

Hearing Stream 12D: MAPS: Ohoka - RIDL

Questions from the Hearing Panel

Having read the Section 42A Reports, the Hearing Panel has questions that they would appreciate being answered by the Section 42A Report author at the hearing, both verbally and written.

This is in the interests of running an efficient hearing.

Please note this list of questions is not exhaustive. The Panel members may well ask the Section 42A Report author, and expert advisers, additional questions during the course of the hearing.

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
Para 31 & 163	<p>You state:</p> <p><i>Relevantly, if some of the other rezoning submissions in those hearings are adopted then this would mean more capacity is available than is shown by the submitters' and Council's experts (including the supporting modelling).</i></p> <p><i>I note that if the Panel considers insufficient capacity is provided, then there are a range of rezoning submissions before the Hearing Panel which could be accepted to provide this additional capacity. In my opinion, the Hearing Panel needs to assess the merits of the various rezoning proposals before them on a comparative basis. I understand that this analysis will be provided in the s42A report for Hearing Stream 12E by Mr Wilson.</i></p> <p>Is there an overall Report/Table that shows the total extent of land that has been requested for rezoning to urban/residential? Will this be provided by Mr Wilson for HS12E?</p>
Para 35	<p>You state:</p> <p><i>I note that RIDL's supporting evidence raises concerns over future development opportunities in Kaiapoi and other locations in the District, and if the anticipated residential capacity is unable to be provided at Kaiapoi or elsewhere, this arguably strengthens RIDL's argument that insufficient development capacity has been provided by the Council under the NPS-UD and needs to be provided at Ōhoka. I consider that RIDL's concerns over development opportunities in other locations in the District are valid RMA concerns. As such, while RIDL benefits from this assertion, I do not consider it amounts to pure 'trade competition'.</i></p> <p>Has RIDL lodged any further submissions opposing any other rezoning requests?</p>
Para 92	<p>You state:</p> <p><i>I accept the evidence of Mr Binder. I also note that there is currently no mechanism proposed in the submission or submitters' evidence that would require the submitter to provide the bus service proposed for the full 10 years.</i></p>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	In your experience are you aware of any mechanism that might be built into a District Plan to require a public transport service to be established prior to development occurring, and to then be maintained - even if such a service proves to be non-viable?
Para 113	Is downstream flooding an issue that needs to be addressed at this hearing, i.e. is it a determinative issue for the rezoning request?