

Hearing 22: Residential Zones

Questions from the Hearing Panel

Para	Questions
8.9	<p>In her Public Access, Subdivision and Development Areas Section 42A Report Ms Carruthers recommended accepting Kainga Ora’s submission to amend SUB-01 to refer to “planned form”. You have recommended the opposite for RESZ-01 (and numerous other provisions).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can you and Ms Carruthers please advise us of the basis for that inconsistency and whether or not either one of you wishes to amend your recommendations.
8.46	<p>RESZ-06 and RESZ-07 arguably provide conflicting guidance for decision-makers given that RESZ-07 appears to list “non-residential activities”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In response to the submission of Kainga Ora can you please provide wording for our consideration for an Objective that coherently combines RESZ-06 and RESZ-07.
8.59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RESZ-03 is not amended? Can you please advise which RESZ objectives would explicitly enable a decision-maker to favourably consider allowing a retirement village in a residential zone? Can you please advise which if any of the four RES zones are to be preferred for the development of a retirement village?
8.77	Can you please explain how your conclusion regarding amenity gives effect to NPS-UD Policy 6(b)?
8.103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can you please advise which aspects of amenity are to be considered by decision-makers over and above the matters of privacy, outlook and access to sunlight? Is there any particular reason why RESZ-P7 refers to amenity but the similar RESZ-P9.2 does not?
8.179	Please clarify why, when you've added nine new matters of discretion to RESZ-MAT1, that doesn't require a s32AA evaluation?
8.184	Can you explain what is meant by the term “receiving environment” in RESZ-MAT2 (and other provisions) and how that differs from the term you recommend for RESZ-MAT1 namely “... the scale and character of development anticipated <u>within the zone</u> for the surrounding area and relevant significant natural, heritage, and cultural features.”
8.213	Can you explain why you use the term “shading” in RESZ-MAT6.2 whereas other provisions use the term “access to sunlight and daylight” (for example RESZ-P3.2).
8.214	Is the intent of your recommended RESZ-MAT6.6 to <u>avoid</u> buildings, balconies, or decks being constructed above, on, or over the railway corridor?
8.258	Submitters comments to RESZ-MAT13 at paragraphs 8.254, 8.245, 8.246 infer that it’s not critical for a residential retirement village to be located near a town centre or to community facilities. The Section 42A Report refers to the reasons given in relation to RESZ-12 in response to

	<p>these submissions. Under the analysis of submissions on RESZ-P12 you say (at paragraph 8.138) “.... <i>consideration should be given to the proximity of services, given the possible challenges to mobility that likely residents may face</i>”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To assist our consideration of submissions on RESZ-MAT13, can you please further explain why retirement villages need to be located close to a town centre or community facilities?
8.268	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can you explain how the design of a retirement village can “provide engagement with” the RES-MAT14i.1.a, c, d and e matters? ▪ In RES-MAT14i.2 you use the term “appropriate on-site amenity”. Where would a decision-maker look to determine what “appropriate” means in this context? ▪ In RES-MAT14i.3 are the words “ <u>as required to achieve a safe, secure environment</u>” a necessary qualifier to the incorporation of CPTED principles?
9.175	<p>LLRZ REQ7 and related REQ in other zones i.e., LRZ REQ10. In terms of landscaping and the requirement for a specimen tree what particularly distinguishes supported residential accommodation and visitor accommodation activities from other anticipated development in residential zones?</p>
10.277	<p>Submission DPR-0409-028 on LRZ-REQ14 considers “ that design outcomes can be frustrated by the subjective nature of this provision... “.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can you please reconcile the conflict between LRZ-REQ14.1.b with your paragraph 10.279 where you say “ <i>While certain level of conformity in these larger scale residential developments is anticipated, I consider that variation in appearance assists in the internal legibility ... allowing for ‘individual houses to be distinguished from one another’...</i>”. ▪ To assist our consideration of DPR-0409-028, can you please draft some alternative wording for LRZ-REQ14.1.b that could enable variations in individual designs (reflecting people’s diverse tastes) to be met alongside the conformity needs of the larger scale residential developments described in paragraph 10.279
11.288	<p>Has your recommendation to amend to RDIS been incorporated in Appendix 2?</p>
13.15	<p>You have recommended amendments to SUB-R10 that differ from those recommended by Ms Carruthers in her Section 42A Report for the Public Access, Subdivision and Development Areas chapters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can you and Ms Carruthers please liaise and advise us of the basis for that inconsistency and whether or not either one of you wishes to amend your recommendations.
	<p>Can you and Ms Carruthers please advise liaise and determine if there are any other areas of inconsistency with your respective H14 and H22 recommendations and if there are, can you please identify these for us and advise whether or not either one of you wishes to amend your recommendations</p>