

## Hearing 1 – Strategic Directions

### Questions from the Hearing Panel

As foreshadowed by paragraph 12 of Minute 1, having read the Section 42A Report for the Strategic Directions hearing, the Hearing Panel members have a number of questions that they would appreciate being answered by the Section 42A Report author(s) in writing prior to the hearing commencing.

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
9.4.1	<p>A number of submissions say that climate change is the biggest issue facing us and the Plan lacks provisions to effectively address climate change effects. At 9.4.1 the author states - <i>a strategic objective is meant to be broad, not highlight narrow specific environmental issues or factors as highlighted in the submission...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given that climate change is a global issue with very wide-reaching consequences, can the author please further explain why it is too narrow an issue to be addressed by a district plan strategic objective?</li> </ul>
9.4.2	<p>At paragraph 9.4.2 the author states - <i>It is not the place of the Plan to address climate change, only the effects of climate change.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In light of the concept ‘ki uta ki tai’ embodied in SD-DI-03 and what it means in a general sense (ie everything is inter-related and connected) can the author please further explain why the Plan is limited to dealing with the effects of climate change and not climate change itself?</li> </ul>
13.6.2	<p>Minimise versus avoid, remedy and mitigate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has consideration been made to defining the term minimise, (including minimises, minimisation) in order to provide for greater clarity and to avoid potential confusion as was outlined by the submission of Transpower?</li> </ul>
14.3	<p>Where in the Plan would one find the criteria that is used to determine what is “reasonable” in relation to the phrase .... <i>no reasonable alternative</i>” used in SD-IR-03.</p>
15.3 & others	<p>The recommendation here (and reasons) is specific to the original submissions, and not the further submissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can the author please confirm that as a general approach the Further Submissions are recommended for acceptance or rejection in accordance with your recommendations on the primary submissions to which they relate?</li> </ul>
15.3	<p>It is noted that the two original submissions on SD-MWV-O1 (Partnership with Ngāi Tahu) are in support. Your recommendation is to accept those submissions, but the only reason provided is that <i>“no amendments have been recommended to the objective, so given this it is recommended that these submissions points be accepted”</i>. However, there are several further submissions in opposition which we will also need to consider in our deliberations.</p>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can the author please provide a brief summary of the issues raised by the further submitters, and your recommendations with respect to the specific matters raised in those further submissions?</li> </ul>
18.4	<p>CDHB seek that SD-UDF-03 is amended to include a reference to “... <i>environments that protect or improve prospects for long-term health and wellbeing.</i>” At paragraph 18.4 the author recommends rejecting that relief, for reasons that include reference to SF-UDF-01 which is primarily about urban land forms and features.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can the author please explain why the use of the words ‘sustainable’ and ‘community needs’ in an urban growth context would put health outcomes at the forefront of the reader’s mind?</li> <li>Can the author please explain why the reasoning in paragraph 7.4, in particular the reference to the NPS-UD, does not lead to a recommendation to accept the relief sought by CDHB for SD-UDF-03?</li> </ul>
19.3	<p>While it appears correct that Objective GRUZ-01 addresses the matters of concern to the submitters who seek a new Rurally Based Strategic Objective, would referring to rural primary production activities somewhere in the existing Strategic Objectives, for example in SD-DI suite of objectives, enhance the Plan’s clarity and certainty?</p>
SD-IR-Objectives	<p>Effects of Important Infrastructure. At a strategic objective level how does the Plan recognise and provide for infrastructure (e.g. local roads) that are not included in the definition of important infrastructure?</p>