

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ADAM WILLIAM CHARLES JELLIE ON
BEHALF OF POKENO VILLAGE HOLDINGS LIMITED (SUMBITTER NO. 368 /
FURTHER SUBMITTER NO. 1281)**

PLANNING

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Adam William Charles Jellie. I am a Senior Planner in the consultancy firm of Beca. I have over 10 years' experience in planning.
- 1.2 This is a summary of my statement of evidence on behalf of Pokeno Village Holdings Limited ("PVHL") in relation to Hearing 7 – Industrial Zone and Heavy Industrial Zone dated 10 December 2019.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Light Industrial and Industrial 2 zones in the operative Waikato District Plan – Franklin Section were developed through the Plan Change 24 (PC24) process which incorporated the Pokeno Structure Plan ("PSP") and associated provisions into the former Franklin District Plan. The provisions formed part of a comprehensive planning framework designed to deliver the vision of the PSP. The PSP and associated provisions introduced by PC24 have not been included in the Proposed Waikato District Plan ("PWDP"). Instead a new Industrial Zone and Heavy Industrial Zone apply to the industrial areas previously zoned Light Industrial Zone and Industrial 2 Zone within the PSP area.
- 2.2 The new zones in the PWDP, as notified, do not carry over all the activities provided for in the Light Industrial Zone and Industrial 2 Zone, and in some cases include more permissive development standards.
- 2.3 The section 42A report author, Ms Macartney, has subsequently recommended in response to a submission that some of the activities, (but not all) provided for in the Light Industrial Zone be included in the Industrial Zone of the PWDP¹. I consider that this does not fully address the relief sought by PVHL, which sought that the PSP provisions of PC24 and PC21 be fully reinstated in the PWDP.
- 2.4 Activities which have not been carried over into the Industrial Zone, or recommended for inclusion by Ms Macartney include:

¹ Paragraph 195, Section 42A Report for Hearing 7: Industrial Zone and Heavy Industrial Zone

- (a) Fitness centres;
- (b) Service stations;
- (c) Child care and learning centres;
- (d) Schools;
- (e) Active recreation and entertainment;
- (f) Funeral services premises;
- (g) Health centres;
- (h) Hospitals; and
- (i) Community facility

2.5 Furthermore, the Light Industrial Zone included a specific standard which limited the above activities to sites located 100 metres away from the Industrial 2 Zone. I understand the purpose of this setback is to protect Heavy Industrial activities from reverse sensitivity effects. This has not been included in the PWDP.

3. **LIGHT INDUSTRIAL ZONE IN POKENO**

3.1 The Light Industrial Zone was developed by PVHL as part of PC24. The Light Industrial Zone was drafted to include activities anticipated within the PSP area. This included activities which could service the wider residential area, such as commercial and community facilities, which provide for a mix of employment opportunities for Pokeno residents.

3.2 The Light Industrial Zone acted as a buffer between residential and heavy industrial activities, whilst protecting heavy industrial activities from reverse sensitivity effects. This was done in two ways:

- (a) By the application of the zones, i.e. the Light Industrial Zone between the Industrial 2 Zone and the Residential 2 Zone; and
- (b) The inclusion of interface controls which restrict commercial and non-industrial activities from locating near Industrial 2 zoned sites, encouraging these activities to locate closer to the boundary of the Residential 2 Zone.

These interface controls are also not included in the Industrial Zone of the PWDP.

- 3.3 To address the specific issue arising in Pokeno I consider that the activities enabled by the Light Industrial Zone and Industrial 2 Zone which have not been carried over into the PWDP could be implemented by way of a Pokeno Industrial Development Area.
- 3.4 I have provided example provisions for a Development Area in **Attachment 1** of my Evidence in Chief. This approach only reintroduces the provisions as they apply to Pokeno and the PSP area, and does not amend the Industrial Zone, which I recognise has a wider geographical application. The use of a Development Area would therefore avoid that the risk that a non-industrial activity which has been assessed as being appropriate for Pokeno has potential adverse effects in another location.
- 3.5 I note that in his rebuttal evidence² Mr Mark Tollemache for Havelock Village Limited, another significant Pokeno landowner, agrees that it would be appropriate for the Operative District Plan provisions of the PSP (Plan Change 24 and those for the Light Industry and Industry 2 Zones) to be reflected in the PWDP.
- 3.6 In her "rebuttal" section 42A report,³ Ms Macartney suggests that the appropriate forum for consideration of the inclusion of a Pokeno Development Area would be Hearing 26 (Zone Extents). I agree with Ms Macartney that one Pokeno Development Area could encompass all elements of the PSP (rather than, for example, creating a series of separate development areas for industrial, residential activities, etc in Pokeno) and that if this approach is preferred by the Panel it would be appropriate to address all of these matters comprehensively in one forum. I understand that PVHL will present a comprehensive case in respect of the implementation of the PSP by way of a Pokeno Development Area at Hearing 26.
- 3.7 In conclusion, I consider the use of a Development Area (either specific to industrial activities or with broader effect) is an appropriate method to achieve the objectives of the PWDP and implement the provisions of the PSP.

² Paragraph 2.1, Rebuttal Evidence of Mark Seymour Manners Tollemache

³ Paragraph 230, Section 42A Rebuttal Evidence for Hearing 7: Industrial Zone & Heavy Industrial Zone