

**Elias Matthee for QLDC – Summary Statement for Subdivision (Chapter 27)**

1. My s42A Report addresses submissions on the notified amendments to Chapter 27 – Subdivision and Development, prepared as part of the Urban Intensification Variation (**Variation** or **UIV**) to the Proposed District Plan. I have not prepared rebuttal evidence. The purpose of the amendments to Chapter 27 are to support the delivery of intensification in appropriate urban locations and to align the subdivision chapter with changes to the relevant residential zone chapters.
2. The key notified changes to Chapter 27 are:
  - (a) new policy references to housing diversity and future character (notified Policies 27.2.1.4 and 27.2.3.2);
  - (b) a decrease in minimum lot size of from 450m<sup>2</sup> to 300m<sup>2</sup> in the Lower Density Suburban Residential Zone (**LDSRZ**), and an increase in the High Density Residential Zone (**HDRZ**) minimum lot size from 450m<sup>2</sup> to 600m<sup>2</sup>;
  - (c) the introduction of minimum lot dimension standards for the LDSRZ, Medium Density Residential Zone (**MDRZ**), and HDRZ (notified Rule 27.7.30); and
  - (d) an amendment to Rule 27.7.32 to replace the reference to “infill development” with “residential development” for clarity;
  - (e) amendments to Rule 27.7.33 to clarify that the rule is applicable when subdivision associated with residential development is proposed where sites are less than 300m<sup>2</sup> in the LDSRZ; and
  - (f) amendments to Rule 27.7.33.1 to enable subdivision below 300m<sup>2</sup> in the LDSRZ where a combined land use and subdivision consent is lodged.
3. I support the majority of the notified Chapter 27 provisions. I support the new policy reference to housing and future character. I consider that the notified 300m<sup>2</sup> minimum lot area for subdivision in the LDSRZ removes a barrier to achieving densities already enabled by the PDP. In the HDRZ, I support the notified 600m<sup>2</sup> minimum lot size, which is intended to reduce land fragmentation and support more efficient urban development over time. While this may have limited short-term economic benefit, I consider it appropriate from an implementation perspective and to enable higher-density development outcomes in the long term. I support the notified lot dimension standards, which better reflect the anticipated built form in each zone and were informed by urban design evidence. I also

support the clarification to Rule 27.7.32, which improves its application across both infill and greenfield contexts.

4. In response to submissions received, I recommend one change to the notified provisions aimed to be more enabling of smaller lots within the LDSRZ — the removal of notified subparagraphs (b) and (c) from Rule 27.7.33.1. These subparagraphs duplicate matters of discretion and assessment matters (Rules 27.5.7 and 27.9.3.1), which applications will already be assessed against under the PDP and the Council’s Code of Practice. Subject to this amendment, I consider the notified changes to Chapter 27 remain appropriate and give effect to the Objectives and Policies of the NPS-UD by enabling more efficient use of urban-zoned land and supporting a compact and well-functioning urban form.
5. I also note that if Ms Morgan’s evidence in respect of the Three Parks rezoning is accepted, changes will be needed to the subdivision chapter.
6. No evidence has been filed for any submitters that challenges the s42A recommended subdivision provisions.

**Elias Jacobus Matthee**

**28 July 2025**