

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS
AT RANGIORA / WAIMAKARIRI**

**I MUA NGĀ KAIKŌMIHANA WHAKAWĀ MOTUHAKE
RANGIORA / WAIMAKARIRI**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the hearing of submissions and further submissions on the **Proposed Waimakariri District Plan**

HEARING TOPIC: **Stream 7A Whitua Nohonoho – Residential Zones and Variation 2**

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JOSHUA NEVILLE
ON BEHALF OF KĀINGA ORA – HOMES AND COMMUNITIES**

CORPORATE

11 SEPTEMBER 2024

Instructing solicitor:
C E Kirman
Special Counsel
Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities
PO Box 14594
Central Auckland 1051
E: claire.kirman@kaingaora.govt.nz

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 I am Joshua Neville, Team Leader – Development Planning for the South Island at Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (**Kāinga Ora**). I am authorised to provide evidence in support of its primary submission (submitter #325) and further submissions (further submitter #88) on the Waimakariri District Council’s (**WDC**) Proposed District Plan (**the PDP**), and to provide evidence in support of its primary submission (submitter #77) and further submissions (further submitter #5) on the Variation 2 to the proposed Waimakariri District Plan (“**V2**”).
- 1.2 The S42A Reporting Officer has recommended accepting some but not all the changes requested by Kāinga Ora. This statement of evidence focuses on the elements that remain in contention. Planning evidence for Kāinga Ora has been provided by Ms Clare Dale.
- 1.3 In summary the points addressed in my evidence are as follows:
- (a) Background context and the submissions of Kāinga Ora,
 - (b) Relief requested in the Objective and Policy framework of the residential chapters of the PDP; and
 - (c) Provisions within Variation 2
- 1.4 Overall, Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed planning regulations notified through the PDP and V2 will constrain the ability of Kāinga Ora to provide public housing in the Waimakariri District in the future.
- 1.5 If the requested relief is adopted, this will enable Kāinga Ora to adequately manage its existing public housing as well as provide a suitable regulatory framework for continued public housing provision in the future.
- 1.6 Kāinga Ora has also submitted on V1 and filed evidence on this topic. The matters that replace the provisions of the PDP are not addressed in this evidence.

2. INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 My full name is Joshua Thomas John Neville.
- 2.2 I hold the position of Team Leader – Development Planning for the South Island, within the Urban Planning and Design Group at Kāinga Ora. I have held this position since March 2023, and have been employed by Kāinga Ora since August 2021.
- 2.3 I have 10 years' experience in planning, policy and urban development, which includes working within local government.
- 2.4 I hold the qualifications of a Bachelor of Science (Geography) and a Master of Science (Geography) from the University of Canterbury.
- 2.5 In my role with Kāinga Ora, I have provided planning advice, and management of processes relating to:
- (a) Assessment and identification of redevelopment land within the Kāinga Ora portfolio,
 - (b) Strategic future land-use planning,
 - (c) Regulatory planning associated with Kāinga Ora residential development projects; and
 - (d) Input into regulatory policy planning activities including plan reviews and plan Variations throughout the South Island.
- 2.6 I was involved in the review of the PDP, V1 and V2 and the preparation of submissions for Kāinga Ora as a submitter on the PDP and Variations. I am presenting this corporate evidence in relation to these submissions and further submission from Kāinga Ora.
- 2.7 I have also provided Kāinga Ora with advice, and representation in a number of forums related to the Greater Christchurch Partnership and in the development of the Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan. I am familiar with the Kāinga Ora corporate intent in respect of the provision of housing within the Waimakariri and how the Waimakariri District is contextualised within this proposed plan. I am also familiar with the national, regional and district planning documents relevant to the PDP.

- 2.8 In preparing this evidence I have read the Section 32 and Section 42A Reports together with the associated appendices prepared by Council staff and the evidence prepared for Kāinga Ora by Ms Clare Dale (Planning – Novo Group).

Scope of Evidence

- 2.9 My evidence encompasses submissions and further submissions on the PDP in relation to the general residential objectives and policies. This evidence does not cover other provisions in the PDP General (**GRZ**) and Medium Density Residential Zones (**MDRZ**) as these have been replaced by Variation 1(**V1**) as far as Kāinga Ora were interested in these zones. Kāinga Ora has not made submissions on the Residential Large Lot zone or Settlement zone provisions.
- 2.10 This evidence also addresses Variation 2 (**V2**) in terms of how the notified provisions and proposed amendments still lack certainty and clarity for users with respect to the requirements for financial contributions.
- 2.11 Separate evidence will be provided with respect to Variation 1/ Hearing Stream 7b.

Background to Kāinga Ora

- 2.12 The background to Kāinga Ora and the statutory context in which the organisation operates, including its functions under the Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities Act 2019, has been provided through the corporate evidence of Mr Brendon Liggett in respect of the Strategic Directions¹ Hearing Streams 1 & 2.
- 2.13 This evidence focuses on the how the provisions of the PDP, and V2 impact the ability for Kāinga Ora to continue to maintain, operate, redevelop and expand the public housing portfolio.
- 2.14 The prior evidence for Kāinga Ora discussed the Kāinga Ora Housing portfolio, and the public housing demand for the Canterbury Region.

¹ Corporate Evidence of Brendon Liggett Proposed Waimakariri District Plan Hearing Stream 1 & 2, dated 1 May 2023

- 2.15 For the benefit of the Panel, since the filing of the Hearing Stream 1 & 2 evidence in May 2023 some changes have occurred in the public housing provided in Waimakariri, namely:
- (a) At the present time, Kāinga Ora manages a public housing portfolio of approximately 243² homes across the Waimakariri District; and
 - (b) The Ministry of Social Development's Housing Register identifies that in June 2024 there are 90 households needing a home in Waimakariri; this is up from 38 homes needed in 2019.³
- 2.16 As previously identified, there continues to be a changing demand with respect to the typology of homes sought by those on the public housing waitlist. This demand is largely skewed towards smaller 1–2-bedroom homes in the Waimakariri District.
- 2.17 A significant proportion of the current demand (47% in 2019 and 60% in 2024) is for single bedroom housing required for single persons, the elderly or disabled. This trend of increasing demand for smaller homes is consistent with the national trends discussed in my previous evidence.
- 2.18 Furthermore, based on trends and Kāinga Ora development to date, there is a continued need for smaller more manageable sections for many residents.
- 2.19 Over the 2019 - 2024 period, Kāinga Ora added an additional 62 homes to its portfolio in Waimakariri. This was achieved through the redevelopment of older sites as well as the acquisition of new sites. The result of this development activity is that now one quarter of the current Kāinga Ora portfolio has been added in the past five years. For the next 2024/2025 period, Kāinga Ora has 25 new builds consented, which is a net increase of a further 16 homes within the district (taking into account the redevelopment of existing sites).

² Managed stock by Territorial Local Authority as of 30 June 2024.

³ [housing-register-june-2024.xlsx \(live.com\)](#)

- 2.20 The portfolio in Waimakariri is now considerably newer relative to the age of the assets in its national portfolio. These homes benefit from the accessibility of this area to the key centres of Waimakariri - Rangiora, and Kaiapoi (as well as being within easy access to Christchurch City) and numerous other amenities and community facilities.

Kāinga Ora approach to development in the Waimakariri District

- 2.21 The Kāinga Ora housing portfolio in the Waimakariri District has significantly increased in the last 10 years, increasing by an additional 110 homes. A significant portion of these additional homes have been delivered through comprehensive redevelopment, built on existing Kāinga Ora land. This approach is likely to continue as Kāinga Ora reviews land holdings and seeks to redevelop existing sites to meet the social housing demand and ensure the portfolio consists of warm, dry, healthy homes.
- 2.22 Over half (55%) of the Kāinga Ora housing stock within the Waimakariri District has been constructed within the last 10 years, however there is still approximately 18% of the housing stock which is more than 50 years old. A further 19% of the total Waimakariri Housing stock is between 20-50 years old. Given the consistently increasing social housing waitlist in the District, it is likely that over time Kāinga Ora will look to redevelop the older homes within its portfolio, and this is likely to occur during the life of the proposed PDP, V2 and V1.
- 2.23 There is an ongoing need for the renewal of older housing that is no longer fit for purpose. This presents a strong opportunity to reimagine brownfield and infill developments at scale where land holdings permit. To realise this Kāinga Ora seeks a planning framework which supports the development of smaller homes on functional sites in areas which are accessible to the town centre and community facilities.
- 2.24 Looking forward, Kāinga Ora may seek opportunities that are accessible to commercial and community services located with the town centres of the District. The Kāinga Ora portfolio within Waimakariri will only have a limited number of existing sites viable for redevelopment (sites with older homes on them) in the near future. Should additional public housing be needed in the region, there will be a need to acquired

sites for development, and an enabling planning framework will be required to ensure development of public housing is feasible and that the District Plan provides for the establishment of a range of housing choices both in size and typology. Specifically, there is a need for the District Plan to provide for smaller dwellings and typologies, such as low-rise walk-up apartments, that have not previously been enabled by the District Plan to meet current and future public housing need.

3. KĀINGA ORA SUBMISSIONS AND FURTHER SUBMISSIONS

- 3.1 The Kāinga Ora PDP submission and further submission points allocated to the Stream 7A hearings are attached in the evidence of Ms Dale at Appendix 1.
- 3.2 Submission points allocated to V2 are attached in **Appendix 1** of this evidence.
- 3.3 Kāinga Ora lodged comprehensive submissions across the PDP, V1 and V2. In making these submissions Kāinga Ora sought to ensure that the PDP provisions align with national planning directions to provide for well-functioning environments that meet the needs of current and future generations. Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to the PDP to ensure that development opportunities are enabled in locations that are located close to public transport, employment opportunities and public amenities such as education facilities, retail, and community services. In this way, well-functioning environments are formed to provide for the whole communities' social, economic, and cultural well-being.
- 3.4 Kāinga Ora is particularly concerned that some of the objectives, policies, and provisions in the PDP will not provide for efficient delivery of public housing and will inhibit the ability to provide for housing in the future.
- 3.5 Kāinga Ora acknowledges that in the Section 42A Report recommendations of Mr Maclennan, and Mr Wilson some changes to the Plan provisions are proposed, Kāinga Ora considers that there remain a number of outstanding matters which are necessary to address.

4. OBJECTIVE AND POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR THE PDP

- 4.1 The Kāinga Ora submission addressed the proposed objectives and policy framework in the PDP. Much of the focus of this was related to providing plan users with certainty and clarity, as well as in relation to aligning with the intent of the NPS-UD.
- 4.2 Kāinga Ora considers the PDP s42 author has not adequately addressed changes sought to RESZ-O1, RESZ-O2, RESZ-O3, RESZ-O5, RESZ-P1, RESZ-P2, RESZ-P3 and RESZ-P8.
- 4.3 One of the key issues raised by Kāinga Ora and addressed further in evidence for this hearing is the need to replace references to “existing character and amenity” with references to “planned/anticipated built form”, consistent with the policy direction in the NPS-UD. There is a need for a mindset shift in the way in which plan provisions are to provide for urban development, as directed by the NPS-UD.
- 4.4 Kāinga Ora is cognisant of the need for plans to provide for a range of housing choice and typologies. As mentioned above, a number of the units that Kāinga Ora have built or may seek to build in the future, will be smaller dwellings on smaller lot sizes. Without adequate support for these to be established in the objectives and policies of the Plan, this can negatively impact investment decisions, where consent barriers are, or are perceived to exist.
- 4.5 It is the view of Kāinga Ora that the objectives and policies as notified do not align with:
- i. The strategic directions of the plan;
 - ii. The outcomes sought through the NPS-UD, or;
 - iii. The needs of plan user in terms of an easy to navigate framework.
- 4.6 Ms Dale discusses these objectives and policies further and also provides amended drafting.⁴

⁴ Evidence of Ms Dale Hearing Stream 7A, dated 11 September 2024, Paragraphs 4.3-4.32 and Appendix 2

4.7 Kāinga Ora supports the drafting changes proposed by Ms Dale.

5. PROVISIONS WITHIN V2

5.1 The Kāinga Ora submission in relation to V2, supported the concept of Financial Contributions (“FC”) in principle, but raised concerns as to how these would be calculated and applied to developments. Kāinga Ora also questioned the relationship between the proposed FC’s and the existing Development Contributions.

5.2 Kāinga Ora has reviewed the Section 42A Report by Mr Wilson, and in its review, concludes that the concerns raised have not been fully addressed. The following matters are still relevant:

- (a) *FC-R1 New Residential Units* and the relief sought that the threshold for when a FC would be assessed and required should be only where there are more than three units; and
- (b) *FC-S1 Assessments Methodology* and that further clarity is required for all plan users around how any contribution will be assessed and calculated.

FC-R1 New Residential Units

5.3 With respect to *FC-R1 New Residential Units*, Kāinga Ora disagree with the assumptions made in the S42A report by Mr Wilson. At Section 1.55 of his report, he has implied that if the FC were to only apply where there are more than three units per site (as opposed to more than two units as notified)⁵, then this would allow for up to nine units to be constructed per parcel⁶ without any FCs being levied, and that a “substantial loading” would occur on the network without FCs to offset this.

5.4 It is not clear how Mr Wilson has arrived at this conclusion, but seemingly this assessment is made on the basis that most existing lots are able to be subdivided by three as of right, and V1 will permit three dwellings to be established per site as of right.

⁵ Rule FC-R1

⁶ S42A report, Mr Wilson, 19 August 2024, paragraph 155

- 5.5 Kāinga Ora contends that this assessment of what level of residential development will attract a FC has not been sufficient or appropriate. In light of this, Kāinga Ora recommends that the Panel adopt the proposed wording outlined in the Kāinga Ora primary submission, aligning the application of a financial contribution with the proposed permitted level of development anticipated by Variation 1, this being proposed at three units per site.
- 5.6 The rationale for this recommendation is that the application of financial contributions should address the cumulative effects of new residential development in a manner that is equitable in offsetting accelerated effects on infrastructure. As a matter of principle, Kāinga Ora does not believe that development within the anticipated built form would in and of itself create accelerated adverse cumulative effects that are out-of-step with capacity modelling that informs development contributions.
- 5.7 Kāinga Ora contends that within the V1 Medium Density Zone, up to three residential units should be a permitted activity, provided other standards are met. This intensification is anticipated by the MDRS and should form part of the planned environment in terms of infrastructure capacity and funding.
- 5.8 Kāinga Ora has not sought to exempt certain classes of types of development as implied in Mr Wilson's report.
- 5.9 Kāinga Ora contends that the assessment of the threshold to apply a FC has not been appropriately assessed, and therefore recommends the Panel should adopt the proposed wording, aligning the application of a financial contribution with Variation 1 provisions:

(a) *Activity status: PER CON*

Where:

- 1. there are more than ~~two~~ three residential units per site;*
- 2. a financial contributions assessment has been completed in accordance with FC-S1; and*
- 3. all monies calculated under FC-S2 to FC-S4 are paid.*

FC-S1 Assessment Methodology

- 5.10 The S42A author has stated in their response to some of the Kāinga Ora submission points that no particular relief was sought.⁷ However, the intent of the Kāinga Ora submission was to address a lack of transparency in the proposed rules regarding how a FC is assessed.
- 5.11 In other words, it is difficult to determine whether the provisions as notified are suitable. It is the view of Kāinga Ora that the standards still do not illustrate a clear methodology on how an FC is assessed, in accordance with s77E of the Amendment Act.
- 5.12 Kāinga Ora believe the Council must set out clearly in the District Plan how financial contributions are to be assessed, calculated, and explain the purpose they are to be collected. Kāinga Ora considers that without these matters being clearly articulated in the District Plan the Council has not fulfilled the requirements of the Act to levy the contributions. The Kāinga Ora submission seeks that requirements of the Act are met if financial contributions are to be proposed within the Plan.
- 5.13 Kāinga Ora supports the S42A recommendation to improve the clarity on the interface with development contributions. However, most of the remaining assessment of the Kāinga Ora submission points in V2 are disagreed with.
- 5.14 Kāinga Ora was clear in its relief sought, that FC-S1 needed to be comprehensively amended to provide clarity and certainty for plan users. As per the submission on V2 – Kāinga Ora suggested that the rules be supported by an online calculator, or mapping in order to support a plan user to determine the impact of any financial contribution on a development proposal. As the rules stand in the proposed V2, a development of a 2 unit+ proposal would be unaware of any FC cost requirements or any impacts such costs might have on the feasibility of a project prior to receiving a calculation from the Council, and the completion of a costly pre-consent process.

⁷ Submission Point 77.2, 77.3, 77.12 and 77.13

- 5.15 The lack of a robust and clear assessment methodology being replaced with the word *reasonable* in respect to costs that the Council may levy is of significant concern to Kāinga Ora.
- 5.16 Mr Wilson appears to be of a view that it would not be possible for Council to make such assessment methodology due to each FC being levied based on the particulars of a consent application or permitted activity⁸. Taking a converse view, it would be near impossible for a Plan user to ascertain what is reasonable in this light, having not the access to the same information the Council has, nor able to make any prediction of a FC they may be charged. The lack of a clear methodology for the identification of effects to mitigated by the financial contribution and the calculation of the charges payable does not provide for an efficient or effective administrative process for the collection of financial contributions. This lack of certainty will inevitably lead to challenges on each financial contribution sought to be levied by the Council.
- 5.17 It is the view of Kāinga Ora that the proposed standards and subsequent S42A recommendations do not illustrate a clear methodology on how an FC is applied and calculated, in accordance with s77E of the Amendment Act.
- 5.18 Kāinga Ora seeks to work with Council further regarding FCs and requests that the Council test-run a number of development proposals through an amended FC calculation assessment to see what issues may arise. This work would aid in identifying solutions and processes to improve and addresses any issues with the FC assessment methodology and would assist the Panel as part of its consideration of V2. Kāinga Ora seeks that without sufficient demonstration that the methodology to set financial contribution charges that are reasonable to the effects of development, equitable as to the distribution of costs or certain that the provisions as currently proposed are removed from the District Plan.

⁸ S42A report, Mr Wilson, 19 August 2024, paragraph 168

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The amendments sought by Kāinga Ora, as outlined in this evidence, the evidence of Ms Dale, and as summarised in **Appendix 2** to Ms Dale's evidence, are intended to provide an efficient and effective means to achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of the PDP and other relevant statutory documents including the NPS-UD.
- 6.2 If the Panel adopts the relief that Kāinga Ora has sought, better alignment with the PDP, the NPS-UD, and the purpose, principles and provisions of the RMA (as amended by the Amendment Act), will be achieved.
- 6.3 Furthermore, the amendments sought by Kāinga Ora for Variation 2, are needed to assist plan users with clarity and certainty.

Joshua Neville
11 September 2024

Appendix 1: Kāinga Ora Submission and Further Submission Points for Stream 7A Hearing / Variation 2

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Part 2 - District Wide Matters/ General District Wide Matters					
FC - Koha pūtea - Financial Contributions					
1.	FC - Koha pūtea - Financial Contributions	All provisions	Support in part	<p>In principle, Kāinga Ora supports and understands the need for Financial Contributions (FC) as a tool or mechanism to enable Council to take monetary contributions at the time of development to pay for (or mitigate) the additional effects/ demand of a development and that are not already programmed to be undertaken through Council's Long-Term Plan (and are therefore already funded through Development Contributions ('DC') and/or rates).</p> <p>However, Kāinga Ora has a number of concerns as identified in that part of its submission preceding Table 1 about the lack of clarity and certainty as to the costs of FC to developers.</p> <p>In Kāinga Ora's view, there needs to be greater transparency about costs and how these will be calculated and proportioned, and greater clarity in how FC will be implemented.</p>	Amend the provisions to provide greater clarity and certainty to plan users of the costs and implementation of FC.

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
2.	FC - Koha pūtea - Financial Contributions	Introduction to FC chapter	Support in part	Whilst generally supported, the introductory section to the chapter needs to clearly state that FC are required where the costs of development are not otherwise covered by development contributions or other funding sources available to the Council.	Amend the provisions as follows <i>Financial contributions are collected by councils to address adverse effects of development that cannot be otherwise avoided, remedied or mitigated. Financial contributions can be used to cover the proportioned cost of the provision of infrastructure, such as upgrading or replacement of infrastructure to service higher capacity; and/or to offset adverse effects on the environment, <u>where such costs are not otherwise addressed by any other funding source available to the Council.</u></i>
3.	FC - Koha pūtea - Financial Contributions	Objective FC-O1 Infrastructure impacts	Oppose	Whilst the objective appropriately seeks that development 'equitably contributes' towards the remediation or mitigation of effects on Council infrastructure, it does not adequately and clearly specify the purpose for which FC are required, as required by s77E of the Amendment Act.	Delete FC-01 as notified and amended to ensure the purpose for which FC are required is more clearly and comprehensively set out, in accordance with s77E of the Amendment Act.
4.	FC - Koha pūtea - Financial Contributions	Objective FC-O2 Environmental Effects	Oppose	FC-O2 is opposed for the same reasons expressed above in regards to FC-01.	Delete FC-02 as notified and amend to ensure the purpose for which FCs are required is more clearly and

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
					comprehensively set out, in accordance with s77E of the Amendment Act.
5.	FC - Koha pūtea - Financial Contributions	Policy FC-P1 Provision of Infrastructure	Support in part	<p>Consistent with submission point 2, this provision needs amendment to clearly state that FC are required where unplanned infrastructure upgrades and associated costs are not otherwise covered by development contributions or other funding sources available to Council.</p> <p>As worded, the policy may unnecessarily require FC for infrastructure upgrades that are 'ahead of the scheduled maintenance/replacement program' but which might otherwise be catered for in the Council's Development Contribution policy or by other funding sources (e.g. developer agreements or developer funded infrastructure) in a way that makes a FC unnecessary. Accordingly, the proposed amendments provide greater clarity and scope to consider wider sources of funding.</p>	<p>Amend FC-P1 as follows:</p> <p><i>Financial contributions are required where housing intensification, subdivision, and development or both have an adverse environmental effect on existing infrastructure, which requires capacity increases, upgrades or other modification to the infrastructure ahead of the scheduled maintenance/replacement program, or outside the scope of scheduled maintenance/replacement programme where such upgrades and costs are not otherwise addressed by Council's Development Contributions Policy or other funding sources available to the Council.</i></p>
6.	FC - Koha pūtea - Financial Contributions	Policy FC-P2 Acquisition of Land	Oppose	Kāinga Ora expect that the land requirements for new road reserve, stormwater reserve, or council infrastructure generally would be planned and provided for through the LTP process.	Delete FC-P2 in its entirety.

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
				To the extent that this policy might otherwise be intended to provide for the acquisition and vesting of land as an alternative source of funding, the relief sought in Kāinga Ora's submission on FC-P1 above would provide for this as an 'other funding source available to the Council'.	
7.	FC - Koha pūtea - Financial Contributions	Activity Rules FC-R1 Medium Density Residential Zone - New Residential Units	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora broadly supports the intent of the rule as notified, subject to its requested relief for rules FC-S1 to FCS4 (to which rule FC-R1 relates).</p> <p>However, Kāinga Ora seeks that:</p> <p>a. Rule FC-R1.1 be amended to apply to more than three residential units, on the basis that the MDRS permit up to 3 units per site and this level of development should be planned for by Council in terms of infrastructure requirements and funding; and</p> <p>b. Rule FC-R1.3 be amended to specify that FC be paid prior to the issue of a Code Compliance Certificate under the Building Act, to ensure such payments are not premature.</p>	<p>Amend FC-R1 as follows:</p> <p><i>Activity status: PER</i></p> <p><i>Where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. there are more than two <u>three</u> residential units per site;</i> <i>2. a financial contributions assessment has been completed in accordance with FC-S1; and</i> <i>3. all monies calculated under FC-S2 to FCS4 are paid, <u>prior to the issue of a Code Compliance Certificate under the Building Act 2004.</u></i>

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
				c. Make consequential amendments as required to V1, including as a minimum, the deletion of all other infrastructure assessment matters applying to land use consent applications for more than 3 units (noting this will otherwise be addressed by rule FC-R1). In the alternative, such applications should refer to rule FC-R1.	Make consequential amendments as required to V1, including as a minimum, the deletion of all other infrastructure assessment matters applying to land use consent applications for more than 3 units.
8.	FC - Koha pūtea - Financial Contributions	Activity Rule FC-R2 All Zones – Subdivision	Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to the rule, consistent with its submission on FC-R1.	<p>Amend FC-R2 as follows:</p> <p><i>Activity status: PER</i></p> <p><i>Where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>there are more than two <u>three</u> allotments are created;</i> 2. <i>a financial contributions assessment has been completed in accordance with FC-S1; and</i> 3. <i>all monies calculated under FC-S2 to FCS4 are paid, <u>prior to the issue of a completion certificate under section 224c of the Resource Management Act 1991.</u></i>
9.	FC - Koha pūtea - Financial Contributions	Financial Contribution Standards FC-S1:	Oppose	In principle, Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of an assessment methodology for FC.	Amend FC-S1 comprehensively in order to provide clarity and certainty in accordance with the comprehensive

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
		Assessment Methodology		<p>However, FC-S1 as notified provides no certainty or transparency to plan users. Among other things, FC-S1 provides no certainty as to the spatial extent/scope of a Financial Contribution Calculation Assessment, how the costs in FC-S1.1a-e will be determined, whether such costs will be determined or confirmed independently of Council, or to what extent they can be reviewed or contested in the event of disagreement with an Assessment.</p> <p>Accordingly, FC-S1 provides little or no certainty to plan users as to the potential implications of the Financial Contribution Calculation Assessment to development, including the potential magnitude of any resulting FC.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora also note that FC-S1 as notified does not refer to FC-S2 to FC-S4, despite these provisions being integral to FC-S1.</p>	submission points set out preceding Table 1 of Kāinga Ora's submission, and in accordance with the reasons expressed in this submission point.
10.	FC - Koha pūtea - Financial Contributions	Financial Contribution Standards FC-S2: Financial Contribution Calculation for Water, Wastewater and Stormwater	Oppose	<p>Consistent with its submission on FC-S1, Kāinga Ora supports the intent of this provision but has concerns with the lack of clarity and certainty in the provision as notified.</p> <p>Among other things, Kāinga Ora considers that FC-S2 to FC-S4 should be amended to:</p>	Amend FC-S2 comprehensively in order to provide clarity and certainty in accordance with the comprehensive submission points set out preceding Table 1 of Kāinga Ora's submission, and in accordance with the reasons expressed in this submission point.

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
				<p>a. Provide a consistent methodology for determining FC across all forms of infrastructure, to the extent possible. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Assessing whether infrastructure upgrades are already allowed for within the Council's Development Contributions Policy and only charging FC on upgrades not allowed for. ii. Only charging the proportion of FC needed to service the proposed development (e.g. accounting for cumulative effects on infrastructure, but not disproportionately charging FC to those who may be the first to trigger an infrastructure upgrade). <p>b. Provide specific calculations, to the extent possible (e.g. per FC-S4.1.c).</p> <p>c. Provide specific circumstances where FC will not be charged (e.g. per FC-S2.1.d).</p>	

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
				<p>d. Provide details as to who undertakes the assessment (e.g. per FC-S3.1.d) and the process for dispute resolution.</p> <p>e. By reference to an external document or resource provide an 'online calculator' or similar tools to enable plan users to readily assess FC.</p>	
11.	FC - Koha pūtea - Financial Contributions	Financial Contribution Standards FC-S3: Financial Contribution Calculation for Acquisition and Vesting of Land	Oppose	<p>Consistent with its submission on FC-P2, Kāinga Ora expect that the land requirements for new road reserve, stormwater reserve, or council infrastructure generally would be planned and provided for through the LTP process.</p> <p>To the extent that this policy might otherwise be intended to provide for the acquisition and vesting of land as an alternative source of funding, the relief sought in Kāinga Ora's submission on FC-P1 above would provide for this as an 'other funding source available to the Council'.</p>	Delete FC-S3 in its entirety.
12.	FC - Koha pūtea - Financial Contributions	Financial Contribution Standards FC-S4: Financial Contribution Calculation for Roading	Oppose	The FC provisions will apply when more than two (notified version) or three (Kāinga Ora relief) dwellings are developed on a single site. It is Kāinga Ora's view that FC-S4 should only apply where the scale of development requires road upgrades.	Amend FC-S4 comprehensively in order to provide clarity and certainty in accordance with the comprehensive submission points set out preceding Table 1 of Kāinga Ora's submission, and in accordance with the reasons expressed in this submission point.

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
				<p>Consistent with its submission on FC-S1, Kāinga Ora supports the intent of this provision but has concerns with the lack of clarity and certainty in the provision as notified.</p> <p>Among other things, Kāinga Ora considers that FC-S2 to FC-S4 should be amended to:</p> <p>a. Provide a consistent methodology for determining FC across all forms of infrastructure, to the extent possible. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Assessing whether infrastructure upgrades are already allowed for within the Council's Development Contributions Policy and only charging FC on upgrades not allowed for. ii. Only charging the proportion of FC needed to service the proposed development (e.g. accounting for cumulative effects on infrastructure, but not disproportionately charging FC to those who may be the first to trigger an infrastructure upgrade). 	

ID	Section of Plan	Specific Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
				<p>b. Provide specific calculations, to the extent possible (e.g. per FC-S4.1.c).</p> <p>c. Provide specific circumstances where FC will not be charged (e.g. per FC-S2.1.d).</p> <p>d. Provide details as to who undertakes the assessment (e.g. per FC-S3.1.d) and the process for dispute resolution.</p> <p>e. By reference to an external document or resource provide an 'online calculator' or similar tools to enable plan users to readily assess FC.</p> <p>As a general comment, Kāinga Ora considers that FC-S4 as notified provides greater certainty and clarity (as to the calculation methodology) that FC-S2 or FC-S3. Whilst further amendments are considered necessary, in accordance with its submission, Kāinga Ora considers that FC-S4 offers a useful starting point for such amendments.</p>	

Further Submission Points for Kāinga Ora - Stream 7A Hearing / Variation 2

Submitter Number and Name	Submission Point Number	Chapter Topic/ Provision	Submission Position	Summary of Decision Requested (Decision Sought)	Kāinga Ora response (support or oppose)	Kāinga Ora reasons	Decision(s) sought (allow or disallow)
66 Mark Allan - on behalf of Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	66.1	FC- Koha putea – Financial Contributions General	Oppose	Ensure consistency with development contributions policy, remove duplication with development contributions, and replace references to 'offset' or 'offsetting' with 'mitigate' or 'contribute towards'.	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission and the submitter's proposed amendments for the reasons expressed in, and to the extent that these are consistent with, its primary submission.	Allow
66 Mark Allan - on behalf of Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	66.2	FC- Koha putea – Financial Contributions FC-01 Infrastructure	Oppose	Amend Objective FC-O1 to clarify that contributions required to mitigate effects on Council infrastructure must be fair, reasonable, and consistent.	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission and the submitter's proposed amendments for the reasons expressed in, and to the extent that these are consistent with, its primary submission.	Allow
66 Mark Allan - on behalf of Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	66.3	FC- Koha putea – Financial Contributions FC-02 Environment	Oppose	Amend Objective FC-O2 to clarify that any contribution required to mitigate impacts on the environment must be fair, reasonable and consistent.	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission and the submitter's proposed amendments for the reasons expressed in, and to the extent that these are consistent with, its primary submission.	Allow
66 Mark Allan - on behalf of Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	66.4	FC- Koha putea – Financial Contributions FC-P1 Provision	Amend	Amend Policy FC-P1 (provision of infrastructure) to: <i>"Except where already provided for by the current WDC Development Contributions Policy, financial contributions are required where housing intensification, subdivision, and development or both have an adverse environmental effect on existing infrastructure, which requires capacity increases, upgrades or other modification to the infrastructure ahead of the scheduled maintenance/replacement program, or outside the scope of scheduled maintenance/replacement programme."</i>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission and the submitter's proposed amendments for the reasons expressed in, and to the extent that these are consistent with, its primary submission.	Allow
66 Mark Allan - on behalf of Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	66.5	FC- Koha putea – Financial Contributions FC-R1 New Residential	Oppose	Remove or amend Rule FC-R1 to: clearly articulate when any calculated financial contribution must be paid by; and provide greater certainty on the process for obtaining a financial contributions assessment and how this will be undertaken in a fair and reasonable way.	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission and the submitter's proposed amendments for the reasons expressed in, and to the extent that these are consistent with, its primary submission.	Allow
66 Mark Allan - on behalf of Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	66.6	FC- Koha putea – Financial Contributions	Oppose	Remove or amend Rule FC-R2 to: clearly articulate when any calculated financial contribution must be paid by; and provide greater certainty on the process for obtaining a	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission and the submitter's proposed amendments for the reasons expressed in, and to the extent that these are consistent with, its primary submission.	Allow