UNDER	the Resource Management Act 1991 ("**RMA**")
IN THE MATTER	of Proposed Plan Change 12 to the Operative Hamilton City District Plan

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF FRASER GUY MCNUTT ON BEHALF OF PRAGMA HOLDINGS LIMITED

[PLANNING]

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My full name is Fraser Guy McNutt. I am a planning consultant and hold the position of Partner at Barker & Associates Limited (B&A), an independent planning consultancy operating throughout New Zealand. As part of my role, I am Manager of B&A's Hamilton office; a position which I have held since June 2019. My qualifications and relevant experience are set out below.

1.2 I am a Full Member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I have a Bachelor in Social Sciences (Resources and Environmental Planning), (REP) from the University of Waikato. I have 16 years of experience in Resource Management and Local Government. My experience is broad and covers a range of both public and private development and strategic planning processes.

Expert Witness Code of Conduct

1.3 I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note 2023). I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing this evidence and agree to comply with it while giving evidence. Except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person, this written evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in this evidence.

1.4 I have been commissioned by Pragma Holdings Limited (**PHL**) to prepare this statement of evidence to address matters raised in their submission(s) in relation to Plan Change 12 (**PC12**). PC12 seeks:

(a) To respond to Hamilton City's revised approach to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act (HSAA) as notified under PC12 to the Hamilton Operative District Plan (ODP).

Purpose and Scope of Evidence

1.5 The scope of my evidence is limited to submissions (Submission 203 - 247-253 and 263-269 Horsham Downs Road; Submission 219 - 51A Rifle Range Road; Submission 228 – 163 River Road) made on behalf of **PHL** to PC12, and the associated relief sought.

1.6 The sequence of my evidence that responds to Plan Change 12 (**PC12**) is set out below:

(a) Executive summary;

(b) Site specific zoning relief, regarding 163 River Road; 247-253 and 263-269 Horsham Downs Road; 51A Rifle Range Road.

(c) Assessment Criteria

(d) Water Conservation Measures – Rule 25.13.4.5

(e) Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment

(i) Appendix 1.2.2.5 Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment

(f) Electric Vehicle Charging

(g) Rule 4.4.5.3 Impermeable Surface and Landscaping

2. SUMMARY OF MY EVIDENCE

2.1 The submission is generally supportive of Plan Change 12 (PC12) with some amendments requested that focus on the key topics below:

(a) Site specific zoning relief, regarding 163 River Road; 247-253 and 263-269 Horsham Downs Road and 51A Rifle Range Road to better align with current or anticipated development on these sites.

(b) The High-Density Residential Zone would benefit from having a set of tailored assessment criteria that are reflective of the intent of the zone and outcomes the Plan is seeking to achieve.

(c) The Information Requirement for a Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment (1.2.2.5b) lacks specificity, are too general to how it is applied, rely on a Council consultation process which is resource, technology and capability dependent. This might contribute to frustration, uncertainty, delays and as a consequence a significant impediment to development in Hamilton.

(d) Clarity is sought how the proposed Electric Vehicle Charging Rule could impact the ability to fee simple residential apartment and terraced typologies.

(e) There does not appear to be a Section 32 Evaluation of the alternatives considered to deliver the objectives of an urban tree canopy (tied to Rule 4.4.5.3 and repeated in other zones). The current wording is not easily understood, and when passed onto an owner / occupier could become a significant compliance obligation to Council, at a cost of the consent holder.

2.2 This evidence has focused on the role of Hamilton City Council (HCC) in ensuring appropriate infrastructure, capacity and assessment is applied to support coherent outcomes as part of PC12.

3. PLANNING ANALYSIS

3.1 The following sections of my evidence will focus on discussion points of the **PHL** submission(s) that were rejected or partially accepted in the 42a reports.

Site Specific Zoning Relief

163 River Road

3.2 The site owned by **PHL** and is located within the 'High Density Residential Zone' under PC12 where previously it was zoned Residential Intensification Zone. The site is within a 10-minute walking distance from the Hamilton CBD. I support the retention of the High Density Residential Zone for the subject site and exclusion from the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.

3.3 I support the exclusion from the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay as the provisions within the District Plan Three Waters Chapter for residential and non-residential

activities excluded from this overlay are sufficient in managing the effects on these services subject to the amendments detailed below.

3.4 I oppose the retention of the explanation to B – Design and Layout Assessment Criteria item and seek an amendment to these provisions to enable new developments within the High Density Zone to not be required to consider the surrounding context including adjacent properties and instead be assessed on their own merits and the developments ability to be achieve the Purpose of the Zone and the identified Objectives and Policies of the High Density Residential Zone. The S42A Report does not directly respond to this, and it is unclear how assessment criteria that appear to apply equally across all residential zones would be implemented as part of consideration of resource consent applications.

3.5 The Purpose of the High Density Residential Zone acknowledges; *Buildings of at least 6 storeys can be readily anticipated within this Zone, including adjacent to pre-existing 1 to 2 storey detached dwellings*. As a result, the character of the Zone is anticipated to change substantially over time. The provisions to then consider the surrounding context is contrary to this statement and could impede early development projects within this area resulting in the Zone not fulfilling its Purpose. The Purpose has been retained as notified under PC12, and I am concerned with how such a statement might be applied within the High Density Residential Zone.

3.6 The planning framework and provisions support a more nuanced approach to deliver the intent of the High Density Residential Zone, which in my opinion is currently lacking.

3.7 Assessment Criteria Item B2(c) seeks to assess whether a proposal is able to *Configure buildings to limit visual dominance and building length effects such that, as a rule of thumb, buildings should be no more than 70% of the length of a side or rear boundary, if 1-storey height, and 60% of a boundary, if 2 or more storeys in height.*

3.8 Due to the High-Density Residential Zoning occurring in large areas of Hamilton which have been predominately low to medium density in terms of urban form. This has resulted in allotment size and shape that could be restrictive of higher density development when assessed against this point.

3.9 It is also unclear which boundary should be used when applying this assessment item if the side and rear boundaries vary significantly in different lengths.

3.10 163 River Road has side and rear boundaries that equate to 28m, 27m and 38m approximately which limits the height of development to 17m, 16m and 22m depending on which boundary is used to assess this item any development could be limited to 16-17m which contradicts the High-Density Residential Zone provisions to enable developments to build to a maximum height of 26m (Rule 4.4.5.4).

3.11 **PHL** oppose this assessment criteria item and seek an amendment to these provisions to enable new developments within the High Density Residential Zone to not be required to be assessed against this item. B2(c) is considered to be ambiguous and also limits development's ability to provide good outcomes. This is inconsistent with the intention of the Plan and the foundation/ hierarchy the Plan is based on i.e., Purpose – Objectives – Policies – Rules.

3.12 Instead, developments within the High Density Residential Zone should be assessed on their own merits and the developments ability to be achieve the Purpose of the Zone and the identified Objectives and Policies of the High Density Zone.

3.13 Assessment Criteria C – Character and Amenity item C1 General requires a development/ activity to be assessed on the extent to which the activity: • *Ensures adequate onsite amenity is provided for future occupants. In particularly, internal living spaces should be practical and functionable. As a general rule of thumb, internal living areas should have a minimum dimension of 3.8m. 3m for basic furniture and 0.8m for circulation.*

3.14 In my opinion, this item falls out of the scope of Council and the RMA. Provisions of the District Plan should seek to provided quality and functional on-site amenity. Council should not direct how this form of on-site internal amenity should be provided. Developments and the sites they occur on provide unique characteristics and opportunities that should not be restricted in relation to design due to a Council 'general rule of thumb' in relation to internal living area dimensions.

3.15 The use of 'Rule of Thumb' which is defined as a broadly accurate guide or principle is more so than not based on practice. This rule of thumb 'guidance' can be led to being ambiguous and also limits development's ability to provide good outcomes when governed by an arbitrary statement which is not provided as a planning rule/ provision. This conflicts with the intention of the Plan and the foundation/ hierarchy the Plan is based on i.e., Purpose – Objectives – Policies – Rules.

3.16 I oppose this assessment criteria item and seek an amendment to these provisions to enable new developments within the High-Density Residential Zone be assessed on their own merits and the developments' ability to be achieve the Purpose of the Zone and the identified Objectives and Policies of the High-Density Residential Zone.

3.17 The High Density Residential Zone, in my opinion, would benefit significantly from having its own set of assessment criteria that are suitably tailored to the intent of the zone and outcomes the Plan is seeking to achieve. In my opinion, the ambiguity associated with how Council might process a resource consent and assess it against this section could give unintended consequences or outcomes that are not aligned with the underlying zoning.

247 – 253, 263-269 Horsham Downs Road

3.18 The sites are currently zoned Rototuna North East Character Zone (RNECZ), **PHL** support the residential precinct based approach and General Residential Zone that has been applied as part of PC12.

3.19 **PHL** also seek exclusion from the ICO, given that Council's S32 Report clearly states that it does not apply to Greenfield sites, which is applicable to the subject sites above. Section 9.1 of Appendix 2.5 Infrastructure Capacity Provisions, outlines that *"Greenfield areas are excluded from the overlay, as the current subdivision and development process enables capacity issues to be addressed through consent processes."*. Therefore, it is considered that the site should not be included in the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay in accordance with the Section 32 Report provided by HCC.

3.20 **PHL support** the Precinct based approach that is also adopted in Rotokauri.

51a Rifle Range Road

3.21 Submission 219 (**PHL**) sought a rezoning at 51A Rifle Range Road from an Open Space zoning to General Residential. No specific reasons for declining this request have been seen in the relevant S42a Reports. For the reasons stated in the original submission, the site is more appropriate with a General Residential zoning, noting the consented baseline and the fact that the consent has additionally been given effect to. The zoning should acknowledge and reflect the built environment.

Water Conservation Measures – Rule 25.13.4.5

3.22 I support the clarity provided that differentiates the notified PC12 water sensitive techniques definition and Rule 25.13.4.5 which focuses on Water Conservation Measures. Given the intent of the Water Conservation Measures is now clear, it seems to apply to each residential unit as part of a development, further clarification on how this would be assessed and considered within the High Density Residential Zone is required. If a proposal included a 5 storey walk up apartment units as part of a bigger apartment building, as anticipated in the zone, would one satisfy this rule if a single rainwater tank were provided onsite that was appropriately sized based on demand, not on 3000 litre requirement per unit? The likely scenario would be water demand for gardening requirements associated with a High Density Residential Zone development differ from elsewhere in the residential zone. Yes, water reuse is anticipated and provided for, however depending on the scale of development some pragmatism is likely required and it is unclear how this would be applied.

Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment Overlay – Table 1.2.2.5b

3.23 Table 1.2.2.5b outlines the information required for Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment. **PHL** oppose the requirements outlined in Table 1.2.2.5b.

3.24 As outlined in the S42a Author's report, *On the whole, the recommended amendments are minor in nature and retain the notified PC12 approach to Three Waters. The recommended changes provide improved clarity, correct errors, and align with HCC's recommended changes to other chapters of the district plan and the planning maps* (emphasis added).

3.25 Given the perception that the recommended amendments are minor in nature and the PC12 approach as notified is largely retained, the detailed concerns outlining the appropriateness of the S32 evaluation report remain. The S42A author goes on to state

"The other changes that I am recommending to notified PC12 generally retain the notified approach to Three Waters matters and are minor in nature, and the original section 32 assessment remains generally applicable." (Paragraph 41, S42A Author on Three Waters)

3.26 **PHL** consider the adequacy of the S32 Evaluation Report, as provided as Appendix 2.5 Infrastructure Capacity Provisions of HCC's Section 32 Evaluation Report, is inadequate for the following reasons:

a. There is inconsistency between the technical assessments provided in relation to demand and capacity, particularly in Appendix 2.5 Infrastructure Capacity Provisions, Appendix 3.4 Capacity Modelling and Appendix 3.5 Three Waters Performance Assessment Report. This inconsistency establishes a level of doubt in the data and subsequent assessment provided in the Section 32 Evaluation Report.

b. Appendix 2.5 Infrastructure Capacity Provisions cross references the HBA 2021 Assessment, which concludes that capacities cannot be accurately calculated. This supports point 3.26a. above, which establishes that the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay that is being treated as a qualifying matter, in my opinion, is not supported by sound evidence.

"Given the complex, integrated nature of the 3 waters networks an accurate figure for short-medium-long term infill/intensification infrastructure serviced capacity for Hamilton City Council cannot be accurately calculated. The ability for existing infrastructure in the current urban environment will vary from street to street, and suburb to suburb, significantly influenced by the age of the infrastructure and design standards at the time of construction."

c. I consider that Appendix 3.5 Three Waters Performance Assessment Report is inappropriate having been prepared based upon outdated modelling and population figures which misalign with the most recent capacity model included in PC12.

"The performance assessments use HCC most recent modelling results and three waters master plans. The water and wastewater modelling and master plans are based on 2017 population and growth projections. These population and growth figures do not reflect the current plan enabled capacity or the MDRS and NPS-UD requirements".

d. Appendix 2.5 Infrastructure Capacity Provisions has not comprehensively assessed the proposed Infrastructure Capacity Overlay in accordance Section 77J of the RMA, in particular the assessment fails to consider what the impact of limiting development capacity, building heights or density, will have on the provision of development capacity instead raising concerns with the potential unfetter development capacity created by PC12.

3.27 The NPS-UD requires Councils to plan well for growth and ensure a well-functioning urban environment for all people, communities and future generations. The NPS-UD also provides Councils the necessary policy direction to allow further urbanisation where it may not have previously been anticipated or supported by operative planning frameworks.

3.28 The NPS-UD recognised the national significance of:

- Having well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.

- Providing sufficient development capacity to meet the different needs of people and communities.

3.29 Objective 3 requires "*district plans* enable more people to live in*, … areas of an urban environment in which one or more of the following apply:*

a) The area is in or near a centre zone or other area with many employment opportunities

b) The area is well serviced by existing or planned public transport

c) There is high demand for housing or for business land in the area, relative to other areas within the urban environment"

3.30 The Infrastructure Capacity Overlay discourages residential development by making it costly, time intensive and restrictive. The Infrastructure Capacity Overlay results in further assessments (Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment) that might see an increased development cost to the applicant and is anticipated to require additional resourcing to a resource consenting process which is already at capacity in my opinion.

3.31 The Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment is likely in my view to be expensive and time intensive. The S32A Report that evaluates the costs and benefits of the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment identifies that *"Applicants will incur the costs of a Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment report. This will not be dissimilar to the current costs of a Water Impact Assessment however, the applicability will be broadened to also apply to developments of 1-3 residential units in the Overlay that are at a density of more than 1 per 150-200m2 (zone dependent)."*.

PHL believe this statement is flawed on the basis that the specific provisions proposed under PC12 are ambiguous and unnecessary for the reasons detailed in the points above and Paragraph 3.26 of this evidence. As the information requirements outlined in *Table 1.2.2.5b* (Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment) are unclear, indirect, difficult to understand and open to interpretation, and this lack of clarity means assessments are likely to be lengthy which comes at a greater cost.

3.32 The Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment is anticipated to see an increased development cost to the applicant and to require additional resourcing to a resource consenting process which is already at capacity. In addition, it is likely that to avoid this assessment, developers/applicants may limit development to 1-3 residential units which may not achieve that NPS-UD which is to enable greater residential development.

3.33 The information requirements are anticipated to vary in detail dependant on the scale and significance of the potential effects of a proposal. It is suggested that a threshold trigger would be more appropriate for this assessment. For example, the requirement for information would be required for applications greater than 40 lots / units, in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds. Such a trigger would represent a more realistic response to managing infrastructure constraints, whilst supporting environmental and economic outcomes in Hamilton.

3.34 The revised Table 1.2.2.5b seeks to introduce more clarity on what is required to satisfy this information requirement. The intent is supported, however further clarity is still required. 1.2.2.5b ii now states *Details of what on site stormwater management techniques are proposed and <u>resulting demands on downstream infrastructure</u>* (emphasis added). I have not seen a definition of downstream infrastructure, but assume the intent is to only capture Council infrastructure.

3.35 1.2.2.5b iii now states *Council confirmation of available Three Waters infrastructure capacity to appropriately service the proposal, taking into account:*

a. Net increase in water and wastewater demands

b. Available water flow and pressure

c. Known water and wastewater capacity constraints

d. The cumulative effect of permitted and consented development elsewhere in the catchment

e. Programmed and funded Council works.

As part of the process of Council confirming available capacity, detailed modelling of developments on water and wastewater network capacity may be required to be provided by applicants.

3.36 The suggested amendments provide more certainty on what Council expects to receive in relation to this information requirement. I support the intent, however, given this is pitched at developments with 3 or more units in some zones, this is quite a significant obstacle and impediment to timely delivery of housing and broader planning outcomes sought by PC12. The comment that detailed modelling may be required by applicants, is understood, but provides limited certainty of the likelihood, the cost, time and subsequent implications of the modelling. Nor does it talk to how transparent this modelling information will be displayed and shared, or who own the model(s). Given the importance of modelling within the three waters infrastructure capacity assessment, this is critical to the transparent and successful implementation of the approach outlined.

3.37 1.2.2.5b 'd' outlined above, includes permitted and consented development. I support the intent of this and acknowledge the S42a Report Author for Three Waters sees this sitting with Council to provide as part of the consultation, however it is unclear just how this might be interpreted. If you consider a catchment, apply the permitted underlying provisions and then assess that as the current status quo for infrastructure demand, it does not seem to apply consideration of scale and time. I consider it fanciful to assume a developed catchment baseline that could be quickly established reflective of the PC12 permitted baseline, whereas the modelling should in my opinion factor in metrics that support anticipated intensification that aligns with current and future projected catchment growth, which will represent more accurate reflection of demand. Equally I hold concern with the ability for Council to accurately reflect the consented development baseline at any one time and for this information to be readily available for experts to prepare reporting against.

3.38 1.2.2.5b iv outlined below, *Where there is insufficient capacity to appropriately service the proposal, details of;*

a. Outcomes of consultation with Council as asset owner

b. *Possible works to increase capacity and or other mitigation measures both within a development area or site, as well as within the relevant network surrounding the development site or area*

c. *Reduction in the scale of the development and/ or staging of the development to match available capacity*

d. *Private Development Agreements towards infrastructure upgrades*

e. *Incorporation of measures to reduce water consumption and limit wastewater outflows*

f. *Any measures necessary to remedy any identified deficiencies in water supply for firefighting purposes.*

3.39 Given the comprehensive nature of Table 1.2.2.5b, I consider 1.2.2.5b iv. to essentially act as a safety net for Council. Given the level of information required, the detail that is expected and the scale to which it currently applies, a resource consent application where in the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Overlay, would require consultation, and in effect approval, from the Council engineering team, prior to formal lodgement. This essentially adds a step to the process. It is likely that development within the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Overlay will require significant front-end processes within Council's engineering department. The scale, level of information and technical detail that has been outlined, does raise significant questions about how this can be resourced, triaged, and considered whilst maintaining good practice and timely inputs into the resource consent process.

3.40 Quoting from JWS Waters & Planning 4th and 5th May 2023, *Jackie Colliar and Raewyn Simpson noted Council have committed funding to deliver a new web based viewer to display relevant information to assist with meeting the proposed information requirements which would be available to assist the process. An improved process is also being developed to assist with making the access to relevant information easier. The web based capacity assessment viewer is due for initial delivery in early 2024. For larger developments Council has established processes for infrastructure capacity assessments including how developers can procure services to utilize council water and wastewater models where that is required. (Para 3.3.5)*

3.41 As far as I am aware, an external facing web based viewer to display relevant information to assist with meeting the proposed information requirements is yet to be

unveiled, whilst clearly being identified for early 2024. Acknowledging Council is currently in a challenging fiscal situation, one would expect it is likely the applicant will pay or contribute to the cost of the consultation prior to lodging a resource consent. Further understanding and consideration of this within the S32 Report is expected to understand the true cost of implementing a secondary approval process within the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.

3.42 In addition to this, I consider that 1.2.2.5b iv b) is a matter that is more appropriate to consider as part of a S95 and S104 planning assessments, in terms of mitigation measures both within the site and more broadly. To elevate this to being part of an Information Requirement, and one that is essentially satisfied prior to lodgement, confuses the role and consideration that Council must adhere to under the RMA.

3.43 The overall concern about how this Information Requirement will be considered and applied is summed up by Council's S42a Author of the Three Waters Evidence, who has acknowledged Council is on a step change to implement this process, and whilst heartened, the underlying costs (time, implications, uncertainty) associated with the ambiguity of how this information requirement will be assessed could significantly impact the ability to support future growth in Hamilton.

3.44 In addition to the broad application of the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Overlay, there is uncertainty to how this is removed or uplifted as infrastructure is improved and able to support future demand.

3.45 Overall, as currently pitched, the Information Requirement for a Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment (1.2.2.5b) lacks specificity, is too general to how it is applied, relies on a Council consultation process which is resource, technology and capability dependent. This may contribute to frustration, uncertainty, delays and as a consequence, an impediment to development in Hamilton.

Electric Vehicle Charging

3.46 Rule 25.14.4.2b – Electric Vehicle Charging has been reworded to respond to submissions made. The impact of the rules have now focused on one EV charging point per residential unit with some exceptions. The S42a Author outlines that Appendix K of their evidence adequately addresses the scenario of multi-unit development and the implementation of EV charging points. The scenario presented relies on the existence of a body corporate, and a traditional means of unit title

subdivision. Fee Simple Subdivision is provided for within the Plan. Clarity is sought how the proposed Rule will impact the ability to fee simple residential apartment and terraced typologies.

Rule 4.4.5.3 Impermeable Surface and Landscaping

3.47 Whilst acknowledging **PHL** did not specifically submit on the landscaping rule originally as notified, the broader submission points made on Assessment Criteria outlined above highlight the importance of considering onsite amenity and design and layout elements. A 20% tree canopy at maturity is set within this rule, for both the General Residential and Medium Density Residential Zones. As drafted it also applies to the High Density Residential Zone, however the S42a Author's report refers to 10% tree canopy coverage at maturity applying to the High Density Residential Zone.

3.48 There does not appear to be a Section 32 Evaluation of the alternatives considered to deliver the objectives of an urban tree canopy, as specified in the updates set of provisions. Practically, how this might compete with outdoor living areas and driveways could be challenging, as there will be a tension between canopy cover / growth and other onsite amenities that are sought. Having outdoor living areas that are fully landscaped, whilst providing high onsite visual amenity, may not support all the broader elements that an owner/occupier might want in their outdoor living area.

3.49 Given the time it takes to achieve maturity, one would expect such an approach would be tied to conditions of consent, whether as part of a landscape plan or similar. The current wording is not easily understood, and when passed onto an owner / occupier could become a significant compliance obligation to Council, at a cost of the consent holder.

3.50 Notwithstanding some of the obstacles outlined above, the Deep Soil Area (DSA) captured in Rule 4.4.5.3 c) and d), does not appear to have a specific S32 Evaluation Report. Acknowledging the Evidence of Michael Graham on Urban Landscape/Green Policies, this is not a S32 Evaluation. New Zealand Transport Agency Landscaping Guidelines recommend topsoil of 300mm for general planting, which is less than the 400mm proposed. The rationale as to why uncompacted soils is used, in the absence of a definition, is again open for interpretation.

3.51 The implementation of the Tree Canopy provisions are challenging, however cascading the quantum for the High Density Residential Zone to 10% is a more balanced approach, which reflects the different outcomes and amenities available in proximity to higher density. Given the strategic intent and importance of delivering a balanced Plan under PC12, that enables for growth, site redevelopment, and broader outcomes, within the Medium Density

Residential Zone a % of 15% urban canopy would be considered more appropriate. This essentially provides a cascade of where tree canopy coverage is applied and supports the broader outcomes being sought in the PC12 provisions.

4. CONCLUSION

4.1 Overall, I consider that with the appropriate amendments suggested in this evidence, the PC12 will better respond to the current and future environment outcomes sort through PC12.

Fraser McNutt

24th July 2024