

IN THE MATTER OF Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF An application by Rolleston Industrial
Developments Limited for a private plan
change RCP31 to the Waimakariri District
Plan pursuant to Part 2 of Schedule 1 of the
Resource Management Act 1991

MINUTE 3: DIRECTIONS FOR EXPERT WITNESSES

PUBLIC TRANSPORT OPTIONS AND SPATIAL CONSTRAINTS MAPPING

[1] The hearing of RPC 31 by Rolleston Developments Limited requesting changes to the zoning of rural land in Ōhoka to enable residential and some commercial and associated facilities commenced on Thursday 3 August 2023. The applicant has now presented their evidence and we are about to commence hearing evidence and submissions from Submitters¹ on the plan change.

[2] In addition to the expert evidence presented by the applicant, we have received expert evidence from a number of Submitters, including the Waimakariri District Council, Canterbury Regional Council, and from the s42A Report writer.

[3] We have identified two issues that we would be assisted further by the expert Planning and Transport witnesses meeting to produce a joint witness statement to narrow or resolve issues of contention.

Planning Evidence

[4] Mr Tim Walsh provided planning evidence on behalf of the applicant. As part of his evidence, he produced a series of constraints maps which demonstrated a number of policy and environmental constraints that he is of the opinion limit the amount of land, and location of land suitable for urban development of the kind being pursued by the applicant.

[5] Those maps show the following:

- i. Map No 14895-M-850 [E] 'combined constraints map' showing the intersection and overlap of constraints.
- ii. Map No 14895-M-820 [C] 'WDC coastal flood depth (1 in 200 year)
- iii. Map No 14895 -M-821 [E] 'WDC Tsunami Evacuation Zone Map'.
- iv. Map No 14895-M-825 [E] WDC Flood Hazard Map
- v. Map No 14895-M-810 [C] Liquefaction Risk Areas
- vi. Map 14895-M-830 [F] Soil Classification Map

¹ Including further submissions.

- vii. Map 14895-M-840 [C] Areas of Māori Cultural Significance
- viii. Map 14895-M-845 [E] Noise Contour Map
- ix. Map 14895-M-875 [A] Local Purpose Reserves and Open Space Zones

[6] To assist the hearings panel understand the difference between a policy constraint (i.e. prescribed in an operative planning instrument) as distinct from evidential constraint we direct Mr Walsh to provide us with a revised set of constraints maps that separate the policy constraints from matters of evidence.

[7] For example Mr Walsh at para [45] and [74] of his evidence in chief, noted that the 'Airport Noise Contour' constraint map does not reflect the air noise contour in the operative Canterbury Regional Planning Statement or the Operative District Plan, rather it is the Outer Edge Noise Contour, remodelled as part of the Independent Expert Panel review that we are told by Mr Walsh and Ms Appleyard was publically released on 5 July 2023 as part of the review of the airport noise contours provided for in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

[8] Another example is the Liquefaction Risk Areas map, which we understand are not shown or regulated by any operative planning instrument, but reflect Mr Walsh's 'first principles' approach addressing policies in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and Waimakariri District plan directed at addressing the effects of natural hazards. The extent of these areas, and their consequences appear to be matters of evidence.

[9] Mr Walsh mapped soils classified LUC 1 and 2, but has not included LUC 3. We understand that the argument as to whether the plan change site is subject to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL), depends on whether the sites proposed "rural lifestyle" zone is excluded from being 'highly productive land' for the purposes of the NPS-HPL. To assist the hearings panel understand the extent of the mapping constraint, can we please have the Soils map amended to include classification 3 land with an overlay of the proposed District Plan rural lifestyle zone.

[10] We direct that the revised constraint maps be provided to, and then discussed with Mr Boyes, Mr Willis and Ms Mitten. We then direct Mr Walsh, Mr Boyes, Mr Willis and Ms Mitten to provide a joint witness statement identifying the agreed constraints to urban development and those which are in wholly or partly in dispute, and the reasons for any dispute.

Public Transport

[11] We direct Mr Milner who was called by the applicant, Mr Fleete (called by the Canterbury Regional Council), Mr Binder who provided a report on transport matters for the purposes of s42A Report, and Mr Metherall (called by the Waimakariri District Council as submitter) to conference and provide a joint witness statement setting out the matters they are agreed or not agreed to in relation to the availability and accessibility of public transport options to serve Ōhoka if the plan change were to be approved, in the short, medium and longer term. We would like them to address:

- (a) Whether a connector service between Ōhoka and Kaiapoi or Rangiora is realisable within the short, medium and longer term identifying the degree of uncertainty and/or contingent matters.
- (b) Whether an on-demand service, like that available in Timaru, is realisable in the short, medium or long term, identifying the degree of uncertainty and/or contingent matters.

[12] We ask that the experts confer and advise when the requested information and statements can be provided.

Dated 7 August 2023



Cindy Robinson
Chair
for Independent Hearings Panel