

## Hearing Stream 10: Special Purpose Zones

### 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(s) 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 Section 42A Report authors additional questions during the course of the hearing.

### SPZ – Whaitua Motuhake - Kaiapoi Regeneration SPZ(KR)

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
Para 23	Does the Recovery Plan ceasing to have legal effect on 30 June 2021 mean that the wording the Introduction to the Chapter where it says the District Plan must not be inconsistent with the Recovery Plan is incorrect?
Para 57	Do you maintain that none of the UFD objectives and policies are relevant, given that the SPZ(KR) does in fact provide for residential, industrial and commercial activities?
Para 63	Please clarify the statement in para 63 that <i>“the strategic objectives do have some level of primacy”</i> with the statement in para 61 that <i>“the SD objectives do not provide much direction specific to the SPZ(KR) and therefore would not be of particular relevance...”</i>
Para 77	In preparing this assessment, did you consider the wording in the Introduction of the Chapter which states:  <i>“the provisions in this chapter are consistent with the matters in Part 2 – District Wide Matters – Strategic Directions and give effect to matters in Part 2 – District Wide Matters – Urban Form and Development”?</i>
Paras 103 & 105	Whilst impacts on property values are not a relevant effect under the RMA would you agree that amenity effects as described by the submitter are nevertheless relevant.  Will the Transport Chapter really provide any protection for the amenity of neighbours through requiring any on-site carparks to meet design standards, when the concern expressed by the submitter relates to <i>“increased traffic movements thereby creating noise, vibration, and parking issues on a road unsuitable for such traffic”?</i>
Para 108	Would you agree that SPZ(KR) R27 applies only to industrial activities, and commercial activities are not similarly constrained? Is this significant in terms of the submitters’ concerns about the change in character of the area to non-residential land uses?

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
Para 23	Does the Recovery Plan ceasing to have legal effect on 30 June 2021 mean that the wording the Introduction to the Chapter where it says the District Plan must not be inconsistent with the Recovery Plan is incorrect?
Para 117	The Recovery Plan dates back to 2016. Has there been subsequent growth in Kaiapoi that might now justify additional open space being provided?
Para 131	You have agreed with the submission requesting a 20m building setback from the NOSZ, as you consider a 6m setback would not provide a sufficient buffer particularly if the vegetation had been removed.  How realistic is it that the established vegetation shown in your Figure 5 photograph (which is presumably in a NOSZ zone controlled by Council and which provides excellent amenity) will ever be removed?
Para 134	Should the wording be for any building adjoining a NOSZ or rather any site adjoining a NOSZ?

#### SPZ – Whitua Motuhake - Pines Beach and Kairaki Regeneration SPZ(PBKR)

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
Para 27	Does the Recovery Plan ceasing to have legal effect on 30 June 2021 mean that the wording the Introduction to the Chapter where it says the District Plan must not be inconsistent with the Recovery Plan is incorrect?
Para 63	How relevant are points a to d to Pines Beach and Kairaki?
Para 65	If the Panel determines that the SD objectives should have full primacy, and if we accept there is no scope to include a new SD for regeneration, will this cause any issues for the SPZ Chapter?
Para 67	In preparing this assessment, did you consider the wording in the Introduction of the Chapter which states:  <i>“the provisions in this chapter are consistent with the matters in Part 2 – District Wide Matters – Strategic Directions and give effect to matters in Part 2 – District Wide Matters – Urban Form and Development”?</i>
Para 84	Please explain the relationship between SPZ(PBKR)-O2 and the Natural Hazards Chapter, and why natural hazards are addressed in the SPZ(PBKR) Chapter in addition to the NH chapter.
Para 93	Please set out the evidence / basis for the proposed hours of operation.
Para 97	Please explain the difference between visitors and clients in respect to these activities.
Para 133 - 135	It is not totally clear to the Panel why those 2 properties were not treated the same as the other residential properties, was this an omission?

**SPZ – Whitua Motuhake - Pegasus Resort SPZ(PR)**

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
Paras 73, 74 and 75	<p>Please explain what you mean when you provide a definition of golf education facility in para 64 and then state in para 65 that it is not defined.</p> <p>What are the implications for other chapters if golf education facilities are nested under education facilities? In answering this question, please set out the legal status of the Definition Nesting Tables compared to the Definitions themselves.</p>
Para 89	<p>Is this an accept in part, given your conclusion that what the submitter is seeking is already encapsulated by the definition?</p>
Para 127	<p>Please clarify the statement “<i>In summary, I do not consider there to be any implications to the SPZ(PR) Chapter if the Strategic Directions Chapter were to be given primacy</i>”. Do you mean, specifically, primacy in terms of Mr Buckley’s memorandum set out in (b) (i) and (ii)?</p>
Para 136	<p>Is your conclusion about water quality consistent with the evaluations of the reporting officers for the TRAN and EW Chapters? If not, why not?</p>
Para 160	<p>Please be prepared to expand on this point at the hearing, i.e. why is the number of visitor accommodation units restricted to ensure this “<i>does not exceed the national average provision per capita</i>” and how that outcome which came from an economic analysis report might be relevant to the potential effects that you have identified in para 161 (water supply, stormwater generation, wastewater loads and traffic generation). Were the water supply, stormwater generation, wastewaters loads and traffic generation also determinative on setting the visitor accommodation unit limits?</p>
Para 163	<p>Can you comment on what the realistic number of visitor accommodation units might be in Activity Areas 1, 2 or 4 were the cap to be lifted as requested by the submitter, so the Panel can gauge the impacts of removing the cap (NB: we may ask the submitter the same question).</p>