## WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

## MEMO

FILE NO AND TRIM NO:	DDS-06-10-02-04-06 / DDS-14-05-06 / 241001168639
DATE:	3 October 2024
МЕМО ТО:	District Plan Review Hearings Panel
FROM:	Neil Sheerin, Senior Policy Planner – Development Planning Unit
SUBJECT:	Hearing Stream 6 – Open Space and Recreation Zones s42A Report – Missed Further Submission Points

- 1. The purpose of this memo is to inform the Hearings Panel of 30 further submission points on original submission points from 9 further submitters that were missed in the Open Space and Recreation Zones s42A report and provide an update to Appendix G of the s42A report to address these.
- 2. The missed further submission points on original submission points are as follows:
  - a. Richard and Geoff Spark [FS 37] on Canterbury Regional Council [316.177, 316.178, 316.179]
  - b. I.W. and L.M. Bisman [FS 38] on Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd [160.14, 160.15, 160.16]
  - c. David Cowley [FS 41] on Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd [160.14, 160.15, 160.16] and Canterbury Regional Council [316.177, 316.178, 316.179]
  - d. Martin Hewitt [FS 60] on Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd [160.14, 160.15, 160.16]
  - e. Steven Holland [FS 72] on Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd [160.14, 160.15, 160.16]
  - f. Michelle Holland [FS 73] on Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd [160.14, 160.15, 160.16]
  - g. Val and Ray Robb [FS 74] on Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd [160.14, 160.15, 160.16]
  - h. Edward and Justine Hamilton [FS 75] on Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd [160.14, 160.15, 160.16]
  - i. Ohoka Residents Association [FS 137] on Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd [160.14, 160.15, 160.16]
- 3. The missed further submission points were noticed in a further check of all original submission points and all further submission points across all s42A reports released to date.
- 4. All the further submitters listed above had been recorded as having lodged further submissions on original submissions on the Open Space and Recreation Zones provisions and therefore were sent the Open Space and Recreation Zones s42A report. No further submitter raised the missed further submission points as an issue at the Stream 6 hearing, or since the hearing. No original submissions were missed. My recommendations remain unchanged. For these reasons, it is considered that no further submitter is unfairly disadvantaged by this.
- 5. The recommendations on these further submission points are shown in Attachment 1.
- 6. In order to distinguish between the recommendations arising from this memo and the recommendations made in the s42A report, the recommendations arising from this memo are shown in Attachment 1 in blue *italics* with <u>underline</u> under the original submission points cited above in the relevant tables from Appendix G of the s42A report. Note: Attachment 1 only shows the original submission points cited above and related further submissions.

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments (Summary)	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
160.14	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	General – Natural Open Space Zone	Supports Natural Open Space Zone provisions. Retain Natural Open Space Zone provisions as notified.	3.3	Accept in part	See relevant section of report.	No
<u>FS 38</u>	I.W. and L.M. Bisman		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>
<u>FS 41</u>	David Cowley		<u>Support.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Accept in part</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>
<u>FS 60</u>	<u>Martin Hewitt</u>		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>
FS 62	Oxford-Ohoka Community Board		<i>Oppose submission points 160.1 to 160.22 by Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd in their entirety.</i>	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No
<u>FS 72</u>	Steven Holland		Oppose. Disallow.	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	No
<u>FS 73</u>	Michelle Holland		Oppose. Disallow.	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	No
<u>FS 74</u>	Val and Ray Robb		Oppose. Disallow.	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>
<u>FS 75</u>	<u>Edward and Justine</u> <u>Hamilton</u>		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	No
FS 84	Ohoka Residents Association		Oppose submission points 160.1 to 160.22 by Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd in their entirety. Disallow.	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No
FS 130	David and Elaine Brady		Oppose development proposed at Ohoka by Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd.	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No
FS 132	Jan Hadfield		Oppose development proposed at Ohoka by Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd. Disallow.	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No
FS 136	Emma Wood		Oppose submission #160 in its entirety.	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No
<u>FS 137</u>	Ohoka Residents Association		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	No
160.15	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	General – Open Space Zone	Supports Open Space Zone provisions. Retain Open Space Zone provisions as notified.	3.3	Accept in part	See relevant section of report.	No
FS 38	I.W. and L.M. Bisman		Oppose. Disallow.	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	No
FS 41	David Cowley		Support.	<u>3.3</u>	Accept in part	See relevant section of report.	No
<u>FS 60</u>	Martin Hewitt		Oppose. Disallow.	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	No
FS 62	Oxford-Ohoka Community Board		<i>Oppose submission points 160.1 to 160.22 by Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd in their entirety.</i>	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No
<u>FS 72</u>	Steven Holland		Oppose. Disallow.	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	No
FS 73	Michelle Holland		Oppose. Disallow.	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	No
<u>FS 74</u>	Val and Ray Robb		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>
<u>FS 75</u>	<u>Edward and Justine</u> <u>Hamilton</u>		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>
FS 84	Ohoka Residents Association		<i>Oppose submission points 160.1 to 160.22 by Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd in their entirety. Disallow.</i>	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No
FS 130	David and Elaine Brady		Oppose development proposed at Ohoka by Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd.	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No
FS 132	Jan Hadfield		Oppose development proposed at Ohoka by Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd. Disallow.	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No
FS 136	Emma Wood		Oppose submission #160 in its entirety.	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No

Table G	Table G 2: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions - General OSRZ Matters								
Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments (Summary)	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?		
<u>FS 137</u>	<u>Ohoka</u> <u>Residents</u> <u>Association</u>		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		
160.16	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	General - Sport and Active Recreation Zone	Supports Sport and Active Recreation Zone provisions. Retain Sport and Active Recreation Zone provisions as notified.	3.3	Accept in part	See relevant section of report.	No		
<u>FS 38</u>	I.W. and L.M. Bisman		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		
<u>FS 41</u>	David Cowley		<u>Support.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	Accept in part	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		
<u>FS 60</u>	Martin Hewitt		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		
FS 62	Oxford-Ohoka Community Board		<i>Oppose submission points 160.1 to 160.22 by Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd in their entirety.</i>	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No		
<u>FS 72</u>	<u>Steven Holland</u>		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		
<u>FS 73</u>	Michelle Holland		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		
<u>FS 74</u>	Val and Ray Robb		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		
<u>FS 75</u>	<u>Edward and Justine</u> <u>Hamilton</u>		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		
FS 84	Ohoka Residents Association		Oppose submission points 160.1 to 160.22 by Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd in their entirety. Disallow.	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No		
FS 130	David and Elaine Brady		Oppose development proposed at Ohoka by Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd.	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No		
FS 132	Jan Hadfield		Oppose development proposed at Ohoka by Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd. Disallow.	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No		
FS 136	Emma Wood		Oppose submission #160 in its entirety.	3.3	Reject	See relevant section of report.	No		
<u>FS 137</u>	OhokaResidentsAssociation		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		

Table G 3	Table G 3: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions - Objectives								
Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments (Summary)	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?		
NOSZ Obje	ectives								
316.177	Canterbury Regional Council	NOSZ-01	Natural landscapes and features may also be a characteristic of the Natural Open Space Zone. Add an additional clause for 'natural landscapes and features'.		Reject	See relevant section of report.	No		
<u>FS 37</u>	Richard and Geoff Spark		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.4.1</u>	<u>Accept</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		
<u>FS 41</u>	David Cowley		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.4.1</u>	<u>Accept</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		

Table G 5	Table G 5: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions - Rules								
Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments (Summary)	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?		
NOSZ Rule	S								
316.178	Canterbury Regional Council	NOSZ-R13	NOSZ-R13(3) should also permit planting of vegetation for hazard mitigation such as erosion control. Amend NOSZ-R13(3) to include planting for hazard mitigation purposes.		Accept	See relevant section of report.	Yes		
<u>FS 37</u>	Richard and Geoff Spark		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.5.4</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		
<u>FS 41</u>	David Cowley		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.5.4</u>	<u>Reject</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		

Table G	Table G 7: Recommended responses to submissions: Matters of Control or Discretion								
Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?		
316.179	Canterbury Regional Council	OSRZ-MCD7	OSRZ-MCD7 excludes both the consideration of natural feature and landscape values, and the presence of any indigenous vegetation. Amend OSRZ-MCD7(2)(d) to include reference to natural landscapes and features in the area, and consideration of any indigenous vegetation present.		Reject	See relevant section of report.	No		
<u>FS 37</u>	Richard and Geoff Spark		<u>Oppose. Disallow.</u>	<u>3.7.2</u>	<u>Accept</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		
<u>FS 41</u>	David Cowley		Oppose. Disallow.	<u>3.7.2</u>	<u>Accept</u>	See relevant section of report.	<u>No</u>		