

**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 S42A Officer's Summary Statement on the commercial and industrial
rezoning submissions on behalf of the Waimakariri District Council
Date: 31 May 2024**

Introduction

1. My name is Andrew Willis. I am a consultant planner engaged by the Waimakariri District Council to respond to the commercial and industrial rezoning submissions. I prepared the s42A report on these rezoning submissions and can confirm that I have read all the submissions, further submissions, submitter evidence and relevant technical documents and higher order policies. I also prepared the s42A reports for the commercial and industrial zones. I have the qualifications and experience as set out in my s42A report.
2. My intention with this summary is to provide background information on the commercial and industrial zoning approach in the Proposed Plan and summarise the key points in the s42A report. I will also touch on the outstanding matters covered in evidence by the submitters, however it is not my intention to provide a preliminary view on these matters at this time as I wish to hear the evidence and the Hearing Panel questions and I note that there is a right of reply where I can provide a formal response to the matters heard at the hearing.

Commercial and industrial zoning - background

3. The Operative Plan contains two key business zones (Business 1 for commercial activities and Business 2 for industrial activities), together with a number of bespoke zones for specific areas / developments (such as the Business 5 Zone at Waimak Junction in Kaiapoi and Business 3 Zone for the Daiken operations near Sefton).
4. In the Proposed Plan, the Operative Plan's zones were migrated to the most closely matched zone provided under the National Planning Standards (NPS). Figure 2 in the Commercial and Industrial s32 (page 33) shows the zone migration for the commercial zones. The Operative Plan's Business 2 industrial zones and bespoke industrial zones were migrated to the LIZ, GIZ and HIZ.
5. In addition to migrating the existing commercial and industrial zoned sites to the NPS zones, a number of residential and rural zoned sites containing established commercial or industrial activities were rezoned to commercial or industrial zones where considered more appropriate. Some vacant greenfield land was also rezoned as set out in the s32. Section 5.5.1 of the s32 set out the re-zoning criteria used to assess rezoning decisions.

S42A report – key points

6. There were 65 submissions and 3 further submissions received on CMUZ or INZ zonings that have been allocated to Hearing Stream 12A. The s42A report responded to the submissions, relying on supporting evidence for the Council provided by Mr Derek Foy (on economic matters) and the Council's engineers on roading and servicing matters.
7. The submissions received ranged from:
 - Supporting the Proposed Plan's zoning;
 - Rezoning to recognise existing activities;
 - Rezoning to recognise resource consented, but not yet established, activities;
 - Rezoning to support proposed activities; and
 - Rezoning to carry over and accommodate the agreed Plan Change 30 (PC30) provisions for North Woodend (Ravenswood).

Submitter evidence – key outstanding matters

8. Based on evidence before the Hearing Panel, I consider that the matters in contention identified in the submissions has narrowed significantly. The key remaining matters are:
 - The appropriate zoning of 726, 732, 734 Main North Road, Kaiapoi. Southern Capital Ltd [131.1] is seeking LIZ, whereas I recommended to retain the RLZ zoning.
 - The appropriate zoning of 464 and 474 Mandeville Road, Mandeville. A & M Giles [335.1] is seeking an LCZ zoning, whereas I recommended to retain the LLRZ zoning.
 - The appropriate provisions to apply to Ravenswood. RDL Investments Ltd [347] sought a number of zone and provision changes to accommodate the Ravenswood development in North Woodend. I have largely agreed with the requested changes and included recommended changes in my s42A report Appendix A, however I note the submitter's legal submission is seeking the Panel adopt the amendments set out in Annexure 2 of Mr Haines' evidence (which I responded to in my s42A report), with a new additional amendment to TCZ-P1(2) to remove the reference to the 'Woodend/Pegasus commercial catchment' (which I have not assessed).