

GENERAL INDUSTRIAL ZONE

CONTENTS

1	Scope of Report.....	3
2	Hearing and Submitters Heard	3
3	Sub-topic Recommendations.....	4
3.1	Chapter in general.....	4
3.2	Non-notification clauses	5
3.3	Objectives and Policies	5
3.3.1	Notified Objectives.....	5
3.3.2	New Objectives	5
3.3.3	General Industrial Zone Policies.....	6
3.3.4	New Policies	7
3.4	Rules.....	8
3.4.1	Supported as Notified	8
3.4.2	Residential Units and Activities.....	8
3.4.3	Educational Facilities.....	9
3.4.4	Corrections Activities	9
3.4.5	Primary Production	10
3.4.6	Visitor Accommodation.....	11
3.4.7	Landfills	11
3.4.8	New Rules.....	11
3.5	Rule Requirements.....	13
3.5.1	GIZ-REQ1 Servicing.....	13
3.5.2	GIZ-REQ2 Height.....	13
3.5.3	GIZ-REQ3 Height in Relation to Boundary ('HRTB')	14
3.5.4	GIZ-REQ4 Setbacks	15
3.5.5	GIZ-REQ5 and GIZ-REQ6 Landscaping	15
3.5.6	GIZ-REQ7 Outdoor Storage	16
3.5.7	GIZ-REQ8 Impermeable Surfaces	16
3.5.8	GIZ-REQ9 Roof Length.....	17
3.5.9	GIZ-REQ10 Street Interfaces	17
3.6	Matters for Control or Discretion	17
3.6.1	GIZ-MAT1 to GIZ-MAT7	17
3.25	New Matter for Control or Discretion.....	18
3.7	Schedules, Precincts and Mapping	18
4	Other Matters	19
	Appendix 1: Recommended Amendments	20

Amendments to the PDP Maps	20
Amendments to the PDP Text	21
Appendix 2: List of Appearances and Tabled Evidence	28

1 Scope of Report

- [1] This Recommendation Report relates to the General Industrial Zone chapter of the PDP and contains the Hearing Panel's recommendations to Council on the submissions and further submissions received on that chapter.
- [2] The Hearing Panel members for the General Industrial Zone chapter were:
- Gary Rae (Chair)
 - Nicole Reid
 - Raewyn Solomon
 - Andrew Willis
- [3] The initial Section 42A Report and the end of hearing Section 42A Report (Reply Report) for this topic were:
- General Industrial Zone, 13 February 2022, Jessica Tuilaepa
 - General Industrial Zone, 27 April 2022, Jessica Tuilaepa
- [4] Prior to the hearing the reporting officer also provided a report entitled 'Officer's Response to Questions from The Hearings Panel', dated 29 March 2022.
- [5] The Hearing Panel's recommended amendments to the notified provisions of the General Industrial Zone chapter are set out in Appendix 1. Amendments recommended by the Section 42A Report author that have been adopted by the Hearing Panel are shown in strike out and underlining. Further or different amendments recommended by the Hearing Panel are shown in strike out, underlining and red font.
- [6] The Hearing Panel's recommended amendments to the notified planning maps (and consequential changes to PDP chapters) are also set out in narrative form in Appendix 1, including any amendments recommended by the Section 42A Report author that we have adopted.
- [7] We note that some of the numbering of individual clauses in the rule and rule requirement provisions will need to be consequentially amended and not all such amendments are shown in Appendix 1. We understand that will occur in the amended version of the entire PDP that will accompany the release of all of the Recommendation Reports.
- [8] Further submitters are not listed in the tables in this Recommendation Report because further submissions are either accepted or rejected in conformance with our recommendations on the original submissions to which they relate.

2 Hearing and Submitters Heard

- [9] The hearing for the General Industrial Zone chapter was held on Tuesday 29 March 2022 and reconvened on Tuesday 12 April 2022 to hear an additional statement from Ara Poutama, Department of Corrections. The submitters who appeared at the hearing (either in person or via Zoom) are listed below, together with an identification of whether they were an original submitter, a further submitter, or both.

Sub #	Submitter	Original	Further
DPR-0300	Ara Poutama, Department of Corrections	✓	

Sub #	Submitter	Original	Further
Combined			
DPR-0358	RWRL	✓	✓
DPR-0363	IRHL	✓	✓
DPR-0374	RIHL	✓	✓
DPR-0384	RIDL	✓	✓
DPR-0396	Woolworths New Zealand Limited	✓	
DPR-0453	Midland Port, LPC (LPC)	✓	

[10] Some of the submitters had expert witnesses appear on their behalf. The witnesses we heard from are listed in Appendix 2, along with a list of tabled evidence. Copies of all evidence (expert and non-expert) received are held by the Council. We do not separately summarise that material here, but we refer to or quote from some of it in the remainder of this Recommendation Report.

[11] We record that we considered all submissions and further submissions, regardless of whether the submitter or further submitter appeared at the hearing and whether they were represented by expert witnesses.

3 Sub-topic Recommendations

[12] In this part of the Recommendation Report we assess the submissions by sub-topic, using the same headings as the initial Section 42A Report.

3.1 Chapter in general

[13] For the following submitters and their submission points on those provisions we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author, including in the Reply Report.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0363	IRHL	355
DPR-0374	RIHL	399
DPR-0384	RIDL	433
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	022, 031

[14] In response to submission points by IRHL, RIHL and RIDL we agree that there is no need for the GIZ-Overview to explain that the proposed precincts are based on current zonings in the operative District Plan. We also agree that, in response to a submission point by Stuart PC Limited, there is no need for reference to be made in the Overview to confirm that activities are able to operate 24 hours a day, noting however that there may be some specific rules which may result in restricted hours of operation (such as in the Noise Chapter).

[15] We agree with the Section 42A Report author that, in relation to Stuart PC Limited DPR-0365.031, it is not appropriate to amend all rules to provide a blanket restricted discretionary activity status to all GIZ-REQ's in the GIZ chapter. However, we note that our recommendations in later sections of this report are to accept the officer's recommendation that a restricted discretionary activity status is appropriate for some of the REQ's and so this submission point is accepted in part, as recommended in the Reply Report.

3.2 Non-notification clauses

- [16] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0358	RWRL	430
DPR-0363	IRHL	450
DPR-0374	RIHL	496
DPR-0384	RIDL	529

- [17] We accept the reasons of the Section 42A reporting officer. In particular, we consider it is not appropriate to preclude limited or public notification for controlled and restricted discretionary activities on a chapter wide basis. The RMA contains a specific process for determining notification on a case-by-case basis and in our view that statutory process should only be circumvented where there is absolute certainty that potential adverse effects will not affect any other party. Having made this finding, we assess requests for non-notification for individual rules on their merits.

3.3 Objectives and Policies

3.3.1 Notified Objectives

- [18] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0353	HortNZ	295
DPR-0363	IRHL	356, 357, 358
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	002
DPR-0374	RIHL	400, 401, 402
DPR-0384	RIDL	434, 435, 436

- [19] The support of RIDL, IRHL and RIHL for GIZ-O1, GIZ-O2 and GIZ-O3, and the support of HortNZ for GIZ-O2, is acknowledged. In relation to Stuart PC Limited's submission, we consider that GIZ-O1 as notified appropriately encompasses the range of activities anticipated within the GIZ and no change is required.

3.3.2 New Objectives

- [20] For the following submitter and their submission point we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. We agree that an additional objective is not required because existing objectives and policies in the Strategic Directions chapter and Energy and Infrastructure chapter are enabling of important infrastructure which includes national, regional and local electricity generation activities and electricity distribution and transmission networks.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0367	Orion ¹	151

¹ Commissioner Reid recused herself from consideration of Orion's submissions due to a conflict of interest.

3.3.3 General Industrial Zone Policies

- [21] For the following submitters and their submission points we generally agree with the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author, but have recommended some amended wording for GIZ-P4 and GIZ-P5 to that which was recommended in the Reply Report.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0353	HortNZ	296
DPR-0363	IRHL	359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	003
DPR-0374	RIHL	403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408
DPR-0384	RIDL	437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442
DPR-0396	Woolworths	005
DPR-0453	LPC	081

- [22] The Section 42A Report author recommended amending GIZ-P4 to include reference to the Large Format Retail Zone, in response to the submissions of IRHL, RIDL and RIHL. We also heard expert planning evidence in support from Mr Phillips for those submitters. Ms Panther-Knight, planning witness for Woolworths, gave evidence that the policy should not elevate the role of the LFRZ. While we have some sympathy for Ms Panther-Knight's argument given that the LFRZ is not a 'centre' *per se*, on balance we consider the LFRZ should be included in this policy, particularly given that the focus of GIZ-P4 is to ensure that commercial activities in the GIZ do not undermine the LCZ or TCZ. In determining this, we recognise that the Rolleston Township includes the LFRZ and that the District's commercial and mixed-use zones, which include the LFRZ, are identified in the Plan as the focal points for the District's commercial and community needs. We consider that the LFRZ should be afforded some protection from commercial activities establishing in the GIZ and we note that this approach supports both the LFRZ itself and the overall zoned approach in the Plan.
- [23] Another submission point by Woolworths sought an amendment to GIZ-P4 to limit the commercial activities being able to establish in the GIZ to those that demonstrate a functional need to locate within the zone and do not undermine the viability of the TCZ and LCZ, as follows:
- “Avoid commercial activities that do not demonstrate a functional need to locate within the zone and that result in unacceptable adverse effects that undermine the viability and function of the Town Centre and Local Centre Zones.”
- [24] There was some discussion at the hearing in response to the Panel's questions of the expert planners (i.e. Ms Tuilaepa, Ms Panther-Knight and Mr Phillips) as to whether the recommended amended words are clear as to the intended outcome. Having considered the evidence the Panel considers that for a commercial activity to establish in the General Industrial Zone it will need to establish that it has both a functional need to locate within the zone, and also that it will not result in unacceptable adverse effects on the viability and function of the TCZ and LCZ's.
- [25] Mr Phillips alerted us to a perverse outcome that could arise were we to accept the amended wording above, i.e. it could be read to mean that a commercial activity need only satisfy one

limb of the ‘functional need’ or ‘unacceptable adverse effects’ criteria. We have recommended some amended wording to clarify this.

[26] We also consider ‘significant’ is a more appropriate word than ‘unacceptable’ and also note Mr Phillips’ point that the term ‘functional need’ is appropriate to use here as it is defined in the PDP and in the National Planning Standards.

[27] Accordingly, the wording we recommend for GIZ-P4 is:

“Avoid commercial activities unless they:

1. can demonstrate a functional need to locate within the zone; and
2. will not result in significant adverse effects on the viability and function of a Town Centre, Local Centre or Large Format Retail Zone.

[28] Stuart PC requested an amendment to GIZ-P5, as it considered the policies for the zone need to more clearly be a method by which the objectives are to be achieved as opposed to being a repeat of the objectives. The Section 42A Report author supported the amended policy, as follows:

~~“Manage the adverse visual effects~~ Enable a scale and form of development which recognises the functional and operational requirements of industrial activities whilst also managing adverse effects to an appropriate level.”

[29] We agree that the policy would be improved by adding a reference to enabling a scale and form of development to ‘add value’ to Objective GIZ-O2, by acknowledging the scale and form of activities anticipated in the GIZ. However we do not consider there is a need for the reference to managing effects as this aspect is covered by GIZ-P6. We have recommended an amendment accordingly.

[30] In terms of s32AA, we are satisfied that the amendments are required for consistency and clarity and are the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

3.3.4 New Policies

[31] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Point
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	004
DPR-0367	Orion ²	152

[32] In relation to the submission point from Orion we are satisfied that important infrastructure is currently protected through provisions located in the Strategic Directions chapter and in the Energy and Infrastructure chapter.

[33] In relation to the submission point of Stuart PC Limited, GIZ-P5 as notified already recognises the functional and operational requirements of industrial activities. However, with the Section 42A Report author’s recommended amendments to GIZ-P5, which we have accepted, we consider that policy will now also recognise that industrial activities generate higher levels of

² Commissioner Reid recused herself from consideration of this submission due to a conflict of interest.

noise, dust, odour, and visual effects than other activities. To that extent the relief sought by this submitter may be considered to be met, at least in part.

3.4 Rules

3.4.1 *Supported as Notified*

- [34] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. These represent full support for GIZ-R1, GIZ-R4 to GIZ-R10, GIZ-R12 to GIZ-R16, GIZ-20, and GIZ-R22 to GIZ-R24.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0145	Bunnings	010
DPR-0363	IRHL	365 – 375, 377 - 379
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	005, 008-011, 012, 014-015, 018-019, 021
DPR-0374	RIHL	410, 413-419, 421- 425, 429, 431-433
DPR-0384	RIDL	444, 447-453, 455 – 459, 463, 465-467
DPR-0453	LPC	084

3.4.2 *Residential Units and Activities*

- [35] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author, in the Reply Report.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0363	IRHL	367, 368
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	006, 007
DPR-0374	RIHL	411, 412
DPR-0384	RIDL	445, 416
DPR-0453	LPC	082, 083

- [36] The submission by LPC seeks to amend both GIZ-R2 and GIZ-R3 to restrict residential units and their associated activities from readily establishing in the General Industrial Zone, where also located within the Noise Control Overlay for the PORTZ. The other submissions in the table above were all in support of the rules which allow for custodial dwellings in the zone.
- [37] We accept Mr Bonis' planning evidence for LPC that it is important to prevent incompatible activities in the form of custodial dwellings locating within the Port Noise Control Overlay to avoid potential incompatibility with existing and anticipated activities within the PORTZ. He recommended non-complying activity status for these activities rather than relying on controlled activity assessments and mitigation.
- [38] The Section 42A Report had initially recommended the submission of LPC be rejected as there is a matter for control in the rules which would allow for acoustic insulation of custodial dwellings, and this will ensure that the impacts LPC are concerned about are suitably addressed. However, in the Reply Report, and in response to Mr Bonis' evidence, the officer supported the need to further restrict residential units within the Port Noise Control Overlay³.
- [39] The Panel accepts that residential units should be NC within the Port Noise Control Overlay for the reasons outlined by Mr Bonis. The Reply Report advises that no s32AA evaluation is required. However, in the event that one is required we are satisfied that the amendments

³ Reply Report, paragraph 2.5

are the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

3.4.3 Educational Facilities

- [40] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0363	IRHL	376
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	013
DPR-0374	RIHL	420
DPR-0378	MoE	032
DPR-0384	RIDL	454
DPR-0453	LPC	086

- [41] We accept the evidence in the Section 42A Report that they fall outside of the activities provided for in GIZ-P1 and GIZ-P2 and the potential for reverse sensitivity means they are also unlikely to align with GIZ-P3. For those reasons we do not accept the Ministry of Education's submission that educational facilities be changed to a restricted discretionary activity. We are satisfied that these are appropriately classified as a non-complying activity in the General Industrial Zone.
- [42] We note also that Mr Bonis, planner for LPC, supported the retention of educational facilities as a non-complying activity in this zone.

3.4.4 Corrections Activities

- [43] Ara Poutama Aotearoa's submission sought an amendment to GIZ-R18, which, as notified, manages 'Corrections Activities' as a non-complying activity.
- [44] We note at this point the Panel's recommendations on Hearing 2 is to delete the definition of 'Corrections Activity' and instead provide separate rules for both 'Community Corrections Activities' as defined in the Planning Standards, and 'Corrections Prisons' as defined in section 2 of the Corrections Act 2004. The Section 42A Report's recommendation on this aspect was to amend GIZ-R18 to reflect those changes to the definition, and we consider that is appropriate.
- [45] However, the substance of the submission is to alter the activity status of 'Community Corrections Activities' so that they would become a permitted activity in the GIZ, whereas other Corrections Activities, (now proposed to be defined as 'Corrections Prisons') will remain as a non-complying activity.
- [46] Mr Dale, planner for Ara Poutama Aotearoa, in evidence said that permitted activity status for community corrections activities in industrial zones is being sought nationally by Ara Poutama Aotearoa and has been applied by local authorities within many recent District Plan review processes, including locally within the Christchurch District Plan, and the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan.
- [47] His evidence was that community corrections activities include elements of industrial activities (large building footprints, parking and yard areas, equipment and vehicle storage) and that overall they are compatible with the character and amenity of the zone. In response to questions he confirmed they do not entail residential accommodation on site and are not

sensitive to noise and high traffic movements expected in the zone. He said that due to the specialist nature of community corrections activities there will not be a proliferation of them or any impact on the wider availability of industrial land.

- [48] The Section 42A Report author noted that permitted status for Community Corrections Activities would be consistent with the approach in the Commercial Mixed Use Zones, however, the non-complying activity status, as notified, recognises that these activities are less appropriate in the General Industrial Zone and other Special Purpose Zones due to the potential for reverse sensitivity effects. The officer therefore recommended this activity be retained as a non-complying activity⁴ and did not alter that view as part of the Reply Report.
- [49] We consider the evidence of Mr Dale, supported by Ms Hurrell from Ara Poutama Aotearoa, to be persuasive that Community Corrections Activities will not be incompatible in the General Industrial Zone, and will not give rise to reverse sensitivity issues. Accordingly, we accept that this activity should be provided for as a permitted activity in the zone, noting that it will be subject to the full range of performance standard rules applicable to permitted activities.
- [50] Consequently, for the following submitters and submission points our recommendations are set out below.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Point	Accept	Accept in Part
DPR-0300	Ara Poutama Aotearoa	015	✓	
DPR-0363	IRHL	383		✓
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	016		✓
DPR-0374	RIHL	427		✓
DPR-0384	RIDL	461		✓

- [51] In terms of s32AA of the RMA, we are satisfied from Mr Dale's evidence the recommended amendment to GIZ-R18 to enable Community Correction Activities as permitted activities in the General Industrial Zone, is the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

3.4.5 Primary Production

- [52] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author, which results in no changes to the notified provisions.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0258	Coal Action Network Aotearoa	002
DPR-0363	IRHL	382
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	020
DPR-0374	RIHL	426
DPR-0384	RIDL	460
DPR-0439	Rayonier	015

- [53] We concur with the Section 42A Report author that the definition of 'Plantation Forestry' as notified aligns with the intent of the activity the provisions are intending to manage, and if

⁴ Appendix 2 of the Section 42A Report had incorrectly shown acceptance of the relief requested in DPR-0300.015

consent is applied for such an activity to establish in the GIZ, the specifics of the activity would still be managed by the NES-PF.

- [54] We also accept there is no need to amend GIZ-R17 to exclude mining and extraction of fossil fuels from the list of allowed primary production activities in the GIZ, particularly as GIZ-R17 as notified proposes a non-complying activity status for mineral extraction and will include fossil fuels by default. We consider the activity status of 'Primary Production Activities', as notified, need not be changed from Permitted to Restricted Discretionary as the relevant objectives and policies set a clear direction that a range of activities should be enabled in the General Industrial Zone, and these activities are clearly anticipated in the GIZ.

- [55] We heard no evidence from the submitters on these points.

3.4.6 Visitor Accommodation

- [56] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author, which results in no changes to the notified provisions.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0363	IRHL	384
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	17
DPR-0374	RIHL	428
DPR-0384	RIDL	462
DPR-0455	Paul & Fay McOscar	012

3.4.7 Landfills

- [57] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author, which results in no changes to the notified provisions.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0122	Frews Quarries Ltd	33
DPR-0363	IRHL	386
DPR-0374	RIHL	430
DPR-0384	RIDL	464

3.4.8 New Rules

- [58] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author, which results in no changes to the notified provisions.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0363	IRHL	365
DPR-0367	Orion ⁵	153 - 156
DPR-0374	RIHL	409
DPR-0384	RIDL	443
DPR-0396	Woolworths	021

⁵ Commissioner Reid recused herself from consideration of this submission due to a conflict of interest.

- [59] Consistent with our earlier recommendations we do not support Orion's request for an additional rule in the GIZ Chapter to further protect important infrastructure.
- [60] Mr Phillips confirmed in his evidence⁶ that the submitters known as the Carter Group were not pursuing the additional rules requested in the GIZ Chapter.
- [61] Woolworths' submission point was that supermarkets should be provided for in the GIZ as a discretionary activity (DIS) rather than a non-complying activity (NC). We have carefully considered the expert evidence of the Section 42A Report author and of Ms Panther-Knight for Woolworths (as well as economics evidence and legal submissions) and have determined, on balance, that it is more appropriate that the activity status for supermarkets remains as NC in these industrial zones.
- [62] Our reasons are as follows:
- (a) Whilst there is a recognised shortfall of appropriately zoned commercial zoned land, the Hearing 23 Commercial and Mixed Use Zones Panel has responded to the planning and economics evidence presented by Woolworths and Foodstuffs and has recommended that further provision be made for supermarkets in terms of both a more enabling policy framework and a more enabling rule framework. That included responses to the JWS prepared by planners representing the supermarket industry to change the 'avoid' focus of CMUZ-P1 so that it is encouraging of commercial development. It also resulted in supermarkets being a permitted activity in both the Large Format Retail Zone and in the Local Centre Zone (restricted there to 1,000m² in size).
 - (b) In terms of the overall policy framework for the GIZ chapter we consider that we received no specific evidence to satisfy us that supermarkets are compatible with the character and function of industrial areas. This is relevant because GIZ-O1 seeks to enable industrial activities and other activities considered compatible and that support the function of the Industrial area. GIZ-P3 seeks to avoid activities where they are incompatible with the character and function of the industrial area. In terms of GIZ-P2 we consider that supermarkets may well be of a similar scale to some industrial activities but they are of a different character (i.e. large scale commercial activities) and are not focused on servicing the needs of workers within the zone.
 - (c) We acknowledge we have recommended some changes to GIZ-P4 (i.e. to avoid activities unless they have a functional need to locate in an industrial zone and will not have significant adverse effects on the viability and function of the TCZ, LCZ and LFRZ). However, we note that both GIZ-P3 and GIZ-P4 are nevertheless retained as 'avoid' policies, and the changes do not in themselves signal the need to change the activity status for supermarkets to DIS. When those policies are considered alongside GIZ-O1 (which enables industrial activities specifically), GIZ-P2 (which has strict restrictions on 'other activities'), our determination is that the policy framework remains one where a high bar should be retained for consideration of new and expanded supermarkets and should appropriately be NC status in the General Industrial Zone.

⁶ Mr Phillips, paragraph 8

- (d) We are not comfortable that the issue of potential reverse sensitivity effects arising from large scale commercial supermarket activities locating in industrial zones has been adequately addressed in evidence, noting that this was a reason for the Section 42A Report author to recommend retaining NC status.
- (e) We are not comfortable that the issue of adverse retail distribution effects that could undermine the viability and function of a Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone or Large Format Retail Zone as per amended GIZ-P4.2 has been adequately addressed in evidence.

[63] Overall, Ms Panther-Knight's evidence was that all of those matters can be adequately assessed, with the production of appropriate evidence, for a supermarket as a discretionary activity rather than as a non-complying activity. However, for the reasons outlined above, and on balance, we consider the appropriate activity status for supermarkets in the GIZ chapter is NC, noting that it is still possible for applications to be consented in appropriate circumstances.

3.5 Rule Requirements

3.5.1 GIZ-REQ1 Servicing

[64] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0145	Bunnings	011
DPR-0343	CDHB	062
DPR-0363	IRHL	390
DPR-0374	RIHL	434
DPR-0384	RIDL	468

[65] We do not consider an amendment to GIZ-REQ1, or a new GIZ-MAT, is required as the treatment of trade waste and the reticulated systems' ability to deal with such waste is managed by the 2016 SDC Trade Waste Bylaw. We also agree it is not appropriate to apply a non-notification clause to a breach of GIZ-REQ1 where the breach in activity status is a non-complying activity.

3.5.2 GIZ-REQ2 Height

[66] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0363	IRHL	391, 392
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	023
DPR-0374	RIHL	435, 436
DPR-0384	RIDL	469, 470

[67] We heard planning evidence from Mr Phillips in support of the submissions by IRHL, RIDL and RIHL to amend GIZ-REQ2 to include a maximum height of 20 metres for any building in that part of the General Industrial Zone bounded by the PORTZ, Jones Road, Hoskyns Road and Maddisons Road. He considered this to be more appropriate than the 15 metre height limit, as notified, taking account of the receiving environment and distance from sensitive sites or

land uses, and further noted that there had been no further submissions in opposition to the requested 20 metre height limit, including from the important infrastructure providers in the adjacent zones. Mr Phillips also supported non-notification clause for breaches of the maximum height rule.

- [68] From our site visit we can accept that a higher limit to 20 metres may be acceptable in certain parts and circumstances within that block of land. However, we did not receive evidence to convince us to relax the notified provisions for a significant increase of 25% above the prescribed height limit (which we understand is carried over from the Operative District Plan). Overall, we prefer the evidence of the reporting officer⁷ regarding the reasons for the height limit. Those reasons include: *“The 15m height limit is appropriate as height in relation to boundary and setbacks are not always applicable, therefore the capped height limit ensure amenity for those operating within the zone it maintained across the GIZ and that the RDIS status would allow for an increased height if deemed appropriate”* and also that *“In Rolleston the PORTZ has a higher height limit than the GIZ. This is due to the operational and functional requirements of the Port, which is deemed to be important infrastructure.”*
- [69] We also consider that a restricted discretionary activity status is not onerous for applications for large and high buildings being sought, and note the reporting officer’s advice that the matters of discretion would be limited to those listed in GIZ-MAT1 which includes consideration of the functional and operational requirements of the activity.
- [70] A non-notification clause is not considered appropriate, particularly given that there is no ‘upper limit’ on how high a building may go other than restrictions that apply with the HRTB requirements (and those do not necessarily apply along all boundaries in the Zone in any event).
- [71] For similar reasons we also do not accept the submission by Stuart PC Limited for an increase in the maximum height of structures throughout this zone from 25 metres to 30 metres.

3.5.3 GIZ-REQ3 Height in Relation to Boundary (‘HRTB’)

- [72] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0126	Foster Commercial	020
DPR-0363	IRHL	393
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	024, 025
DPR-0374	RIHL	437
DPR-0384	RIDL	471

- [73] Stuart PC’s submission point seeks an amendment to the HRTB rule requirement, as a consequence of seeking to amend the height limit to 30m. As we did not accept the submitter’s request on the change to the height limit we accordingly do not accept this particular submission point. We also note that we received no evidence from this submitter.
- [74] We agree with the submission by Foster Commercial that an amendment is required to GIZ-REQ3 to make it clearer as to which HRTB applies. In terms of s32AA of the RMA, for this

⁷ Section 42A Report, paragraph 11.8

submission point we are satisfied that the Section 42A Report author's recommended amendment to GIZ-REQ3 to clarify height in relation to boundary requirements is the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

3.5.4 GIZ-REQ4 Setbacks

- [75] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0353	HortNZ	297
DPR-0363	IRHL	394, 395
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	026
DPR-0374	RIHL	438, 439
DPR-0384	RIDL	472, 473
DPR-0458	KiwiRail	057

- [76] We are satisfied that the Section 42A Report author's recommendation to amend the rule requirement in response to RIHL, RIDL and IRHL, and also Stuart PC Limited, for reduced road setbacks in PREC6 is appropriate as this will be more consistent with setbacks across other General Industrial Zone locations across the district. This will also enable the character of the area to be retained, with the 10 metre setback at the zone interface and the 3 metre landscaping strip and road width requirements retained as recommended by the Section 42A Report author. Accordingly, those submission points are accepted in part.
- [77] In terms of s32AA of the RMA, we consider these changes will achieve efficiencies, and are the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.
- [78] Mr Phillips in planning evidence for RIHL, RIDL and IRHL, considered that applications for reduced road setbacks should not require public or limited notification given that such activities are unlikely to affect persons directly given the nature of buildings and activities within the zone. The Section 42A Report considered that given the minimum setback is to be reduced from 10 metres to 3 metres, the ability to potentially notify an application should be retained, and we agree. We also note GIZ-REQ4 relates to several precincts and each has its own specific setback rules. It would be inconsistent to apply a non-notification clause for only one of the precincts. Overall we consider we have not received sufficient evidence to consider applying a non-notification clause in these circumstances.

3.5.5 GIZ-REQ5 and GIZ-REQ6 Landscaping

- [79] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0363	IRHL	396 - 399
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	027, 028
DPR-0374	RIHL	440 - 443
DPR-0384	RIDL	474 - 477
DPR-0396	Woolworths	022, 023

- [80] We note that the submission points of RIDL, RIHL, and IRHL seeking reductions in the road boundary landscaping strip width requirements in GIZ-REQ5, from 3 metres to 2 metres are no longer being pursued by the submitter⁸.
- [81] We accept the Section 4A Report authors recommendation, in response to several submission points, to amend the activity status for breaches of GIZ-REQ5 and GIZ-REQ6 from discretionary activity to restricted discretionary activity. The evidence was that the matters which Council would consider for an application in breach of the landscaping set backs are quite limited.
- [82] In terms of s32AA of the RMA, we consider these changes will achieve efficiencies, and are the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.
- [83] Mr Phillips in planning evidence for RIHL, RIDL, and IRHL considered that applications for reduced minimum landscape strip widths should not require public or limited notification. The Section 42A Report did not support that, and we agree the ability to publicly notify an application in breach of these standards should be retained for similar reasons as stated above for building set back requirements.

3.5.6 GIZ-REQ7 Outdoor Storage

- [84] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author, including in the Reply Report.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0145	Bunnings	012
DPR-0363	IRHL	400, 401
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	029
DPR-0374	RIHL	444, 445
DPR-0384	RIDL	478, 479
DPR-0396	Woolworths	024

- [85] In the Reply Report, the Section 4A Report author changed her recommendation, and now recommends amending the activity status for breaches of GIZ-REQ7 from discretionary activity to restricted discretionary activity. The evidence was that an assessment of this infringement could be reasonably carried out using additional matters for discretion and therefore the downgrade in activity status is appropriate. We consider this to be appropriate.
- [86] In terms of s32AA of the RMA, we adopt the author's evaluation set out in the Reply Report.
- [87] We note Mr Phillips, in planning evidence for the Carter Group submitters, advised the request for non-notification clauses with respect to GIZ-REQ7 was not being pursued⁹.

3.5.7 GIZ-REQ8 Impermeable Surfaces

- [88] For the following submitters and their submission points, which are all in support of GIZ-REQ8 as notified, we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author, and this results in no changes to the provision.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0145	Bunnings	013

⁸ Statement of Jeremy Phillips, paragraph 8

⁹ Mr Phillips, paragraph 8

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0363	IRHL	402
DPR-0365	Stuart PC Limited	030
DPR-0374	RIHL	446
DPR-0384	RIDL	480

3.5.8 GIZ-REQ9 Roof Length

- [89] For the following submitters and their submission points, which are all in support of GIZ-REQ9 as notified, we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author, and this results in no changes to the provision.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0363	IRHL	403
DPR-0374	RIHL	447
DPR-0384	RIDL	481

3.5.9 GIZ-REQ10 Street Interfaces

- [90] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author, noting that the recommendations have changed as reflected in the Reply Report.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0145	Bunnings	014
DPR-0363	IRHL	404
DPR-0374	RIHL	448
DPR-0384	RIDL	482
DPR-0396	Woolworths	025

- [91] We heard planning evidence from Ms Panther Knight for Woolworths in support of the request to downgrade the activity status for breaches of the rule requirement from discretionary to restricted discretionary activity. She also provided some recommended wording for the assessment matters relating to this rule.
- [92] The Reply Report agreed that the Street Interface provisions in the General Industrial Zone are similar to the Commercial Mixed Use Zone's active frontage provisions, which are proposed to be managed via a restricted discretionary activity status should there be a breach of the relevant rule requirement (as subsequently accepted by the Hearing 23 Commercial and Mixed Use Zones Panel). We agree that, for consistency, RDIS is the appropriate activity status and we accept that Ms Panther Knight's suggested wording for the assessment matter is appropriate.
- [93] In terms of s32AA of the RMA, we adopt the author's evaluation set out in the Reply Report.

3.6 Matters for Control or Discretion

3.6.1 GIZ-MAT1 to GIZ-MAT7

- [94] For the following submitters and their submission points we generally accept the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author, including in the Reply Report.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0101	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited & Vodafone New Zealand Limited	047
DPR-0363	IRHL	406 - 411
DPR-0374	RIHL	450 - 455
DPR-0384	RIDL	483 - 489
DPR-0458	KiwiRail	058

- [95] Our recommendation results in a change to GIZ-MAT1 to acknowledge the reverse sensitivity that over-height buildings may have on important infrastructure, in response to the submission of the telecommunication companies. However, we have recommended simplified wording to that which was recommended by the Section 42A Report author to remove the reference to a 2 metres height exceedance as that was considered too specific for a matter of discretion. That submission point is therefore recommended to be “accepted in part”.
- [96] In terms of s32AA of the RMA, we are satisfied the amendments to GIZ-MAT1 to enable the consideration of additional impacts from an increase in height limit on important infrastructure is the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.
- [97] The Section 42A Report author’s recommended amendments to include four new matters for discretion, (in relation to road boundary landscaping, internal boundary landscaping, outdoor storage and fencing, and street interface), are necessary as a consequence of amending the activity status for the relevant rule requirements and are the most appropriate options for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

3.25 *New Matter for Control or Discretion*

- [98] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0343	CDHB	063
DPR-0396	Woolworths	026

- [99] For the reasons stated in the Section 42A Report we do not consider a new GIZ-MAT is necessary to address whether there is sufficient and appropriate capacity for wastewater treatment systems to handle some of the waste from industrial activities.
- [100] We note here we have recommended four new matters of discretion. This is necessary as a consequence of amending the activity status for the relevant rule requirements for road boundary landscaping (GIZ-REQ5), internal boundary landscaping (GIZ-REQ6), outdoor storage and fencing (GIZ-REQ7), and street interface (GIZ-REQ10), as outlined above in Sections 3.5.5, 3.5.6, and 3.5.9.

3.7 *Schedules, Precincts and Mapping*

- [101] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0145	Bunnings	015

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0363	IRHL	412
DPR-0374	RIHL	003, 456
DPR-0384	RIDL	003, 490

- [102] We note the Section 42A Report author has made a recommendation to amend the extent of PREC6 on the planning maps and to subsequently update this in GIZ-SCHED2, under clause 16(2) of Schedule 1 of the RMA. We accept the misalignment of the PREC6 with the underlying GIZ boundary is an error, as the PREC6 boundary should follow the edge of the GIZ and not cross over into the LFRZ.
- [103] We also note the submission of RIDL, RIHL, and IRHL (to amend GIZ-PREC6 in GIZ-SCHED2 to include Lot 504 DP 551164 in Rolleston as part of Area 1 and realign the boundaries of the ODP and Landscape Treatment 4) was considered by the Rezoning Hearings Panel and we agree with that Panel's recommendations with respect to those submission points.

4 Other Matters

- [104] The recommended amendments to the PDP provisions contained in Appendix 1 are those that result from this Hearing Panel's assessment of submissions and further submissions. However, readers should note that further or different amendments to these provisions may have been recommended by:
- Hearing Panels considering submissions and further submissions on other chapters of the PDP;
 - the Hearing Panels considering rezoning requests, and
 - the Independent Hearing Panel (IHP) considering submissions and further submissions on Variation 1 to the PDP
- [105] Any such further or different amendments are not shown in Appendix 1 of this Recommendation Report. However, the Chair¹⁰ and Deputy Chair¹¹ of the PDP Hearing Panels have considered the various recommended amendments and have ensured that the overall final wording of the consolidated version of the amended PDP is internally consistent.
- [106] In undertaking that 'consistency' exercise, care was taken to ensure that the final wording of the consolidated version of the amended PDP did not alter the intent of the recommended amendments contained in Appendix 1 of this Recommendation Report.
- [107] There are no other matters arising from our consideration of the submissions and further submissions or that arose during the hearing.

¹⁰ Who is also the Chair of the IHP.

¹¹ Who chaired one stream of hearings.

Appendix 1: Recommended Amendments

Note to readers: Only provisions that have recommended amendments are included below. All other provisions remain as notified. Amendments recommended by the Section 42A Report author that have been adopted by the Hearing Panel are shown in strike out and underlining. Further or different amendments recommended by the Hearing Panel are shown in strike out, underlining and red font.

Amendments to the PDP Maps

The following spatial amendments are recommended to PDP Planning Maps:

Map Layer	Description of recommended amendment
Zone Maps	<p>Amend the following property from GRUZ to GIZ^{12 13}</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lot 504 DP 551164 

¹² DPR-0384.490 RIDL, DPR-0374.412 RIHL and DPR-0363.465 IRHL

¹³ DPR-0145.015 Bunnings

Precincts	Amend Industrial Precinct PREC6 to include the following property ^{14 15} <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 504 DP 551164
Rural Density Overlay	Remove the overlay from the following property <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 504 DP 551164

Amendments to the PDP Text

Part 3 – Area Specific Matters

Zones

Industrial Zones

GIZ – General Industrial Zone

GIZ-Overview
<p>...</p> <p>There are also three precincts location located within the General Industrial Zone, one in Lincoln which applies to the entire zone, and one in Rolleston which applies to a large portion of the zone. These precincts reflect those areas within the General Industrial Zone that were zoned Business 2A and Business 2B under the previous District Plan.¹⁶ There is also a precinct which applies to a proposed new area of General Industrial Zone land in Leeston. Within these precincts, there are greater requirements for landscaping along road frontages and at interfaces with the surrounding rural area.</p>

GIZ-Objectives and Policies

GIZ-Policies
<p>GIZ-P4 Avoid commercial activities that <u>unless they:</u></p> <p><u>1. Do not can demonstrate a functional need to locate within the zone; and</u></p> <p><u>2. will not result in significant adverse effects</u> that will undermine on the viability and function of the <u>a</u> Town Centre , and Local Centre <u>or Large Format Retail Zones.</u>¹⁷</p>

¹⁴ DPR-0384.490 RIDL, DPR-0374.412 RIHL and DPR-0363.465 IRHL

¹⁵ DPR-0145.015 Bunnings

¹⁶ DPR-0384.433 RIDL, DPR-0374.399 RIHL and DPR-0363.355 IRHL

¹⁷ DPR-0396.005 Woolworths

GIZ-P5	Manage the adverse visual effects. Enable a scale and form of development while recognising which recognises the functional and operational requirements of industrial activities. whilst also managing adverse effects to an appropriate level. ¹⁸
---------------	--

GIZ-Rules

GIZ-R2	Residential Unit	
<u>Excluding the Port 45dB LAeq Noise Control Overlay</u> ¹⁹	Activity status: CON 1. The establishment of any residential unit, ...	Activity status when compliance not achieved: 3. When compliance with any of GIZ-R2.1.a. or GIZ-R2.1.b. is not achieved: NC 4. When compliance with any rule requirement listed in this rule is not achieved: Refer to GIZ-Rule Requirements
<u>Within the Port 45dB LAeq Noise Control Overlay</u> ²⁰	Activity status: NC ²¹ 5. The establishment of any residential unit	Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A
GIZ-R18	<u>Community Corrections Activities</u>	
	Activity Status: NC ²² 1. Any <u>community</u> corrections activity <u>Where the activity complies with the following rule requirements:</u> <u>GIZ-REQ1 Servicing</u> <u>GIZ-REQ7 Outdoor storage</u> <u>GIZ-REQ8 Impermeable Surfaces</u> <u>GIZ-REQ10 Street interfaces</u>	Activity status when compliance not achieved: 2. When compliance with any rule requirement listed in this rule is not achieved: Refer to GIZ-Rule Requirements. ²³
<u>GIZ-RX</u>	<u>Corrections Prison</u>	
	Activity Status: NC 1. Any Corrections Prison	Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A ²⁴

¹⁸ DPR-0365.003 Stuart PC¹⁹ DPR-0453.082 LPC²⁰ DPR-0453.082 LPC²¹ DPR-0453.082 LPC²² DPR-0300.015 Ara Poutama Aotearoa²³ DPR-0300.015 Ara Poutama Aotearoa²⁴ DPR-0300.015 Ara Poutama Aotearoa

GIZ-Rule Requirements

GIZ-REQ3	Height in Relation to Boundary	
	1. Any building or structure shall comply with the relevant height in relation to boundary Height in Relation to Boundary A ²⁵ requirements in APP3 - Height in Relation to Boundary.	...
GIZ-REQ4	Setbacks	
PREC6	6. Any building shall be setback a minimum of 10 3m ²⁶ from the road boundary. 7. Any building shall be setback a minimum of 10m from the internal boundary with any <u>General</u> Rural Zone or 15m in the area identified in Rolleston Industrial Precinct PREC6 as '15m building setback'. ²⁷	...
GIZ-REQ5	Landscaping – Road Boundaries	
GIZ excluding PREC6, PREC7 and PREC8	...	<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: 3. When compliance with any of GIZ-REQ5.1. or GIZ-REQ5.2. is not achieved: DIS <u>RDIS</u>²⁸</p> <p>Matters for discretion: <u>3A. The exercise of discretion in relation to GIZ-REQ5.3 is restricted to the following matters:</u> a. <u>GIZ-MATXa Road Boundary Landscaping</u>²⁹</p>
PREC6	...	<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: 10. When compliance with any of GIZ-REQ5.4., GIZ-REQ5.5., GIZ-REQ5.6., GIZ-REQ5.7., GIZ-REQ5.8., or GIZ-REQ5.9. is not achieved: DIS <u>RDIS</u>³⁰</p> <p>Matters for discretion: <u>10A. The exercise of discretion in relation to GIZ-REQ5.10. is restricted to the following matters:</u></p>

²⁵ DPR-0126.020 Foster²⁶ DPR-0396.022 Woolworths, DPR-0365.028 Stuart PC, DPR-0363.397 IRHL, DPR-0384.475 RIDL and DPR-0374.441 RIHL²⁷ DPR-0374.438 RIHL, DPR-0384.472 RIDL and DPR-0363.394 IRHL²⁸ DPR-0363.396 IRHL, DPR-0384.474 RIDL, RIHL DPR-0374.440, Stuart PC DPR-0365.028 and Woolworths DPR-0396.022²⁹ Clause 10(2)(b) consequential to DPR-0396.022 Woolworths³⁰ DPR-0363.396 IRHL, DPR-0384.474 RIDL, DPR-0374.440 RIHL, DPR-0365.028 Stuart PC and DPR-0396.022 Woolworths

		a. <u>GIZ-MATXa Road Boundary Landscaping³¹</u>
PREC7	...	<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: 12. When compliance with any of GIZ-REQ5.11. is not achieved: NCRDIS³²</p> <p>Matters for discretion: <u>12A. The exercise of discretion in relation to GIZ-REQ5.12. is restricted to the following matters:</u> a. <u>GIZ-MATXa Road Boundary Landscaping³³</u></p>
PREC8	...	<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: 15. When compliance with any of GIZ-REQ5.13. or GIZ-REQ5.14. is not achieved: DISRDIS³⁴</p> <p>Matters for discretion: <u>15A. The exercise of discretion in relation to GIZ-REQ5.15. is restricted to the following matters:</u> a. <u>GIZ-MATXa Road Boundary Landscaping³⁵</u></p>
GIZ	...	<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: 18. When compliance with any of GIZ-REQ5.16. or GIZ-REQ5.17. is not achieved: DISRDIS³⁶</p> <p>Matters for discretion: <u>19. The exercise of discretion in relation to GIZ-REQ5.3, GIZ-REQ5.10, GIZ-REQ5.12, GIZ-REQ-5.15, and GIZ-REQ5.18 is restricted to the following matters:</u> a. <u>GIZ-MATXa Road Boundary Landscaping³⁷</u></p>
GIZ-REQ6	Landscaping – Internal Boundaries	
GIZ excluding PREC6 and PREC7	...	<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: 3. When compliance with any of GIZ-REQ6.1. or GIZ-REQ6.2. is not achieved: DISRDIS³⁸</p>

³¹ Clause 10(2)(b) consequential to DPR-0396.022 Woolworths

³² DPR-0363.396 IRHL, DPR-0384.474 RIDL, DPR-0374.440 RIHL, DPR-0365.028 Stuart PC and DPR-0396.022 Woolworths

³³ Clause 10(2)(b) consequential to DPR-0396.022 Woolworths

³⁴ DPR-0363.396 IRHL, DPR-0384.474 RIDL, DPR-0374.440 RIHL, DPR-0365.028 Stuart PC and DPR-0396.022 Woolworths

³⁵ Clause 10(2)(b) consequential to DPR-0396.022 Woolworths

³⁶ DPR-0363.396 IRHL, DPR-0384.474 RIDL, DPR-0374.440 RIHL, DPR-0365.028 Stuart PC and DPR-0396.022 Woolworths

³⁷ Clause 10(2)(b) consequential to DPR-0396.022 Woolworths

³⁸ DPR-0396.022 and DPR-0396.023 Woolworths

		<p><u>Matters for discretion:</u> <u>3A. The exercise of discretion in relation to GIZ-REQ6.3. is restricted to the following matters:</u> a. <u>GIZ-MATYb Internal Boundary Landscaping³⁹</u></p>
PREC6	...	<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: 6. When compliance with any of GIZ-REQ6.4. or GIZ-REQ6.5. is not achieved: DIS<u>RD</u><u>IS</u>⁴⁰</p> <p><u>Matters for discretion:</u> <u>6A. The exercise of discretion in relation to GIZ-REQ6.6. is restricted to the following matters:</u> a. <u>GIZ-MATYb Internal Boundary Landscaping⁴¹</u></p>
PREC7	...	<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: 8. When compliance with any of GIZ-REQ6.7. is not achieved: DIS<u>RD</u><u>IS</u>⁴²</p> <p><u>Matters for discretion:</u> <u>8A. The exercise of discretion in relation to GIZ-REQ6.8. is restricted to the following matters:</u> a. <u>GIZ-MATYb Internal Boundary Landscaping⁴³</u></p>
GIZ	...	<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: 10. When compliance with any of GIZ-REQ6.9. is not achieved: DIS<u>RD</u><u>IS</u>⁴⁴</p> <p><u>Matters for discretion:</u> <u>10A. The exercise of discretion in relation to GIZ-REQ6.10. is restricted to the following matters:</u> a. <u>GIZ-MATYb Internal Boundary Landscaping⁴⁵</u></p>

³⁹ Clause 10(2)(b) consequential to DPR-0396.022 Woolworths

⁴⁰ DPR-0396.022 and DPR-0396.023 Woolworths

⁴¹ Clause 10(2)(b) consequential to DPR-0396.022 Woolworths

⁴² DPR-0396.022 and DPR-0396.023 Woolworths

⁴³ Clause 10(2)(b) consequential to DPR-0396.022 Woolworths

⁴⁴ DPR-0396.022 and DPR-0396.023 Woolworths

⁴⁵ Clause 10(2)(b) consequential to DPR-0396.022 Woolworths

GIZ-REQ7	Outdoor Storage	
GIZ excluding PREC6	...	<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</p> <p>3. When compliance with any of GIZ-REQ7.1 or GIZ-REQ7.2 is not achieved: RDIS DIS⁴⁶</p> <p>Matters for discretion:</p> <p>4. The exercise of discretion in relation to GIZ-REQ7.8. is restricted to the following matters:</p> <p>a. <u>GIZ-MATc Outdoor Storage</u></p>
GIZ-REQ10	Street Interfaces	
GIZ excluding PREC8	...	<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</p> <p>2. When compliance with any of GIZ-REQ10.1 is not achieved: RDIS DIS⁴⁷</p> <p>Matters for discretion:</p> <p>4. The exercise of discretion in relation to GIZ-REQ10.1 is restricted to the following matters:</p> <p>b. <u>GIZ-MAT7 Street Interfaces</u></p>

GIZ-Matters for Control or Discretion

GIZ-MAT1	Height
	<p>...</p> <p>4. Whether any reverse sensitivity effects impact on important infrastructure are likely to arise where the zone height standard is exceeded by more than 2m.⁴⁸</p>
GIZ-MAT7a	Road boundary landscaping
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>The extent to which reduced landscaping results in adverse effects on amenity and visual streetscape values, especially where the frontage is to an arterial road or collector road that has a gateway function to a township.</u> 2. <u>The extent to which the reduced landscaping is opposite any residential and the effects of any reduction in landscaping on the amenity values and outlook of those zones.</u> 3. <u>The extent to which the visual effects of reduced landscaping are mitigated through the location of ancillary offices, showrooms, the display of trade supplier or yard-based goods for sale, along the site frontage.</u>⁴⁹

⁴⁶ DPR-0396.022 and DPR-0396.023 Woolworths⁴⁷ DPR-0396.022 and DPR-0396.023 Woolworths⁴⁸ DPR-0101.047 Chorus⁴⁹ DPR-0396.026 Woolworths

GIZ-MAT4b	Internal boundary landscaping
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>The extent of visual effects of outdoor storage and car parking areas, or buildings (taking account of their scale and appearance), as a result of reduced landscaping.</u> 2. <u>The extent to which the site is visible from adjoining sites in residential zones, rural zones and the likely consequences of any reduction in landscaping or screening on the amenity and privacy of those sites.</u> 3. <u>The extent to which there are any compensating factors for reduced landscaping or screening, including the nature or scale of planting proposed, the location of parking areas, manoeuvring areas or storage areas, or the location of ancillary offices/wholesale display of goods/showrooms.</u>⁵⁰
GIZ-MATc	Outdoor Storage
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>The extent to which the infringement results in adverse effects on residential amenity and visual streetscape values.</u> 2. <u>The extent to which the infringement results in adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of loading and parking areas.</u> 3. <u>The size and location of storage area relative to the activity it is related to and the way in which the storage area achieves the intent of this standard.</u> 4. <u>Measures to mitigate adverse effects.</u>⁵¹
GIZ-MAT7	Street Interface
GIZ (excluding PREC8)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>The extent to which the infringement results in adverse effects on residential amenity and visual streetscape values.</u> 2. <u>The design and location of the building having regard to the operational and functional requirements of the activity to be accommodated.</u> 3. <u>The extent to which the design of the building achieves the intent of the standard by other means.</u> 4. <u>Measures to mitigate adverse effects.</u>⁵²

GIZ-Schedules

GIZ-SCHED2 – Industrial Precinct ODPs	
PREC6	Rolleston Industrial Precinct ODP
Replace GIZ-PREC 6, to include Lot 504 DP 551164	

⁵⁰ DPR-0396.026 Woolworths⁵¹ DPR-0396.026 Woolworths⁵² DPR-0396.026 Woolworths

Appendix 2: List of Appearances and Tabled Evidence

Hearing Appearances

Sub #	Submitter	Author	Role
DPR-0300	Ara Poutama Aotearoa, Department of Corrections	Maurice Dale Philippa Hurrell	Planner MoE, Senior Planner
Combined DPR-0358 DPR-0363 DPR-0374 DPR-0384	RWRL IRHL RIHL RIDL	Jo Appleyard, Lucy Forrester Jeremy Phillips	Counsel Planner
DPR-0396	Woolworths New Zealand Limited	Joshua Leckie Kay Panther Knight	Counsel Planner
DPR-0453	Midland Port, LPC	Amy Hill Mat Bonis	Counsel Planner

Tabled Evidence

Sub #	Submitter	Author	Role
DPR-0145	Bunnings Limited	Matt Norwell	Planner
DPR-0367	Orion NZ Limited	Melanie Foote	Planner