

On Hearing Stream 12F: Rangiora Airfield

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 6	<p>How does what is sought through the SPZ relate and compare to the WDC-1 designation and its conditions?</p> <p>The Panel would like to see a copy of the notice of requirement as it was considered, so as to be clear as to what was applied for.</p>
Para 28	<p>You state that:</p> <p><i>This report does not analyse whether the RLZ provisions are appropriate for the land subject to the submission. This topic is covered in separate s42A reports that were considered in earlier hearings.</i></p> <p>Were the proposed RLZ zoning provisions considered at another hearing stream specifically for the Rangiora Airfield?</p> <p>Do you not consider it is nevertheless appropriate in terms of a s32AA evaluation to evaluate whether the proposed zoning will better achieve the objectives than the current zoning (and therefore the appropriateness of the current zoning may be a relevant consideration)?</p>
Para 32	<p>It is noted there were no further submissions in opposition.</p> <p>Can you advise on the extent of notification in the District Plan Review process carried out for rezoning proposals such as this (including to any residents associations, community groups, or adjacent landowners).</p>
Para 43	<p>The last sentence seems to be incomplete:</p> <p><i>This process would occur independent of the district plan review and may not occur ahead of the consideration of [10].</i></p>
Para 64	<p>Can you please advise whether these consents have been progressed and can be considered as part of the existing environment.</p>
Para 75	<p>Is there any policy prerogative that reticulated servicing should be provided where possible, as opposed to on-site solutions? (it is acknowledged that your para 359 may provide a partial answer to this question).</p>
Para 80	<p>Is there any indication in the LTP of the timing of this work?</p>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
Para 88	<p>The Panel request clarification on the relevance of the following statement:</p> <p><i>It is noted that any alteration to the designation that would provide for the extension of the runways would come with consequential amendments to the Rangiora Airfield Obstacle Limitation Surfaces.</i></p> <p>Do the special purpose zone provisions provide adequate control/assessment matters for determining an application to extend the runway?</p>
Para 96	<p>Could a refuelling station be considered as part of the activities covered by the designation itself?</p>
Para 97	<p>Whilst the RLZ also provides a consenting pathway for many of the activities that would be enabled by the SPZ(RA), is such a pathway an appropriate mechanism (in the context of the purpose of a rural lifestyle zone) for assessing activities directly related to aviation?</p> <p>That is, whilst the provisions may provide for some of the activities envisaged, and they may provide a pathway for other activities, does the RLZ envisage there being an airfield and aviation activities within the zone?</p>
Para 103	<p>You state that:</p> <p><i>The submitter proposes to change NOISE-R13 so that it applies to sensitive receivers within the SPZ(RA) and not the RLZ.</i></p> <p>Do you not consider this is outside of scope?</p>
Para 115	<p>You state that:</p> <p><i>It is therefore my view that the scale and operation of the airfield was an important consideration for the hearing commissioner, who also noted that an airfield of this scale and function is not unusual in a rural environment.</i></p> <p>Is it your view that an airfield would be more unusual in an RLZ environment as opposed to a rural environment?</p>
Para 119	<p>You state that:</p> <p><i>Under the SPZ(RA), many foreseeable airfield related works (e.g. navigation equipment) would be permitted by the underlying zone and would not require an OPW. Other airfield buildings that may not be in accordance with the designation (e.g. a terminal building) would also be permitted within Council consideration, despite arguably not being in accordance with the purpose of designation.</i></p>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	What is your view on that, i.e. is there a potential for duplication, and/or conflict, in some controls between the designation and the special purpose zone.
Para 123	Is there sufficient evidence to establish these flood assessment overlay provisions are manageable on this site?
Para 134	Would these provisions provide for in your view a significant intensification of residential activity compared to the current zoning provisions and the and designation ?
Para 137	With a proposed special purpose zone, accompanied by an Outline Development Plan to guide development, what value would you see in retaining a designation over the airfield?
Para 138e	<p>Clause e) provides:</p> <p><i>Indicative future runway extensions and indicative locations of 55 dB and 65 dB noise contours should the runaways be extended</i></p> <p>How do these translate and relate. Would people have anticipated intensification of activities and move to an airport rather than airfield through this submission?</p>
Para 154	<p>The only opportunity that the Council would have to investigate these links would be through the building consent process or by requiring a Certificate of Compliance under s139 of the RMA.</p> <p>Can a Council require a consent notice?</p>
Para 159	Is it appropriate in your view to create potential intensification of noise sensitive activities where <i>“There are no standards relating to outdoor amenity spaces for residential units”</i> ?
Para 167	Is it appropriate from a planning point of view to make numerous changes to district-wide provisions that would be specific to development in a single special purpose zone such as this one?
Para 178 - 183	Please comment on who/which parties might be adversely affected by the Panel accepting the scope issue, i.e. who might be affected by the potentially increased intensity of residential dwellings on the site, or the extension to the runway, or extending the 55 dBA LN noise contour. Are there any natural justice issues arising?
Para 184	Similar to the above question, would other parties have envisaged a greater intensity of airfield activities and changes to the runways?
Para 193	Same question as for para 137

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
Para 204 c	<p>You raise a concern that:</p> <p><i>This ‘village’ would not have community facilities (other than the airfield) and would be located a considerable distance from community facilities and services needed to meet day to day living.</i></p> <p>Please clarify what distance is involved, and how does this compare to other rezoning proposals that we are also considering, for instance in Ashley or Waikuku.</p> <p>And would the permissive provisions for airport extensions impact on the well-functioning nature of other adjacent urban environments?</p>
Para 216	<p>Please expand on your statement that:</p> <p><i>“... the submitter’s zoning proposal can be contemplated as an “urban development.....expressly provided for in the CRPS.”</i></p> <p>Can Objectives 6.2.1(9) and 6.2.1(11), which seek to integrate land use with strategic infrastructure and to optimise the use of strategic infrastructure, be seen as anticipating/encouraging the proposed intensification of residential activity alongside an airfield?</p>
Para 217 c	<p>Is your reference to Policy 3.5.1 of the CRPS correct?</p>
Para 235 and Para 271	<p>You state that:</p> <p><i>Noise sensitive activities are appropriate within the 55 dBA LN ...</i></p> <p>Earlier in the report you expressed concern that there are no controls protecting outdoor amenity of residents exposed to aircraft noise? Can this be reconciled?</p>
Para 244	<p>Please clarify how the special purpose zones work alongside the designation provisions/conditions in these instances, is there a seamless integration between the zones and the designations?</p>
Para 249 b and Para 252	<p>Is there scope for the Panel to make these changes to Objective SD-02, and to SD-04, to reference the SPZ(RA), i.e. as consequential changes?</p> <p>If the UFD chapter is to be amended to include a policy that relates specifically to the unique purpose and character of the SPZ(RA), what would be the wording of such a policy?</p>
Para 267	<p>The Panel has already heard submissions on the Subdivision Chapter and so what would be the process for us considering proposed changes to SUB-MCD2 (Subdivision Design), that do not directly relate to the SPZ(RA).</p>
Para 271	<p>As a planner do you support the method of registering consent notices on the title of any new lots created within the SPZ(RA), as good planning practice to manage potential reverse sensitivity issues that may eventuate from a</p>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	rezoning such as this (i.e. intensification of residential activity near an airfield)?
Para 276	<p>It is noted that clause 3. Of the GCSP requires:</p> <p><i>Meet a need identified by the latest Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment</i></p> <p>Does this stated imperative to establish a need also apply to provisions in the NPS-UD and CRPS?</p>
Para 285	Do you have any update on whether Council has engaged with Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited?
Para 344	The panel has already heard submissions on the NOISE chapter and therefore what would be the process for us now considering whether the internal acoustic level for “other habitable rooms” in Table – NOISE-1 should be lowered in response to the SPZ(RA) proposal.