

BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Proposed Plan Change 26 to the Operative Waipā District Plan

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE
TONY GRANT QUICKFALL**

Dated 19 April 2023

TOMPKINS | WAKE

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

Summary of Rebuttal

Kainga Ora

1. Waipā District Council acknowledges centres intensification did not form part of PC26 as notified. The Council is open to intensification to an extent that accords with the policy basis, is *commensurate*.
2. My opinion is that Kainga Ora have applied an incorrect policy basis of High Density and 6 stories, and have exceeded their mandate under the Government Policy Statement on Housing and Urban Development.
3. Under policy 3(d) NPSUD, Waipā DC proposes centres height of 18m (providing up to 5 storeys but with no limit on storeys), and 3x3 around the Cambridge CBD. In my opinion this amendment provides full relief sought to Kainga Ora.
4. I note there *may be* a scope issue in that centres height intensification and 3x3 around Cambridge CBD did not form part of the notified plan Change. I believe there *is* a scope consideration in respect of Kainga Ora's proposed new High Density zone.
5. Consultation results have been provided from Ahu Ake consultation, that indicates some community support for modest centres intensification that retains the character and identify of Waipā towns.
6. I dispute Kainga Ora's assertion that the intensification they seek is "critical" and "necessary" to enable thriving and vibrant urban environments, and I suggest Waipā's urban environments are already thriving.
7. I disagree with Mr Campbell that cumulative effects is sufficient to achieve the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana. In my opinion "restore and protect" remains the overarching objective.
8. I disagree with Kainga Ora experts that design guides are more effective outside of the Waipā District Plan.
9. In my opinion the roof pitch rule is appropriate to retain.
10. I disagree that a flood hazard overlay would be more effective, efficient and appropriate if it was outside the district plan, and note this seriously erodes Councils regulatory ability in respect of avoiding, remedying and mitigating hazard risk. If scope is not a barrier there is an opportunity for the Panel to update the existing flood hazard overlay, as a consequential amendment, for consistency with the Stormwater Overlay.

TA Projects

11. I do not consider the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay imposes any additional constraints that would not be considered through a resource consent process, and that the ICO should therefore be retained.

RVA/Ryman

12. I do not see any justifiable planning or statutory reasons to enable retirement villages as permitted activities and I note that the restricted discretionary status under the Operative District Plan has not precluded or constrained these developments.

Correction Cambridge Alternative Map (appendix 3).

13. I have belatedly noted a minor error on Appendix 3, Cambridge map. This depicts "Carters Flat" (the right part of the commercial zone) as deferred commercial. This deferment was removed under Plan Change 19 and this entire area is now live commercial zone.

I am happy to answer questions.

Tony Quickfall

Dated 19 April 2023