

**IN THE MATTER of
the Resource Management Act 1991**

AND

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

AND

**of hearing of submissions and further
submissions on Variation 1 to the
Proposed Waimakariri District Plan**

**MINUTE 47 – REPLY REPORT QUESTIONS
FOR HEARING STREAM 12D**

REPLY REPORT QUESTIONS FOR HEARING STREAM 12D

1. The purpose of this Minute is to set out the IHP Panel questions for the Reply Report for Hearing Stream 12D. The timeframe for this Reply Report is set out in Minute 44.
2. The section 42A report author for Hearing Stream 12D is directed to address the matters included in Appendix 1 of this Minute in their Reply Report.
3. The Reply Report should also include comment on any other matters raised in submitter evidence at the hearing that require a response and should confirm or amend any recommendations as may be appropriate. The Reply Report is to append a fully updated Appendix B, recommended responses to submissions and further submissions.

CORRESPONDENCE

4. Submitters and other hearing participants must not attempt to correspond with or contact the Hearings Panel members directly. All correspondence relating to the hearing must be addressed to the Hearings Administrator on 0800 965 468 or Audrey.benbrook@wmk.govt.nz.



Gina Sweetman

Independent Commissioner – Chair - on behalf of the IHP Panel members

12 November 2024

APPENDIX 1 – SPECIFIC MATTERS TO BE ADDRESSED IN HEARING STREAM 12D REPLY REPORT

1. Having reviewed the legal submissions and planning evidence in respect of Variation 1, please provide your view as to:
 - a. Whether there is scope for rezoning the site through Variation 1;
 - b. Whether there is scope for the introduction of a General Residential Zone (GRZ) at this point; and
 - c. If there is scope to introduce a GRZ, your view on the appropriateness of that zoning.
2. Please provide your views on whether the final set of proposed provisions are fit for purpose, vires and will achieve the submitters' stated intent.
3. In reviewing the questions from the Panel, and answers from witnesses, on downstream transportation issues, do you maintain it is reasonable to expect a developer (in an NPS-UD environment such as this) to be able to demonstrate they have 'locked in' the funding and design including land requirements for upgrades at this stage in the process when the developer (and the roading authorities) has no certainty that the development will be able to gain planning approval. If you do maintain that view, what would in your experience be a realistic and practical way for this developer to provide the Panel with certainty that such upgrades will be provided, rather than relying on staged development thresholds as the proposed provisions are based upon?
4. Please set out whether your overall recommendation on the requested rezoning has changed because of evidence presented at the reconvened hearing