

Hearing Stream 12A

Questions from the Hearing Panel

Having read the Section 42A Report, the Hearing Panel has questions that they would appreciate being answered by the Section 42A Report author(s) 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 additional questions during the course of the hearing.

Contents

Rezoning– CMUZ and INZ	2
Rezoning – Whitua motuhaka Special Purpose Zone – Pegasus Resort	3
Rezoning – Whitua motuhaka Special Purpose Zone – Oxford and Settlement Zone.....	5

Rezoning– CMUZ and INZ

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
Para 170	<p>You state that:</p> <p><i>In his evidence (section 9) Mr Foy considers that a commercial zoning would be more appropriate to apply to the Woolworths Kaiapoi site. He considers a TCZ or LFRZ zoning would both be acceptable due to proximity to the Kaiapoi TCZ and because a supermarket would be permitted in both zones, but he prefers a TCZ zone.</i></p> <p><i>Noting the existing activity on the site and Mr Foy’s advice, I recommend that the submission is accepted in part and the Hilton Street site is rezoned to LFRZ.</i></p> <p>You have also stated some reasons in para 169 for recommending the LFRZ, but the Panel notes that Mr Foy has expressed a preference for TCZ on this site. Please provide more discussion around why you prefer an LFRZ zoning in light of Mr Foy’s preferred zoning.</p> <p>And should this recommendation be an ‘accept’ rather than ‘accept in part’.</p>
Para 259	<p>Re: the Ashley Services Ltd sawmill at Oxford.</p> <p>Can you advise how effective the conditions of the current resource consent are/have been? Would the rules/performance standards of the proposed new zoning be less/more effective than the resource consent in managing/controlling the adverse effects of the existing activity or any new industrial activities on the site?</p>
Para 271	<p>Re: Oxford-Ohoka Community Board [172.2]: rezone land around Oxford Frews' Yard and Harewood Road from GRUZ to GIZ</p> <p>What would you envisage the process will be for this submitter (or other submitters faced with a similar recommendation) to provide a more detailed assessment in order to satisfy the rezoning criteria/considerations?</p> <p>Do you envisage this is a separate process outside this District Plan Review Hearing process?</p>

Rezoning – Whaitua motuhaka Special Purpose Zone – Pegasus Resort

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
<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>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> <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>Para 155</p>	<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, services and other District Council infrastructure.</u> 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>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</u></i></p>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	<p><i>the further submission 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>

Rezoning – Whaitua motuhaka Special Purpose Zone – Oxford and Settlement Zone

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
Para 82	Please explain how the Greenspace team’s concerns about lack of connectivity to the open space network would be addressed through the rezoning exercise, and any subsequent subdivision, should the rezoning be approved?
Para 92	Please provide an assessment of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board submission [172.2 and 172.3]
Paras 143 and 144	The Panel is finding it difficult to reconcile your position of not recommending rezoning this land to GRZ, given our understanding that large areas of Waimakariri that are proposed to be zoned GRZ or MRZ and allow for greater levels of development than in the ODP are subject to natural hazards.

