

## **Overarching:**

1. Please review and respond on each of the submitters' planners' opinions in respect to:
  - What is the "urban environment" relevant to these rezoning requests;
  - Whether the LLRZ is urban and whether the NPS-UD applies (noting that some planners considered each LLRZ needed to be considered in its relevant context). In doing so, please also comment on the s32 report for the Residential Chapter which concludes that LLRZ should be treated as an urban environment for the purposes of the NPS-UD, even after acknowledging that in many ways it does not appear as an urban land use;
  - the importance and application of UFD-P3 (with its separate (a) and (b) limbs), and the relevance that UFD-P3 is located in the Urban Form and Development Chapter of the PDP;
  - does UFD-P3 give effect to the RPS, and, if not, does the NPS-UD provide a pathway to resolve the conflict;
  - the weight that should be afforded to the RRDS;
  - the RRDS direction for growth, and in particular does this provide sufficient detail relating to property boundaries etc;
  - Review the evidence relating to NPS-UD Objective 3 and Policy 1 re: location/typology (same matter as for Mr Yeoman above);
  - are there any other matters raised in submitter evidence for specific areas for rezoning that would cause you to change your opinion?

You can group the submitters' planners' approaches where these are the same.

2. In the event that the Panel determines that the LLRZ (or parts thereof) is part of the urban environment, and therefore the NPS-UD applies, please advise on the following:
  - a. What is your understanding of the overall objective of the NPS-UD?
  - b. Taking into account the expert economists' positions, does the term 'at least sufficient development capacity' in NPS-UD Policy 2 (read alongside objectives 2 and 3) indicate a presumption or preference for providing more development capacity than is required to meet forecast demand?
  - c. Does the NPS-UD require that additional supply only be provided through intensification?
  - d. Does the NPS-UD require that the council consider the provision of a variety of homes in other than the three main centres in Waimakariri?

## **Specific questions:**

3. Does the PDP provide for a Settlement overlay as you have recommended in respect to the Cameron submission in Ashley?

4. Given your response to the Panel's question in respect to Paragraph 291 of your s42A report, have you considered whether it is appropriate in the circumstances to recommend accepting these submissions in part, and applying a LLRZ Overlay to these properties? Taking into account your answer to this question, are there any other submissions where it may be appropriate to apply a LLRZ Overlay?
5. Please provide a final response in respect to 3025 and 3065 Oxford Road, Jamie Rapp [37.1], taking into account Panel questions during the hearing and your reply to our question in respect to paragraph 408.
6. Please respond to all evidence, and any legal submissions, presented at the hearing, in particular:
  - a. The tabled evidence from Ms Styles on behalf of Daiken [s145]
  - b. Ms Aston's evidence for Allaway and Larsen [236] seeking with a LLRZ or a LLRZ Overlay apply to the subject land
  - c. Peter and Lizzy Anderson's [32] lay evidence in respect to 1 Tupelo Place
  - d. Mr Glasson's evidence and Mr Schulte's submissions in respect to Cameron [180]
  - e. The expert evidence (including supplementary) in respect to Carr [158]
  - f. The expert evidence (including supplementary) and Ms Appleyard's submissions in respect to Crichton [299]
  - g. The expert evidence in respect to Hack [201]. In responding to this, please liaise with the s42A report author for HS12E
  - h. The expert evidence (including supplementary) and Ms Eveleigh's submissions in respect to MacRae [s409]
  - i. The expert evidence (including supplementary) in respect to McAllister [s8]
  - j. The lay evidence in respect to Pinkham and Black [s247 and 265]
  - k. The expert evidence and Mr Fowler's submissions in respect to Prosser [s224]
  - l. Mr Fletcher's evidence and supplementary evidence in respect to Fraser et al
  - m. The tabled lay evidence from P Marambos [s263]
  - n. The lay evidence of Mr Harris [s348], Mr Guthrie [s85] and Mr Harphur [s388]
  - o. The presentation from Ms McKeever [s111]
  - p. The memorandum of Counsel on behalf of CIAL [s254]

In responding to this evidence:

- Please seek technical advice, as necessary
- Please consider the relevant technical joint witness statements relevant to Hearing Stream 12C

7. Please provide your advice in respect to the differences in the recommendations in the cultural advice reports in respect of the Crichton, Stokes and Hack submissions, and how the Panel should reconcile these differences.
8. The Reporting officer is to liaise with the relevant planners representing submitters on any planning provisions.
9. When you have responded to the evidence and our questions, please update the Spreadsheet Table of all sites requested for rezoning that you have already provided the Panel, applying the same relevant Statutory Tests to all of them to show a consistent approach has been applied, and clearly setting out any changes to your recommendations as a result of:
  - a. your consideration of the evidence presented at the hearing,
  - b. subsequent technical advice, including the joint witness statements,
  - c. conferencing and discussions held with the submitters after the hearing, and
  - d. consideration of any additional information or changes as a result of the above.