

Supplementary to Mr Wilson's s42A on Residential Rezoning

09 August 2024

1. This should be considered as a supplementary s42A report to my overall residential rezoning report released on 22 July 2024¹. It should be read in conjunction with this report, as I may reference sections of it.

Matters raised by submitters

2. Rainer and Ursula Hack [201.1,201.2,201.3] requests that UFD-P1 [201.1], UFD-P2 [201.2], and UFD-P3 [201.3] be amended to enable rezoning of 110 Parsonage Road, Woodend, be rezoned to LLRZ (Figure 44). The submission also requested that 90 and 110 Parsonage Road and part of 20 Thirlwall Street be rezoned as GRZ.
3. The submission requested rezoning to enable subdivision to align with the NPSUD's intent to provide houses in urban environments near services and infrastructure, which Woodend township provides.
4. The site is currently zoned as rural, and proposed to be zoned rural lifestyle in the Proposed Plan. It is outside the projected infrastructure boundary and the shaded areas in Map A.

Assessment

5. Mr Buckley has recommended that the LLRZ component of this submission be rejected, in paras 465 and 466 of his s42A report on large lot rezonings on the basis that it is inconsistent with the RPS². I assess the general residential component of this submission.
6. I adopt the same methodology as in my primary s42A report.
7. For Council, Mr Aramowicz has assessed the servicing potential for the site as follows:
8. *The application site is in the northeast part of Woodend. The ground surface appears to have a slight fall from the north down to the southwest.*

Natural hazards & Geotechnical matters

9. *No geotechnical testing was carried out on the site to inform the submitter's submission, however, based on previous work by another consultant there is a TC2 risk of liquefaction, but no risk of lateral spreading, near the WDC wastewater pump station further west of the site.*
10. *The Localised Flooding Hazard 200yr and Breakout Flooding Hazard 200yr scenarios both indicate the site has only a very low flood hazard.*

¹ https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/165251/STREAM-12E-S42A-REPORT-RESIDENTIAL-REZONING.PDF

² https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0021/163137/STREAM-12C-LARGE-LOT-RESIDENTIAL-REZONE-S42A-REPORT.pdf

11. *In summary, there are no known significant risk from natural hazards or other geotechnical matters that would prevent the proposed land use.*

Stormwater

12. *The ODP identifies the location of a SWMA at the southwest part of the site where the topographic survey indicate ground levels are lowest. The area allowed for the SWMA has not been confirmed and therefore should be seen as indicative only. This should be noted on the ODP.*

13. *In summary, there are no known significant stormwater constraints that would prevent the proposed land use.*

Wastewater

14. *There is capacity within the existing WDC pump station on Parsonage Rd to accept the discharge from a future development of the site, however it is likely a small pump station will need to be provided at the site to convey wastewater from a future subdivision to the existing pump station.*

15. *In summary, there are no known significant wastewater constraints that would prevent the proposed land use.*

Cultural advice

16. The cultural advice is as for the Area 5 sections in Woodend.

Overall consideration

17. I note that as the site is outside of any development areas, existing residential areas, I must consider it under Policy 8, NPSUD. I adopt policy interpretation pathway 2 for this assessment, as outlined in my primary s42A. I can consider the submission under the NPSUD if it provides significant development capacity and contributes to well-functioning urban environments.

18. I note the following in this assessment:

- The yield from the site is up to 35 residential lots of varying sizes³, which I do not consider to be significant, neither in the context of the overall district, or Woodend.
- I note my other assessments where I consider that providing significant development capacity can be interpreted in light of Objective 6, or other parts of the NPSUD, to be responsive in general.

19. I still must consider the second limb of the Policy 8 NPSUD test, requiring an assessment on if it constitutes a well-functioning urban environment. In doing so, I note the following requirements of the CRPS, which I consider gives effect to the NPSUD in

³ Mr Andrew Carr, EIC, para 3.2,
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/166124/STREAM-12E-EVIDENCE-21-SUBMITTER-201-R-and-U-HACK-A-CARR-TRAFFIC.pdf

defining a well-functioning urban environment.

20. I consider that the primary constraint on the site is noise arising from the designated SH1 Woodend bypass motorway, which is immediately to the east of the site. Policy 6.3.5(5) requires the avoidance of activities that have the potential to limit the efficient and effective provision, operation, maintenance, of upgrading of strategic infrastructure and freight hubs. A designated motorway is strategic infrastructure.
21. Noise from the proposed motorway is the biggest constraint on the site. The submitter has not presented noise evidence, however, considers that it would be presented in any subdivision application⁴. I do not consider that this would give effect to the CRPS requirements as set out above in respect of noise.
22. If the reverse sensitivity risks from this site cannot be mitigated, then it should not be rezoned, but I have no evidence on which to assess that. I note evidence from Mr Trevathan, for Crichton Developments Ltd, as referenced in Mr Buckley's s42A (para 458) for a similar site near the proposed motorway that had outdoor noise levels at 57 dB LAeq(24h) but second floor levels of 65 dB LAeq(24).
23. From my planning perspective, I consider that the risks associated with noise from the motorway and the lack of evidence to assess them in the specifics of this rezoning require me to recommend rejecting this application.
24. I consider that the future land use area between the motorway designation and the existing residential zones should be addressed in the future, by plan change, once the final design, including noise effects, of the motorway is known. This would provide a process for addressing the requests of these submitters, but with more comprehensive and strategic evidence.

Recommendation

25. That the following outcome occurs for submissions:
 - Rainer and Ursula Hack [201.1,201.2,201.3] is **rejected**

Amendments

26. There are no amendments to the Proposed Plan arising from these recommendations.

⁴ Para 69, Ms Edmonds, EiC,
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0017/160631/Evidence-of-Victoria-Edmonds-Planning.pdf