

# Proposed Selwyn District Plan



## Right of Reply Report

Residential

Jocelyn Lewes

2 December 2022

## 1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to respond to matters raised in submitter evidence following the publication of the s42A report, or in response to questions posed to submitters at Hearing 22.
- 1.2 Amendments to recommendations to accept, accept in part, or reject submission points are shown in a consolidated manner in **Appendix 1**. Recommended amendments to Plan provisions are shown in a consolidated manner in **Appendix 2**.

## 2. KiwiRail

- 2.1 Ms Grinlinton-Hancock<sup>1</sup> provided written evidence in support of the submission by KiwiRail, seeking amendments to SETZ-REQ5 and SETZ-REQ7 for greater setbacks from boundaries where these adjoin an operational railway corridor, on the basis that there are several sites within Waddington where SETZ land immediately adjoins the KiwiRail designation. Upon review of Council's GIS system, I concur with the submitter.

### ***Proposed amendments:***

- 2.2 I recommend that SETZ-REQ5 and SETZ-REQ7 be amended, consistent with the recommendations made in the s42A report in relation to LRZ-REQ5 and LRZ-REQ7, as shown in **Appendix 2**.

### ***Submission scope:***

- 2.3 Scope is provided for this proposed amendment through KiwiRail's submission points DPR-0458.052 and 066.

### ***Reasoning:***

- 2.4 The amendments seek to allow access and maintenance to occur without the landowner or occupier needing to gain access to the rail corridor, potentially compromising their own safety.

## 3. House Movers Section of the New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc

- 3.1 Mr Bhana-Thomson<sup>2</sup> presented evidence seeking the inclusion of performance standards for relocated buildings, as well as the retention of the definition of relocated buildings.
- 3.2 While I do not propose any amendments to the recommendations in the s42A report, I note, for the Panel's benefit and for consistency within the PDP, that GRUZ-R7, as amended in the GRUZ s42A report, manages relocated buildings, to be used as a residential unit, subject to performance standards. As such, it is necessary to retain the definition of relocated building.

## 4. Hughes Development Limited

- 4.1 Ms Burnett<sup>3</sup> presented evidence in support of the submission by Hughes that SUB-R9 be amended from 400m<sup>2</sup> to 351m<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Evidence of Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock on behalf of DPR-0458 KiwiRail

<sup>2</sup> Evidence of Jonathan Bhana-Thomson on behalf of DPR-0296 NZHHA

<sup>3</sup> Evidence of Alice Burnett on behalf of DPR-0409 Hughes

4.2 While I maintain the recommendation in the s42A report to retain SUB-R9 as notified, should the Panel be of a mind to accept the submitter's submission point, I would recommend that:

a. SUB-R9.1. be amended as follows:

Where:

a. The net site area of each small site development site created shall be ~~a minimum of 400m<sup>2</sup>~~ greater than 350m<sup>2</sup>; and

b. The net site area of each small site development site created shall be ~~a maximum of 499m<sup>2</sup>~~ less than 500m<sup>2</sup>; and ...

b. the definition of *small site* development be amended as follows:

Small site development means smaller residential units built on sites that are ~~a minimum of 400m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum of 499m<sup>2</sup>~~ between 350m<sup>2</sup> and 500m<sup>2</sup> inclusive.

4.3 Scope for the above amendments is provided through Hughes Development Limited's submission points DPR-0409.005 and 006, respectively.

## 5. Ryman Health Care and Retirement Villages Association

5.1 Mr Turner<sup>4</sup> presented evidence in support of the submission by Ryman and RVA, seeking amendments to RESZ-O5, RESZ-O3 (if the Panel considers that a new standalone objective is not warranted), RESZ-P1, RESZ-P2, RESZ-P3, a new standalone RESZ policy, an alternative assessment matter for retirement villages and the inclusion of non-notification statements.

5.2 At the request of the Panel, Mr Turner also provided examples from the Christchurch District Plan, which provides for specific recognition of housing needs of different/changing demographics in the community. I consider that RESZ-O1, RESZ-O3, and RESZ-P1, provide sufficient recognition of the housing needs of different demographics in the community.

5.3 I retain my recommendations as set out in the s42A report and do not recommend any changes to provisions arising from the evidence of Mr Turner.

## 6. Kāinga Ora

6.1 Mr Jeffries<sup>5</sup> presented evidence in support of the submission by Kāinga Ora, seeking amendments to various objectives, policies, rules and rule requirements as set out in Appendix 1 of his evidence.

6.2 Having regard to the s42A report, and the Joint Officer's response to the Hearing Panel's Questions, I do not recommend any changes to provisions arising from the evidence of Mr Jeffries.

<sup>4</sup> Evidence of Richard Turner on behalf of DPR-0424 RVA and DPR-0425 Ryman

<sup>5</sup> Evidence of Joe Jeffries on behalf of DPR-0414 Kāinga Ora