

**Before the Hearings Panel  
At Waimakariri District Council**

**Under** Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

**In the matter of** the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

**Between** **Various**

**Submitters**

**And** **Waimakariri District Council**

**Respondent**

---

**Council Officer's Preliminary Response to written questions on Hearing  
Stream 12A Rezoning requests – Whitua  
motuhaka Special Purpose Zone – Pegasus  
Resort (SPZ(PR)) on behalf of Waimakariri District Council**

**Date: 30 May 2024**

---

**INTRODUCTION:**

- 1 My full name is Jessica Anneka Manhire. I am employed as a Policy Planner for Waimakariri District Council.
- 2 The purpose of this document is to respond to the list of questions published from the Hearings Panel in response to my s42A report.
- 3 In preparing these responses, I note that I have not had the benefit of hearing evidence presented to the panel at the hearing. For this reason, my response to the questions may alter through the course of the hearing and after consideration of any additional matters raised.
- 4 Following the conclusion of this hearing, a final right of reply document will be prepared outlining any changes to my recommendations as a result of evidence presented at the hearing, and a complete set of any additions or amendments relevant to the matters covered in my s42A report.
- 5 I am authorised to provide this evidence on behalf of the District Council.

**Date:** 30/05/2024



.....

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question	Officer's preliminary reply pre hearing
<p>Para 66</p> <p>Residential capacity</p>	<p>The Panel is trying to reconcile the following statement:</p> <p><i>In addition, ... the Waimakariri Residential Capacity and Demand Model September 2023 (WCGM23] ... notes that the <u>total plan enabled capacity in Woodend/Pegasus is now estimated to be around 15,660 new dwellings, or more than five times the existing number of dwellings in this area.</u></i></p> <p>With:</p> <p><i>It concludes that there <u>may not be sufficient residential supply in Woodend/Pegasus in the medium term, with a small shortfall.</u></i></p> <p>Please explain the relationship between these two statements.</p>	
	<p>The total plan enabled capacity in Woodend/Pegasus is estimated by the model to be 15,660. This is the theoretical maximum that could be built under the PDP. However, taking into account what is reasonably realisable and commercially feasible, as required by the NPS-UD, there could still be a potential small shortfall to meet the residential demand in the short-medium term of 280 units.</p> <p>However, I note that, neither I nor Mr Rodney Yeoman have considered the residential supply in the context of the rezoning requests across the wider District Plan Review as a whole, as capacity is being revisited as part of the residential rezoning requests which will be heard in Hearing Stream 12E.</p>	
<p>Para 137</p> <p>1250 Main North Rd</p>	<p>The Panel is trying to reconcile the following statement:</p> <p><i>I consider the site itself <u>would be a different character than the surrounding environment.</u></i></p>	

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question	Officer's preliminary reply pre hearing
	<p>With:</p> <p><i>As noted in the Landscape Effects Assessment, boundaries are to be provided with landscaping to screen and soften views of built form from beyond the site.</i></p> <p><i>In my view, from a planning perspective, <u>the open space and parkland character would mostly be retained from the surrounding sites and give effect to SPZ(PR)-P3 as landscape character values will continue to be provided for.</u></i></p> <p>Please explain the relationship between these two statements.</p>	
<p>Those two statements concluded the paragraphs above in the s42A report in regard to the consideration of character from two different perspectives.</p> <p>The first was about the development on the site itself and how it would be a different character than the surrounding environment.</p> <p>The second statement was focused on whether there would still be open space and a parkland character when viewed from the surrounding sites, and concluded the reduction of open space from the surrounding sites would be minimal due to the large setbacks and the outlook onto the golf course and Taranaki Stream.</p>		
Para 155	<p>You state that:</p> <p><i>The District Council's Senior Civil Engineer Mr Aramowicz has reviewed the information and advises there are no significant natural hazards that cannot be addressed at the time of detailed engineering design. He notes the presence of Taranaki Stream that will need protection and appropriate setbacks. He recommends <u>the developer be required to achieve low-moderate risk of liquefaction induced damage to land,</u></i></p>	

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question	Officer's preliminary reply pre hearing
	<p><i>services and other District Council infrastructure. I accept Mr Aramowicz advice.</i></p> <p>Please explain how Mr Aramowicz's advice is relevant to and would be implemented through the Panel's decisions on rezoning the land?</p>	
<p>As there were no significant natural hazards that could not be addressed at the time of detailed engineering design, Mr Aramowicz's advice was not determinative in forming the recommendation and was not intended to be implemented through the panel's decisions on rezoning land. His advice could be addressed at the time of detailed design and as part of resource consent.</p>		
<p>Para 163</p>	<p>You state:</p> <p><i>DEXIN's original submission indicated the intention to circulate amended provisions before the convening of the hearing on the SPZ(PR) Chapter. DEXIN has provided amended SPZ(PR) provisions <u>attached as Appendix 1 to the further submission</u> and provided updated provisions along with the further information provided on the 5th March 2024.</i></p> <p>Can you please clarify whether there are any scope issues with this additional information being provided as part of a further submission (which the Panel understands can only be lodged in support or opposition of an original submission and cannot request amended/new provisions)</p>	
<p>I did not consider there to be scope issues for the following reasons:</p> <p>In the original submission DEXIN sought relief to:</p> <p><i>"...provide an updated and amended version of the chapter provisions, as well as additional technical reports and assessment (including but</i></p>		

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question	Officer's preliminary reply pre hearing
		<p><i>not limited to including a landscape, ecology, transport, urban design, economic, archaeology and infrastructure) to underpin how the provisions have been derived and to support their inclusion within SPZ(PR) chapter.”<sup>1</sup></i></p> <p>While, the original submission did not provide a marked up version of the chapter, it listed the amendments sought to the provisions. While the submission did not specifically list SPZ(PR)-O2, I consider it was clear that amendments were sought to <i>“ensure the effective delivery of the range of proposed activities (market/agricultural tourism/wellness/events/visitor accommodation/residential) in the new ODP area”</i>.<sup>2</sup></p> <p>DEXIN also further submitted in support of its original submission, so the additional information was provided in support of its original submission.</p> <p>I note that amended provisions were also provided as part of technical evidence to be considered in preparing the s42A report, as per Minute 1.<sup>3</sup></p>

---

<sup>1</sup> DEXIN [377], page 7-8

<sup>2</sup> DEXIN [377], page 7

<sup>3</sup> Minute 1, para 74