

## Jn Hearing Stream 12E: MAPS: Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend and Variation 1

### 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.

### Overarching

1. The Panel is having problems with the Maps provided and being able to clearly see what areas of those maps are subject to the submissions, and to differentiate between the zonings (in an absence of a legend). Can you please provide updated maps to assist the Panel.
2. Please provide in table format for each rezoning request:
  - a. The relevant submission number and submitter (combining these where they overlap)
  - b. The location of the area subject to the submission
  - c. The Operative DP and PDP zoning and any relevant overlays and Outline Development Plans
  - d. The zoning sought by the submitter
  - e. Whether the rezoning is consistent with relevant planning documents (NPS-UD, CRPS, PDP) and identifying where not
  - f. Whether there are technical issues in respect to the rezoning sought
  - g. Anticipated yield
  - h. Summary of any issues in contention
  - i. Recommendation

The priority in preparing these tables is for those rezonings where the submitter is to be heard in Hearing Stream 12E. The other tables can be provided for the Reply Report.

3. In respect to the zoning requests for the South-West and West Rangiora Development Areas, can you please confirm that you are relying on Survus [250.4] for recommending a Medium Density Residential Zone, given in most instances a blanket MRZ has not been sought by any one submitter.

The Panel notes that we will need to see updated ODPs including text and provisions for our deliberations.

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
Para 66	<p>You say '<i>I do not consider that overzoning land achieves a well-functioning urban environment.</i> While Objective 1 of the NPS-UD is that New Zealand has well-functioning urban environment, Objective 2 is that "<i>Planning decisions improve housing affordability by supporting competitive land and development markets.</i>" At what point do you consider surplus zoning to be overzoning?</p> <p>Can the effects of overzoning you mention not be overcome by appropriate planning provisions?</p>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	How does “ <i>overzoned land that sits vacant prevent its use ... in rural production or other uses</i> ”? Will existing use rights not apply to the activities already carried out on the land?
Para 76	Footnote 19 is missing
Para 77	Who can/should clarify the status of the dotted line on Map A?
Para 83	You discuss the requirement to provide at least sufficient development capacity ' in NPS-UD Policy 2. But that phrase is prefaced by ‘at all times’. When read alongside objectives 2 and 3, together with the quarterly monitoring requirement in clause 3.9 and the requirements to address shortfalls in 3.7 and 3.37, does this indicate a presumption or preference for providing more development capacity than is required to meet forecast demand?
Para 89	<p>With respect to Policy 6.3.1 of the RPS: what is your understanding of ‘<i>ensure new urban activities only occur within existing urban areas</i>’ in ss(4)? Does this include the extension of those existing urban areas?</p> <p>With respect to Regional Council Methods for Policy 6.3.1 of the RPS: Is the process to change Map A of the RPS and then subsequent changes to District Plans timely and efficient enough to achieve the responsiveness sought by Objective 6 of the NPS-UD? Is it consistent with, or giving effect to, the requirements of clauses 3.7 and 3.37 of the NPS-UD that territorial authorities address shortfalls?</p> <p>With respect to Policy 6.3.11 of the RPS ‘Monitoring and review’: Does this policy give effect to the NPS-UD, in particular clauses 3.9 and 3.37 (which is specific to territorial authorities)?</p>
Para 93 2.6.5 and Table 3	<p>Policy 2 - You say “<i>I consider that the CRPS Objective 6.2.1(a) defines “at least sufficient capacity” in the context of Greater Christchurch, also by breaking this down to the granular level of the three districts. “At least sufficient development capacity” is defined as targets for the medium term supply of residential housing that are to be achieved by 2031, and the long term, by 2051. There is a 30-year total covering the period from 2021 to 2051</i>”.</p> <p>Policy 2 requires ‘<i>at least sufficient capacity</i>’ to be provided “<i>at all times</i>”. Does this not mean that “<i>at least sufficient capacity</i>” must be available every year of the life of the plan?</p> <p>Policy 8 - please provide the specific policies (or parts thereof) that you consider provides the framework for assessing such proposals.</p> <p>Policy 10 - How has Council or the CRC engaged with ‘the development sector’ as required by ss(c)? Is the District Plan process part of that engagement ‘to identify significant opportunities for urban development’?</p> <p>You have not addressed Clause 3.8 of the NPS-UD in your assessment of how the CRPS gives effect to the NPS-UD. Please provide an assessment of</p>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	this clause and its relevance in respect to the CRPS, and any of your subsequent evaluations and recommendations in your s42A report.
Paras 97 and 125	<p>At para 97, you <i>"note that CRPS policy 6.3.12(1) <b>requires there to be a medium term capacity shortfall</b> to enable release of land from FDAs. It does not specify what to do in the event of a long-term capacity shortfall. In this regard it more than gives effect to the NPSUD requirements, which only assess sufficiency on the basis of a 3-year horizon, however, in the event that the housing market situation required the release of land to satisfy long-term demand, CRPS policy 6.3.12(1) would not be responsive on its own. However, if the NPSUD responsive planning provisions are used as well as the CRPS in this regard, then long term land could be released, stepping outside of 6.3.12(1).</i></p> <p>At para 125, you say <i>"For the first test in NPSUD Policy 8, I consider that the CRPS may assist in defining what "at least sufficient development capacity is", namely, the housing bottom lines in Objective 6.2.1(a) which outline the minimum requirements.</i></p> <p>These comments seem to imply that there needs to be shortfall before proposals that provide 'significant development capacity' can be approved. Given one of the objectives of the NPS-UD is to "improve housing affordability by supporting competitive land and development markets", is this giving effect to the NPS-UD?</p> <p>In relation to the comment <i>"the NPSUD requirements, which only assess sufficiency on the basis of a 3-year horizon"</i>, we assume the 3-year reference comes from clause 3.19. But does clause 3.9 not indicate that this assessment is ongoing?</p>
Para 98	Whilst you <i>"cannot identify any provisions within the CRPS which directly conflict with the NPS-UD"</i> is it nevertheless your opinion that the CRPS does not give full effect to the NPS-UD?
Para 111	In relation to Policy 8, you say <i>"Such a test then requires a consideration of the unanticipated urban environment against the anticipated urban environment."</i> Please explain why such a comparison required?
Para 117	<p>You say <i>"NPSUD Policy 8 is a filter that ensures that it is the significant proposals that are enabled by this gateway <b>in the context of overall capacity, not a gateway that is open to all proposals.</b>"</i></p> <p>Policy 1(a)(i) refers to "needs, in terms of type, price, and location, of different households". As a consequence, should capacity not be seen in the context of 'type, price, and location'?</p>
Para 146	It is noted that cultural advice has been requested by Council on the rezoning proposals and it states that Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga is opposed to the rezoning of the Kaiapoi Development Area, and the Runanga consider themselves <i>"an affected party"</i> in relation to the rezoning of this area.

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	Please clarify the role of the Runanga in this respect, i.e. is it providing cultural advice or is it a submitter in this process?
Para 192	Your third bullet point has (check to see if that has already been rezoned?) – can you please advise of the outcome of that checking?
Para 352	Having reviewed the Doncaster submission, the Panel is unclear where the scope for rezoning the land to medium density residential comes from. Can you please identify this from the submission.
Para 399	<p>You say “I note that as it was intended to become GRZ at some future point, by way of the overlay, it can already be considered to be...”.</p> <p>In your opinion, would the same apply to the LLRZ overlay; that is that that overlay signals it is intended to become LLRZ at some future point?</p>
Para 536	In respect to bullet point 2, how do you define “isolated” in this context?
Para 567	This paragraph appears to be in the wrong place. And do you have an opinion on Mr Read’s advice?
Figure 40	Can you please provide clear plans of the same scale and size which clearly identify the Bellgrove boundary changes referred to.
Para 623	Please explain how Policy 8 NPS-UD is applicable to a Development Area in the PDP.
Paras 626 and 655	The Panel considers that it is unclear from their submission that they are seeking all of the Block A area to be medium density - please refer back to their submission and confirm the extent of rezoning sought, based on the modified ODP presented.
Para 648	You have recommended that an overlay of potential CMUZ/GIZ be added for Block C. The Panel has been unable to find provisions in the PDP for a CMUZ/GIZ overlay. Please explain how you would see such an overlay working if there are no accompanying provisions that explain what such an overlay is, and how it would be removed.
Para 692	Please complete this sentence.
Para 735	Please explain why you have had an ODP prepared in respect to this area and have also sought technical advice, in the absence of an ODP and technical advice being provided by the submitter. Are there any issues of natural justice and fair process raised when we are also considering other submissions seeking rezoning that have not provided an ODP or technical advice?
Para 874	The Panel received evidence for Hearing Stream 12D and from submitters from some of the rezonings in Hearing Stream 12E that the comparison used by BECA in their review is the incorrect approach. Rather, the comparison should be between locations where comparable development

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	could occur. Please provide comment on that approach compared to the BECA review approach.
Paras 897, 910-916	Please explain any relationship between this requested rezoning and the recommended amendments to the SPZ(KR) in the Hearing Stream 10 Reply Report.
Para 929 (and elsewhere)	Please consider whether these recommendations are reject or accept in part, given to a large extent the submitters are getting the relief they are seeking through Variation 1.
Para 946	Re bullet point 3 – please explain this bullet point further, given the submitter has sought rezoning in respect to a Proposed District Plan, and not a plan change.
Para 974	Last bullet point – this appears to be in the wrong place and rather relate to a hazards assessment. Should this be under para 968?
Para 1014	How do you intend that this be addressed in the ODP?
Paras 1047 and 1059	What is RC215675 and how is this relevant to this requested rezoning? What is the resource consent’s current status?
Para 1100	Do you mean “I consider that the difference between the 2031 and <b>2033</b> targets”?
Para 1105	Is the 14,000 the total of short, medium and long term?
15.10	Do you mean that you recommend these be deleted?