

**Before Western Bay of Plenty District Council Hearings Commissioners**

**IN THE MATTER**

of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER**

of Plan Change 92 to the Western Bay of Plenty  
District Plan

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF AARON COLLIER  
FOR THE TAURANGA URBAN TASK FORCE  
( & OTHERS )  
24 August 2023**

---

## 1. Qualifications and Experience

1.1 My full name is Aaron Mark Collier.

1.2 I am a Consultant Planner and a Director of Collier Consultants Limited. Prior to establishing Collier Consultants in 2019 I was a Principal and Technical Director of Aurecon.

1.3 My qualifications are Masters' degree with Honours and a Post Graduate Diploma in Resources and Environmental Planning from the University of Waikato. I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute (NZPI).

1.4 I have 28 years' experience working as a Local Authority and Consultant Planner. My predominant experience has been in the area of plan policy development and land use planning. I have prepared numerous Private and Council Plan Changes. I have provided planning evidence and advice in relation to a number of second-generation District Plans, including those for the Taupo, Tauranga, Rotorua, Thames-Coromandel, Western Bay of Plenty and Waikato Districts as well as the Auckland Unitary Plan. I was heavily involved in Council hearings and subsequent appeal processes for a number of these Plans. More recently I have been involved in a number of Intensification Planning Instrument Plan Changes (IPIs) introducing changes under the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (the RMA Amendment Act 2021), to set new Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) and make other amendments that are set to change the future of housing development. My work includes submissions, expert conferencing and hearings on changes to the Hamilton City, Waikato District, and the Tauranga City Plans. In addition, I have also been involved in changes to the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement (RPS) as Part of Change No6 to the RPS.

1.5 In relation to Ōmokoroa and Te Puke, I have been involved in numerous plan review processes along with subsequent appeals on plan changes and associated over a number of years. I am familiar with Te Puke and Ōmokoroa having been involved in large scale residential projects in the existing urban areas of both settlements over the last 25 years.

1.6 I regularly present evidence as an expert planning witness at other Council hearings the Environment Court, High Court and Boards of Enquiry.

1.7 I confirm I have read the "Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses" contained in the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note 2011. In particular, unless I state otherwise, this evidence is within my sphere of expertise, and I have not omitted to

consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.

- 1.8 I was asked by the Tauranga Urban Taskforce (UTF) in July 2022 to assist with preparing their submission on Plan Change 92 to the Western Bay of Plenty District Plan.
- 1.9 The UTF was established in 2020 and their purpose and role is as set out in the statement of Scott Adams.
- 1.10 My evidence relates to UTF's submission points and responses to a number of matters raised in the Section 42A staff report on Plan Change 92<sup>1</sup>. My evidence relates to a number of matters raised through common submissions including those by:
- TDD Limited
  - Vercoe Holdings Limited
  - Brian Goldstone.
- 1.11 In preparing this evidence I have reviewed the plan change application including the Section 32 Analysis, as well as the Section 42A Reports and the Taskforces original submission. I am also familiar with the provisions of the NPS-UD and the Resource Management Amendment Act 2021.

## **2. Scope of Evidence**

- 2.1 The UTF supported Plan Change 92 and sought a number of amendments based on sound planning policy. UTF sought that changes to the District Plan did not create uncertainty nor lead to unintended outcomes. Provisions need to be within the scope of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (the RMA Amendment Act 2021) which sets new medium density residential standards (MDRS) and makes other amendments, all of which are set to change the future of housing development.
- 2.2 UTF's submission is primarily focused on ensuring that Plan Change 92 is consistent with the objectives, policies and requirements of the NPS-UD and that Plan Change 92 will be an effective mechanism in achieving the intended housing intensification outcomes required by the RMA Amendment Act 2021.

---

<sup>1</sup> My evidence relates to a number of common submissions which have been lodged.

- 2.3 My evidence considers whether the proposed changes to the Western Bay of Plenty District Plan are appropriate and whether they are also sufficiently enabling to ensure the intensification outcomes required.
- 2.4 The District Plans rules and standards must be based on a sound approach so as to assist to rectify the current housing capacity shortage whilst at the same time creating well-functioning urban environments under policy 1 of the NPS-UD. I have highlighted in my evidence those provisions which may create uncertainty, those which may be unnecessary, and those which may lead to insufficient processes. I have also identified replication, i.e. where I consider that existing Plan provisions already address matters, such that further provisions are not necessary.
- 2.5 The UTF's original submission sought that further enabling and more certain amendments are required to Plan Change 92 to achieve medium density outcomes. In particular, more certain and appropriate Restricted Discretionary Activity (RDA) assessment criteria beyond those for permitted development under the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) were required. There were 47 separate matters of restricted discretion in Plan Change 92, as notified.
- 2.6 In relation to these RDA criteria, I actively participated in an expert conferencing session with other Planners and Urban Designers and these matters of discretion and now largely agreed. There were however several matters added to the agreed provisions as part of the Section 42A Report and in my view this approach is contrary to the code of conduct for experts and what was agreed through the statement signed by the experts that participated in the conferencing. My view is that the provisions are as agreed between the experts as the agreed statement were not signed on a "without prejudice" basis nor identified as subject to review through a further Section 42A reporting process. This matter will need to be clarified by Council staff at the hearing.

### **3. Relevant Statutory Considerations**

- 3.1 I have considered the relevant statutory considerations in a separate Statement of Evidence which was prepared for N & M Bruning and do not intend to repeat these. The relevant statutory considerations are also well canvassed in the Section 32 Analysis prepared for the Plan Change and in the Council's Section 42A Report prepared by a number of authors.

### **4. General**

- 4.1 I support Plan Change 92 and have no concerns for the Council's application of the MDRS in relation to residential zones. I also support the extent of the residential zoned land at Ōmokoroa and Te Puke, which gives effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.
- 4.2 I have addressed in a separate statement of evidence my concerns relating to the Council's application of the rural residential zone, the open space zone, and any changes to the industrial zone as part of the IPI process. I have concluded that a number of the changes proposed to the Planning Maps are outside the scope of the plan change and will need to be addressed through a separate First Schedule Plan Change process.
- 4.3 Having reviewed the Section 42A Report I have a number of comments to make on the remaining matters in terms of plan provisions.
- 4.4 I have attempted to respond to the matters raised in the Section 42A Report in order of the original submission, as follows:

### **Definitions**

## **5. Developable Areas**

- 5.1 The UTF submitted on a number of definitions seeking further amendments and clarity.
- 5.2 I supported the definition of developable area but sought that the definition include the following additions in the exceptions:
- *“Local purpose stormwater and neighbourhood reserves to be vested.”*
  - *“Pedestrian accessway to be vested”.*
- 5.3 Although the definition has now incorporated a provision which identifies areas as unsuitable for the construction of a residential unit being a matter for exception, pedestrian accessways and local purpose stormwater and neighbourhood reserves should be excluded from the definition of developable area. These areas are not developable for residential purposes. If these areas are included in the definition, then developers are less likely to want to provide walkway connections and/or pocket parks and neighbourhood reserves.
- 5.4 This is contrary to a well-functioning urban environment and there is no nexus between reserves/open space land and FINCOS, as Reserves and walkways do not generate demand on infrastructure.

- 5.5 Council included a new definition for impervious surfaces, and I generally agree with the definition. There is one matter which I consider needs further consideration in that is the reference to including within the definition point (e) as follows:

*“soil layers engineered to be impervious such as compacted clay”.*

- 5.6 In my opinion, the inclusion of soil layers engineered to be impervious such as “compacted clay” will be almost impossible to determine or monitor. The provision creates significant uncertainty as there is no definition of what constitutes “compacted”. Most impervious surfaces are clearly obvious such as roofs, paved areas, patios, sealed areas and the like which are already included in the definition. In my view the approach goes beyond what is envisioned to determine impervious surface in the context of Section 14A of the Plan.

## **Explanatory Statements and Information Requirements**

### **6. Natural Hazards**

- 6.1 An explanatory statement is included in relation to natural hazards and the use of the online maps. Council has recently incorporated its District Plan maps into a GIS format, consistent with most Council’s which now have an online District Plan rather than relying on hardcopy maps.
- 6.2 The Hazards statement has been redrafted and refers to a large amount of information which is held by the Council (including technical reports) which do not form part of the District Plan. I support the reference now proposed which is

*“including coastal erosion, coastal inundation, flooding, liquefaction and tsunami maps that do not form part of the District Plan”.*

- 6.3 The amendment now confirms that these provisions are non-statutory layers and do not form part of the Plan as per the relief sought in the UTF submission.

## **Proposed Rules**

### **7. Rule 12.3.10.1 (b) (i) – Information Requirements – Subdivision and Development**

- 7.1 The Section 42A Report has recommended the deletion of 12.3.10.1 (b) (i) as follows:

~~*For the Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zones, the proposal must include a detailed contour plan. This must show the existing*~~

~~ground level and proposed new contours to demonstrate compliance with the earthworks performance standards in Section 14A.~~

7.2 I agree that this rule can be deleted. It is unnecessary as earthworks requirements are already set out in the Plan under Rule 12.4.1.i – Site Suitability Requirements (Engineering design required for earthworks).

## **8. Rule 12.4.1 (j) – Controlled Earthworks**

8.1 This provision introduces a limitation on earthworks requiring consent for more than 300m<sup>2</sup> of earthworks in any 6 monthly period without any clear volume. The purpose of this rule is in my opinion unclear and in many instances, the simple construction of building platforms for duplex dwellings would exceed 300m<sup>2</sup> which would trigger a specific consent for earthworks. This would serve no purpose, particularly if large scale earthworks were already complete. This approach also conflicts with the permitted earthworks provisions in the Regional Plan, and previous subdivisions referred to in the explanatory note in the provision do not provide for the likes of earthworks associated with building sites. The provision will in my view result in delays, costs and unnecessary process. There is no proper evaluation of the impact of the rule, and it will lead to significant inefficiencies and unnecessary consenting processes.

## **9. Rule 12.4.5 – Stormwater Alternatives**

9.1 I agree with the inclusion of these provisions which provide for sustainable alternatives to stormwater reticulation. In my view they will provide for innovation and efficiencies in terms of water reuse systems. Rules 12.4.5.1 and 12.4.5.3 which provide for stormwater innovation should be accepted as notified.

## **10. Rule 12.4.5.17 (a) – Stormwater Attenuation Standards**

10.1 This rule proposes to introduce technical stormwater standards into the Plan. These standards include reference to design for attenuation of the 50% AEP and 1% AEP flood events to predevelopment levels. In my view this rule is unnecessary as Te Puke is subject to a separate comprehensive discharge consent which sets the requirements for discharge and Ōmokoroa “should” also be subject to a comprehensive consent<sup>2</sup>. I consider that Rule 15.4.5.17.a should be deleted as follows:

---

<sup>2</sup> The Council does not appear to have applied for a comprehensive discharge consent for Ōmokoroa in tandem with the Plan Change 92 process. In my experience this has the potential to result in some significant conflict between Council imposing stormwater mitigation standards in the District Plan

~~All new subdivisions shall be designed for attenuation of the 50% AEP and 1% AEP flood events to pre-development levels except where it can be demonstrated that there will be no increased adverse downstream flooding effects on the receiving environment.~~

~~All work shall be in accordance with the Ōmokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan and Te Puke Stormwater Management Plan comprehensive catchment consents and shall incorporate water sensitive urban design practices (such as swales, wetlands and pervious pavements) as far as practicable to maintain or enhance predevelopment hydrology and quality.~~

- 10.2 In my opinion, the second part of the above rule should be retained so that it refers to the comprehensive catchment consents which are in place (or will be in place) for each catchment and appropriate water sensitive design matters.

## 11. **Rule 12.4.5.17 (f) – Rule/Advice Note Relating to Planning Maps**

- 11.1 I agree with the Section 42A Report that (f) should be deleted as reference to the stormwater reserve areas at Ōmokoroa being shown on the Planning Maps and described in the Ōmokoroa Peninsula Stormwater Management Plan should not be a rule.

## 12. **Ōmokoroa and Te Puke Medium Density Residential Zone Explanatory Statement**

- 12.1 I agree with the changes made in the explanatory statement which now refer to “*other community-based housing*” rather than the previous text which referred to “*pocket neighbourhood typologies with a variety of different tenures*”. It was unclear what was meant by pocket neighbourhood typologies and tenure options should not be a matter of control under District Plans. I also sought that the explanatory statement be amended to remove reference to McLoughlin Drive South and Sedden Street East and I am now happy with the more simplified reference to medium density development areas. I now support deletion of the following from the explanatory statement:

~~*In support of the provisions of this section, the medium density residential (Section 14) explanatory statement, issues objectives and policies, will remain applicable. In addition this Section 14A also contains more specific objections for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke. Where there are any consistencies in objectives*~~

---

when these will be determined through a comprehensive Regional consent process for the urban catchment. Best practice is for the comprehensive consent process to be run in conjunction with the plan Change process where significant land is rezoned.



~~and policies those specific to Ōmokoroa and Te Puke in this Section 14A take precedence.~~

12.2 I agree that the new MDRZ Chapter should contain its own explanatory statements, issues, objective and policies with specific reference to the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD. I am satisfied that this is provided for in 14A.1 (Significant Issues) and 14A.2 (Objectives and Policies) for Chapter 14A. I do have some further comments however in relation to a number of the specific wording of the objectives and policies as follows.

**13. Objective 14A.2.1.4**

13.1 Objective 14A.2.1.4 should be amended as follows:

*An urban form providing positive ~~private and public~~ amenity outcomes*

13.2 In my opinion the objective should promote amenity outcomes regardless of whether these are private or public. The current wording requires both. In many developments there will be a mix, but in some there may be one but not the other.

13.3 Given Policy 6 of the NPS-UD that there will be some urban form which may not provide positive amenity outcomes.

**14. Objective 14A.2.1.6 – Minimisation of Earthworks**

14.1 I sought that this objective be deleted as follows:

~~*Minimisation of the adverse effects of earthworks and retaining walls on the existing natural landform and associated cultural and amenity values as well as on the stability of land and the safety of buildings and structures.*~~

14.2 I have significant concerns with this objective. In my view the objective is contrary to the policy outcomes of the NPS-UD and will result in significant reductions in usable residential land (as flat sites are not promoted), the inability to provide infrastructure, and a loss of density. The impacts of minimising earthworks across a MDRZ urban area have not been properly assessed through any modelling and analysis as required by Section 32 of the RMA. By the very nature of urban areas, there will need to be significant landform change to enable intensification.

14.3 I believe Council's approach to be misguided. In my extensive experience delivering housing outcomes at scale, I can confirm that minimising earthworks and the use of retaining will have a significant adverse impact on overall housing yield, density, and

amenity outcomes for residents. For example, outdoor common areas and usable spaces on sloping sites would be difficult to create. Earthworks are costly and developers undertake earthworks to maximise density and to provide for the efficient use of residential land. In my view the objective is therefore contrary to Policy 4 and of the NPS-UD.

#### **15. Policy 14A.2.2.7 – Integrated Assessment**

- 15.1 I support in part the policy but consider that the policy requires some simplification and amendment to ensure that the intent of the policy is clear. I therefore recommend the following change:

*Require proposals of four or more residential units on a site to provide integrated assessments which ~~fully~~ assess how the land is to be used effectively and efficiently, ~~how the relevant requirements of the structure plan are met~~ including provision of infrastructure and how ~~high quality~~ good urban design outcomes are being achieved.*

#### **16. Policy 14A.2.2.12 – Functioning of the Residential Environment**

- 16.1 Referencing the policy to functioning of the residential environment is unclear and in my view the policy should relate to residential amenity values and reference to the transportation network as now included in the Section 42A reports recommendations. I therefore support the policy as follows:

*“Limit non-residential activities, accommodation facilities and home enterprises to being undertaken only where any potential adverse effects on residential amenity values and on the transport network including vehicle parking congestion ~~the functioning of the residential environment~~ are able to be avoided or mitigated”.*

#### **17. Policy 14A.2.2.13 – Utilising Existing Natural Landform**

- 17.1 This policy initially sought that development be designed to utilise existing natural landforms. The policy as notified was inconsistent with policy 4 and 6 of the NPS-UD. The amended policy is as set out in the Section 42A Report as follows:

*“~~Ensure~~ Encourage subdivision and development is to be designed to utilise the existing natural landform where is it is practicable to limit the need for earthworks and retaining walls”.*

17.2 As per my view on Objective 14.A.2.1.6, I consider that this policy is unnecessary as by introducing the words “*where practicable*” creates considerable uncertainty. Who will determine whether earthworks were “not practicable”. My experience is that developers will not undertake earthworks unless they are required.

## **18. Policy 14A.2.2.17 – Design**

18.1 The policy as originally notified incorporated a wide range of considerations which in my view needed to be simplified. The Section 42A Report now refers to the policy only, referring to the mixed-use residential precinct at Ōmokoroa. Based on this, I am now happy with the wording of the policy.

## **19. Rule 14A.3.3 (d) – Retirement Villages**

19.1 Under the Operative District Plan, retirement villages are provided for as a controlled activity under Rule 14A.3.2. The proposal under Plan Change 92 was to amend the activity status of retirement villages to a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 14A.3.3 (d). In my view the more restrictive standard for retirement villages (from controlled to restricted discretionary) is less enabling than the current District Plan and does not give effect to the policy outcomes sought under the NPS-UD. There are still matters of control which apply under the Operative Plan and in my view the activity status of retirement village should be retained as a controlled activity consistent with the residential zone which applies to other parts of the District.

## **20. Permitted Standards Rule 14A.4.2 (b) – Residential Unit Typologies**

The rule is notified sought where 6 or more residential units are provided on a site then a maximum of 50% of the total number of residential units should be physically detached. The Section 42A Report has recommended deletion of this provision. I agree that the provision should be deleted as it is contrary to Policy 1 of the NPS-UD which requires Council's to enable a variety of homes that meet the needs in terms of type, needs, price and location of different households.

## **21. Rule 14A.4.2 (d) – Impervious Surfaces**

21.1 I sought deletion of the impervious surface rule requirements given that the MDRS contains separate coverage requirements, and these are accepted. Of concern is that for Te Puke, impervious surfaces shall not exceed 50% of net site area which is the same as building coverage. Typically, all building coverage is an impervious surface. By restricting the impervious surface to 50% of a site, this will lead “by default” to a much smaller maximum building coverage. In my view this has not been considered

through any Section 32 Analysis to determine what the impact will be on density/yield as a consequence. For example, in order to provide for a driveway if the site coverage is the same as the impervious surface coverage rule, then the GFA of buildings must be reduced to comply. Further thought is needed in terms of how these provisions will functionally work. Additionally, the need for a separate impervious surface requirements is not supported by MDRS provisions,

**22. Rule 14A.4.2 (g) – Earthworks**

22.1 UTF sought the deletion of the rule relating to earthworks and this has been accepted through the Section 42A Report. I was concerned that the controls proposed would severely restrict and limit density as a result of the inability to change existing ground levels/contours. The outcome will be that development capacity would be unnecessarily constrained and as set out in the submission there was no Section 32 Analysis to justify the impact on housing choice, yield, density and the impact on the provision of infrastructure. Although the rule has been deleted, there is still a disjointed relationship between the rule framework and Objective 14A.2.1.6 and Policy 14A.2.2.13 noted above.

**23. Rule 14A.5.1 (a) – Notification Requirements**

23.1 I agree with the Section 42A Report and the deletion of 14A.5 in relation to notification requirements as these provisions are unnecessary. The District Plan need not repeat those provisions set out in Section 95 of the RMA.

**24. Rule 14A.6.1 (f) – Design of Services**

24.1 I agree with the Section 42A Report that the design of services as a matter of control can be deleted as this matter is already covered under Chapter 12 provisions.

**25. Rule 14A.6.1 (h) – Effects of Additional Driveways**

25.1 I support the Council's Section 42A Report has accepted my amended change which is as follows:

*h. The effect of additional driveways on public safety ~~and amenity along~~  
footpaths*

25.2 It was unclear to me as to what the reference to “*and amenity along footpaths*” would relate to.

**26. Rule 14A.6.1 (i) – Sun Orientation**

26.1 The submitters sought that this provision be deleted as the provision sought that lot designs provide areas orientated towards the sun and there may be instances where it is not possible for land to be orientated towards the sun. I also considered that the matter of orientation was already addressed under Standard 14A.6.1 (e). However I agree with the revised provision which introduces the words “as much as practicable” as suggested in the Section 42A Report as follows:

*“Lot designs that provide as much as practicable areas orientated towards the sun”.*

**27. Rule 14A.6.1 (k), (l), (m), (n), (o) – Provisions Relating to Natural Landform and Topography, Retaining Walls, Cultural Values Associated with Natural Landforms, and Earthworks**

27.1 These provisions appear to have been included as further matters of control, however having reviewed the submissions received it is unclear how these further five matters have been able to be incorporated under Rule 14A3.6.1 (k) - (o). In my view the Plan can only be amended in response to matters raised in submissions and I am not aware of any submissions which are specifically seeking these further provisions. The provisions should therefore in my opinion be deleted.

**28. Rule 14A.7.1 – Restricted Discretionary Activities for Four or More Residential Units on a Site**

28.1 As set out in paragraph 2.6 of my evidence I participated in a full day workshop with a number of Planners and Urban Designers to discuss and agree the matters of restricted discretion. I agree with the matters of restricted discretion as set out in the document attached a ‘D – Joint Witness Statement’ which is included as part of the Council’s Section 42A Report.

28.2 However, in addition to these provisions, two further provisions have been added in which are (l) Integrated Stormwater Management Design and (m) Earthworks.

28.3 The provisions relating to integrated stormwater management design were not discussed at all at the expert conferencing and have been added. I oppose the inclusion of these provisions as the requirements for stormwater management and design are already set out in Chapter 12 of the District Plan (i.e. Rule 12.4.5, 12.4.9, 12.4.10, and 12.4.11).

- 28.4 In relation to (m) Earthworks, the following provisions have been added:
- i) Whether the design and layout of development recognises and is sensitive to natural landform and topography.*
  - ii) The extent to which any required earthworks minimise the need for retaining walls that are of a scale and location that adversely effects the visual qualities of the area.*
  - iii) Where the earthworks and any subsequent retaining walls lead to a loss of privacy between the subject site and surrounding sites due to creating higher building sites than the predevelopment landform.*
  - iv) Cultural values associated with the existing natural landform.*
  - v) The extent to which any resource consents previously granted for earthworks have already addressed i) to iv).*
- 28.5 At the expert conferencing session there was significant discussion around the earthworks provisions, and it is fair to say that the discussion concluded that the main issue of concern being raised by the Council was in relation to the use of excessive retaining walls which may lead to long term maintenance and/or visual effects
- 28.6 As I reiterated during the expert conferencing, the existing examples noted by Council staff are all in the Stage 1 and 2 Ōmokoroa area largely on the eastern side of Ōmokoroa Road where there were extensive ridgelines and steeper areas which required significant areas of cut and land modification.
- 28.7 The stage 3 area at Ōmokoroa and certainly the residential land at Te Puke is far more gentle in terms of topography and does not raise the same concerns as occurred as part of the developments in the Stage 2 Ōmokoroa area. As previously noted, I believe that the earthworks provisions as drafted will have a significant impact on MDRZ yield which has not been evaluated. In addition, outcomes such as a loss of privacy will be inevitable, albeit that this is envisaged under Policy 6 of the NPS-UD.
- 28.8 Cultural values will need to be assessed, however there are no significant cultural sites identified. Subjective matters such as the need to assess “visual qualities of the area” do not relate at all to the anticipated state of the environment given that sites are being zoned to be used for MDRZ purposes.
- 28.9 In my opinion provisions in (m) should be deleted with one exception. I support the retention of a matter of discretion in relation to retaining walls. This was what was discussed at the expert conferencing. I therefore recommend that (m) (ii) be amended as follows:

**(M) Whether the scale and location of retaining walls is appropriate, and whether the visual effects of these retaining walls is able to be mitigated through design, vegetation, and/or the future location of buildings.**

**29. Conclusions**

- 29.1 Overall I support Plan Change 92 and a number of changes which have occurred following a revision of the provisions in response to submissions as set out in the Section 42A Report. Overall, the Plan Change supports intensification at Ōmokoroa and Te Puke.
- 29.2 I consider that there are a number of further changes which are required to appropriately reflect the intended outcomes under the RMA Amendment Act 2021 and the NPS-UD. A number of these changes (particularly in relation to matters such as earthworks and changes to landform) are natural consequences of a change in zoning from a rural/future urban environment to a medium density residential zone. There will be change from rural to urban however there are a number of provisions proposed which effectively act to preserve or retain existing character and amenity considerations.
- 29.3 The provision of medium density housing is not “at all costs” but I believe a number of these provisions (particularly those attempting to retain existing landform) will have unintended consequences. They will impact density, the ability to service land, and the ability to create flat sites. They will not maximise residential outcomes.
- 1.12 Further amendments have therefore been sought to ensure that the appropriate outcomes are achieved under the RMA Amendment Act 2021 and the NPS-UD.
- 29.4 I would be happy to answer any questions the panel may have.



**Aaron Collier**  
Planner  
23 August 2023