

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 5: QUESTIONS FOR MR YEOMAN

[1] The hearing of the application for 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 and continued up until Thursday 10 August 2023, at which point we adjourned subject to further directions.

[2] In Minute 4, amongst other matters we requested that Ms Appleyard, counsel for the applicant, to submit a memorandum to the hearing panel with possible questions for Mr Yeoman. A memorandum was filed.¹

[3] We have reviewed the memorandum and agree that it would assist in our inquiry for Mr Yeoman to provide a response to those questions with some minor changes of our own. Accordingly we direct Mr Yeoman to respond with a supplementary statement to the questions set out in appendix 1 to this Minute. In the event that Mr Yeoman is unable to provide a response to any particular question, we ask that he explain the reasons for that.

[4] Mr Yeoman's supplementary statement is to be sent to the hearings administrator and to the applicant's solicitor by 5pm on Friday 18 August 2023. A copy of the applicant's memorandum, this Minute and Mr Yeoman's supplementary statement is to be placed on the Council website as soon as practical.

Dated 15 August 2023



Cindy Robinson
Chair
for Independent Hearings Panel

¹ Memorandum of Counsel for the applicant dated 14 August 2023.

Appendix 1 – Hearing Panel Questions for Mr Yeoman

For the medium term:

1. Provide a breakdown of the total amount of greenfield capacity (with each subdivision listed, its location and total number of lots/capacity counted for that subdivision). It would assist the hearings panel to have these identified on the relevant planning maps in the operative district plan.
2. Provide details of the total amount of infill/intensification capacity assumed.
3. What assumptions were made about the Kaiapoi qualifying matters and their impact on density
4. Confirm whether the NDAs/FDAs have or have not been counted in the medium-term.
5. Confirm whether or not you have included:
 - a. Commercial areas;
 - b. Preschools/day-care centres; or
 - c. Kāinga-Ora, Ngāi Tahu or Retirement villages.
6. Confirm whether heritage sites or notable trees have been taken account of.

For the long term:

7. Provide a breakdown of the total amount of greenfield capacity (with each subdivision listed, its location and total number of lots/capacity counted for that subdivision). It would assist the hearings panel to have these identified on the relevant planning maps in the operative district plan.
8. Provide details of the total amount of infill/intensification capacity assumed.
9. Confirm total numbers for NDAs/FDAs allowed for, including:
 - a. List each individual NDA/FDA (it would assist the hearings panel if these can be identified on the relevant planning maps in the operative district plan and provide the reference to the relevant proposed district planning map) and total number of lots/capacity in each area;
 - b. Area (in hectares);
 - c. What has been subtracted in % (and hectares) for:
 - i. Stormwater;
 - ii. Infrastructure;

iii. Reserves;

10. What is the lot size assumed or hh/ha yield?

11. What assumptions were made about the Kaiapoi qualifying matters and their impact on density?

Infill/intensification capacity assumptions

12. Did you take into account restrictive covenants/encumbrances considerations that may apply to particular land parcels or greenfield areas and if so what were they?

13. Is it assumed demolition of the existing houses would occur or is intensification based on utilising the balance land of a parcel?

14. Did you consider access constraints in determining additional dwellings on sections and what were they?

15. Were house shape or parcel shape considerations incorporated and if so what were they?