

PC26 HEARING - WAIPA DISTRICT COUNCIL

Day 1 - 26th APRIL 2023

Nigel Mark-Brown, David Hill (Chair), Vicky Morrison-Shaw, Dave Serjeant

9.00am

D Hill

Chuck Davis
V Morrison-Shaw

Karakia
response

9.06am

D Hill

introductions

9.12am

Damien McGahan
Wendy Embling
D Hill

9.15am

Waipa DC

Wendy Embling - Legal

9.20am

V Morrison-Shaw
W Embling

has any discussion proposal been made

9.22am

D Hill
W Embling

not received any objections, any time limit

9.25am

D Hill
W Embling

refers to city council only

9.29am

V Morrison-Shaw
W Embling

only Hamilton city, what does Auckland mean, correct approach interpreting the table
Future Proof for Waipa

D Hill

relying on section E801E2A, bypasses appendix,
still wanting policy 5

W Embling

Dave Serjeant

focus on similar targets, does it cause problems
no other authorities taken your approach, Te Puke, table 1
two columns, Hamilton, Waikato District, parts of Waipa, western bays Tauranga
Future Proof, tier 1, 3, size of urban areas

W Embling

9.41am

D Hill

key ingredient, whether policy 5 applies

W Embling

9.45am

V Morrison-Shaw
W Embling

Kainga Ora, interpretation for commensurate, is it now, what is the threshold

9.48am

D Hill
W Embling

not been given map of changes

9.51am

V Morrison-Shaw
W Embling

what the pre-conditions are

D Hill

parties not had opportunity to see them, what is proposition
what grounds if it didn't fall in IPI, what are you proposing, further submission process, timetable
are you proposing as alternative position, could require re-opening submission process
cleaner for Council, we don't get time

V Morrison-Shaw
D Hill

took Kainga Ora, argument people affected by further submission, lesser proposal
numbers of residents affected, road map for alternative, financial contribution September
no need to go back to Council

W Embling
D Serjeant
W Embling

kainga Ora, further submissions, how long process take

10.05am

Tony Quickfall
W Embling

10.08am

D Hill
W Embling

latest version, incorporate alternative

10.21am

D Hill

what difference, third potential development constrained, 3 per site across Cambridge, re-modelled
RDA for third, all residential area, implication for rest, permitted activity option
financial contribution later, how define boundaries

T Quickfall
W Embling

10.32am

MORNING BREAK

10.52am

RESUMED

W Embling

D Hill
W Embling

9.3A Mr Jaggard, demonstrate that point, likely, almost certainly, uplift storm water

10.59am

D Hill

is requirement narrowly prescribed in proposed rule

11.00am

N Mark-Brown

flood hazard, provisions talk about quality

W Embling
D Hill implication of alternative overlay, removal
W Embling

11.07am
D Hill can you do that without going back out, property owners' comments, timely in terms of process
W Embling

11.18am
D Hill 14.8, plan enabled capacity
 notified version, council proposed, alternative proposal

Susan Fairgray
D Serjeant all provided for as IDA
W Embling

11.26am
V Morrison-Shaw seeking permitted activity in commercial zone
D Hill primary activities, out of scope
 any further discussions

W Embling

11.31am
Tony Quickfall - Planning

W Embling
T Quickfall

11.36am
D Hill why Future Proof determine tier 3
D Serjeant does Future Proof perceive they have a mandate
T Quickfall
D Hill exception to rule, enable scope to come in left field
W Embling
T Quickfall

11.39am
D Hill council not looking to rely on Future Proof, limited weight
 evidence Ms Fairgray, didn't seem to be contradictions
T Quickfall

11.45am
D Hill view not shared around the country
T Quickfall

11.47am
D Hill RVA alignment, no serious issues, what things change
 not a great deal changes, application to grant
T Quickfall

11.50am
QUESTIONS

D Serjeant

town centre area, high density, Kainga Ora, much smaller than you agreed, happy with it
18m plus 3 x 3 wrap around, fair amount of capacity
adjacency, comfortable with it

T Quickfall

11.56am

V Morrison-Shaw

government policy statement, relevant for us for Plan Change
Carter's Crescent

T Quickfall

11.58am

N Mark-Brown

storm water, para 620 Mr Jaggard, does it work at the moment Te Awamutu, Kikihi and Cambridge, new
house Bryce Street
disadvantages, public process
other parts of country, flood plans, sure there's not a better way of doing it
topography of Cambridge, flood layer within plan
permitted activity development
residential areas, infrastructure address waste water
character clusters, how useful source, expert assessment

T Quickfall

12.08pm

D Serjeant

each character statement similar, what looking for, how many storeys, space around, guiding Applicant could
be simpler
storm water, building coverage, kept separate

T Quickfall

12.11pm

V Morrison-Shaw

MDRS applied, minor dwellings permitted activity, one dwelling plus

T Quickfall

12.13pm

D Hill

secondary dwelling, trigger cuts in for third dwelling, clarification in plan

T Quickfall

W Embling

D Hill

two dwellings on lot, clarification, 30sq.m

T Quickfall

12.15pm

LUNCH BREAK

1.17pm

RESUMED

Tony Coutts - Infrastructure

1.19pm

N Mark-Brown

mitigate demand what do you mean by that

T Coutts

1.22pm

D Hill practicalities of assessment, upstream, downstream
Council take information from individuals and put it in data base
take information into system or another step, certified engineers, not assume information accurate
how much easier for Applicants

T Coutts

1.27pm

D Serjeant with that information, people get to know no-go area

T Coutts

1.29pm

N Mark-Brown recent past 90%, with green fields it gets harder
response to my question, permitted activities, infrastructure

T Coutts

1.34pm

N Mark-Brown storm water overall impervious that is the issue,
management, where house is placed, driveways, how the house is on the site
what needs to be in infrastructure assessment, detailed guide, part of this process asap
reasonable sized projects that need consent

T Coutts

1.37pm

D Serjeant 2.7 rebuttal, definition of infrastructure
D Hill have you road tested that rule, have a look come back to us, confident this is required

T Coutts

D Serjeant 2.7 rebuttal

T Coutts

1.45pm

N Mark-Brown 5.5, Table 1, p10, discharge limits
para 5.14, what sort of projects, green fields, enable plan growth under District Plan
5.28, MFE set up scenario, similarities, climate change, recent flooding
Te Awamutu, infrastructure constraints

T Coutts

1.53pm

D Serjeant what percentage urban areas discharge consents, head room, people join up
constraint areas nowhere near consent catchments

T Coutts

1.54pm

N Mark-Brown para 17, 2-3 years, lead time enough for Council to keep up

T Coutts

1.56pm

V Morrison-Shaw Quickfall, support 3 x 3, do we have information on cost in those areas

T Coutts

1.59pm

D Hill 600 million, time assumption built in, zero base it on dollar values
run numbers, adopted same for 2 dwellings, infrastructure cost

T Coutts

2.02pm

Chris Hardy - Water and Wastewater

2.05pm

D Hill reliable baseline, when was last update
wants to put 3rd dwelling, 100% on the two, not crimping anyone's right

C Hardy

2.08pm

QUESTIONS

N Mark-Brown

water for baseline, one dwelling per lot, separate dwellings, not necessarily conservative
confident disparate pattern, in future can keep up with it
water re-use, how much likely to be an issue

C Hardy

2.11pm

V Morrison-Shaw

any others than Cambridge

C Hardy

2.13pm

D Sarjeant

alternative zone proposition, robustness of plan, availability of network

C Hardy

D Hill doesn't complicate the picture

2.16pm

Michael Chapman - Stormwater

2.26pm

D Serjeant micro-basis, things happen around urban environment

M Chapman

2.27pm

N Mark-Brown Council updating modelling, not part of PC26, key matter up-to-date information available

M Chapman

T Coutts

2.34pm

D Hill your advice, pragmatic point of view, without going through those models
improve, less of burden on public, how regular should maps be updated, reviewed
part of statute plan, no need to do

M Chapman

2.38pm

N Mark-Brown

8.4, building coverage 40%, how significant, contaminant of buildings
targeting the building, impervious doesn't change

storm water

M Chapman

2.43pm

D Hill not evidence to lock 20%, based on concern

M Chapman

N Mark-Brown case needs to be stronger, more work rather than just saying 40%
work example, plans not defining

M Chapman

2.46pm

V Morrison-Shaw not having modelling information, what time to update model, months, years

M Chapman

D Hill run time, what is analysis time
strong submissions against 40%

M Chapman

N Mark-Brown scenario percentage, come up with a number

M Chapman

N Mark-Brown 8.16, sophisticated analysis

M Chapman

2.53pm

Anna McElrea - Green Infrastructure

2.56pm

QUESTIONS

D Serjeant looked at implications, what affect would be, exercise, suggestions where we should look
tree canopy, transport corridor definition
reserve boundaries, 3.7 rebuttal, where wider set-backs been used
how removal of trees is handled

A McElrea

T Coutts

T Quickfall

D Hill external process

A McElrea

D Serjeant are all trees on roads protected

T Coutts

3.09pm

N Mark-Brown new dwellings northern side, advantageous
windows to reserve

A McElrea

3.11pm

D Hill set-backs, related provisions
rationale, very specific 120, what is the reasoning, no guidance by Regional Council

W Embling

A McElrea

3.14pm

AFTERNOON TEA BREAK

3.29pm

RESUMED

Carolyn Hill - Heritage

3.33pm

D Hill

specific methodology or one off
characterize other two, contentiousness, kernel of agreement between professionals
clusters identified, represent story of Cambridge, how does the group cluster
could there be more than you've found
series of values or emerge from what you found

C Hill

3.45pm

QUESTIONS

N Mark-Brown

key things, DG1 need more to guide someone

C Hill

D Hill

C Hill

2.51pm

V Morrison-Shaw

6m, arborist, basis for it
methodology, para 10.2E, standard practise, where 60% come from, 2/3rds or 60
minimum number of houses include in a character cluster
foundation of 10, other Councils
no industry standard

C Hill

3.57pm

D Hill

cluster has to feel like a cluster, 60% defining, any for us to look at
Campbells put in a statement overnight

C Hill

4.00pm

N Mark-Brown

C Dalziel, submission strident, Williamson, was it a mistake
assessment criteria, new building in character cluster, not similar

C Hill

4.04pm

D Serjeant

looking for diamonds, 2-storey on frontage, large garden, depend on visibility
what will areas be like in 20 years time

C Hill

D Hill

not seen non-character defining property to improve
not got a rule they do not fall below xyz, does it achieve QM

4.15pm

N Mark-Brown

found sentence I was looking for, not changed, still similar style, some other words
which provisions

W Embling

C Hill

4.17pm

Susan Fairgray - Market Economics

4.30pm

D Hill should there be a rule that prevents secondary dwelling

S Fairgray

T Quickfall

4.31pm

QUESTIONS

N Mark-Brown model or predicted demand, 8-9,000, is it modelling demand basis was Council generated, without the margin on

S Fairgray

4.35pm

D Serjeant para 4.6, not economically based

S Fairgray

D Hill MDRS, objective, best urban environment

S Fairgray

N Mark-Brown most commensurate, Cambridge, not go to outskirts

S Fairgray

D Hill materialise more dwellings over 20 years, more dispersed development

S Fairgray

N Mark-Brown close to centre, 3 x 3, prevent best outcome, higher

S Fairgray

D Hill support relaxation of ISO

S Fairgray

N Mark-Brown little bit further away still feeds benefits, how do you see changes on amenities

S Fairgray

D Hill if concentration isn't required for urban, does it matter

S Fairgray

T Quickfall

4.53pm

ADJOURNED