a network of thriving towns, and the WRPS principle to direct growth to existing urban areas in favour of new ones. HCC wants to support the growth of the existing towns within the Waikato District.
20. HCC supports this growth pattern set out in Future Proof and WRPS; allowing development outside of defined growth areas results in ad hoc development that creates demand for urban services such as public reticulation. Substantial growth outside the defined urban areas is unsustainable and compromises the Future Proof and WRPS settlement patterns.
21. I will now outline my evidence relating to Hearing 10, but the wider strategic picture as outlined above is useful background to HCC's position on the important role of the

¹ Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 6A Development principles a). Pg 6-27

Residential Zone and the need to allow for a more flexible and varied approach to development within it.

HCC SUBMISSIONS – HEARING 10

22. The S42A report addresses the following HCC submission points in the following way:

	HCC submission	S42A response	HCC Response
Sub 535.20 Objective 4.2.16 – Housing Options	Retain Objective 4.2.16 Housing options. ... HCC supports the focus on a range of housing options within the Residential Zone.	Objective 4.2.16 is appropriate and is retained as notified	Support
Sub 535.21 Policy 4.2.17 – Housing Types	Amend Policy 4.2.17 Housing types, by introducing a suite of policies including those on other housing types and high design quality. AND Amend the wider zone provisions as a consequential amendment.	The approach adopted in the PWDP was not to zone specific areas for higher-density residential development, but rather was to provide for multi-unit development as a restricted discretionary activity throughout the zone and to set out a policy framework (namely Objectives 4.1.2, 4.2.16, Policy 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.2.17, Policy 4.2.18, 4.2.19) that supported development of higher density in areas where the policy criteria were met (such as connected to public services, well-served by transport and in close proximity to town centres). This topic is further addressed in Topic 36 Medium Density Residential Housing. Affordable Housing is also discussed in Topic 35. The submitters have not provided information or analysis to support this change. In light of the reasons given above, I do not agree with the relief sought. I recommend that the panel reject both submission points.	Amendments to corresponding rules and definitions partly address HCC's submission, but the policy could be clarified and tightened by the suggested wording. This will help the residential zones in the towns to grow and thrive and will ensure growth is directed to appropriate reticulated locations. Further amendment through the removal specific housing types from Policy 4.2.17 will ensure it applies to all housing typologies, not just those listed, and therefore encourage greater housing diversity.

Table 1: S.42A response to HCC submissions

23. HCC supports retaining Objective 4.2.16 – Housing Options as notified.

24. The S42A hearing report does not address HCC's submission (535.21) to Policy 4.2.17 – Housing Types. The S42A officer notes that HCC did not provide information to support

the relief sought, so I consider it useful to provide some additional context or reasoning behind the submission point.

25. Firstly, Policy 4.2.17 states '*(a) enable a variety of housing types in the Residential Zone where it is connected to public reticulation*'. The WDPDP does not clearly state what places are connected to public reticulation. Potentially, it is the towns listed in Objective 4.2.16 (Huntly, Ngaruawahia, Pokeno, Raglan, Te Kauwhata and Tuakau). If so, then the policy could be amended to match the corresponding Objective 4.2.16 or alternatively it could list the places with reticulation. This information would help provide some context for the plan reader as to where higher-density development might be appropriate.
26. Secondly, Policy 4.2.17 then goes on to list the appropriate housing types which include '*i) integrated residential development such as low-rise apartments and multi-unit development; and ii) Retirement villages*'. This list seems a little ad hoc as it does not recognise single dwellings, does not define integrated residential development, and did not clearly link back to a comprehensive definition of multi-unit development.
27. It is noted that the S42A report for Hearing 5 recommended a new definition for multi-unit development. This definition better describes a range of housing types than was included in the WDPDP as notified. Although HCC did not submit on the definition, the S42A definition for Hearing 5 would help partly address the submission currently being considered.
28. Finally, I note that while HCC's submission sought a suite of policies for a range of housing types, the desired outcome could also be achieved by not listing any specific housing types in Policy 4.2.17. This would leave the ability for the policy to consider any housing typologies, therefore encouraging housing diversity in appropriate locations. It also seems unnecessary to list Multi-Unit Development and Retirement Villages when there are separate policies (4.2.18 and 4.2.19, respectively) related to these housing types.

29. Therefore, the relief sought by HCC is a ‘tidying up’ of Policy 4.2.17 as follows:

4.2.17 Policy – Housing types

(a) Enable a variety of housing types in the Residential Zone where it is connected to public reticulation within (insert list of reticulated residential), including:

- ~~*(i) Integrated residential development such as low-rise apartments and multi-unit development; and*~~
~~*(ii) Retirement villages.*~~

30. As noted above, HCC supports any increased density within existing towns to achieve the principles of the WRPS and Future Proof. The proposed amendment to Policy 4.2.17 will ensure that it clearly identifies the areas with public reticulation and that a greater range of housing types is encouraged in these areas. I note that enabling a range of dwelling types is a key policy (P2A²) of the draft NPS-UD.

CONCLUSION

31. HCC supports the analysis and recommendations made in the S42A report in relation to Objective 4.2.16.
32. The analysis and recommendation to Policy 4.2.17 does not completely address HCC’s submission.
33. HCC seeks an amended Policy 4.2.17 to address HCC’s submission as outlined above.

Dated 3 February 2020

L Galt

² P2A: When making planning decisions that affect urban development, and the way and rate at which development capacity is provided, local authorities must have particular regard to:

- a) enabling a range of dwelling types and locations, working environments and business locations
 b) limiting as much as possible adverse impacts on the competitive operation of land and development markets.
 When making decisions on consent applications that affect urban development, and the way and rate at which development capacity is taken up, decision-makers must have regard to the need, consistent with this NPS, to:
- c) provide a range of dwelling types and locations, working environments and business locations
 d) limit as much as possible the adverse impacts on the competitive operation of land and development markets.