

## Hearing 25: General Industrial Zones

### Questions from the Hearing Panel

As foreshadowed by paragraph 12 of Minute 1, having read the Section 42A Report and other reports for the General Industrial Zones 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 hearings commencing.

### Sec42A Report

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
10.12	<p><i>MoE<sup>1</sup> seek a change in activity status for educational facilities in the GIZ from NC to RDIS. The focus of the GIZ is to enable industrial activities and I consider educational facilities are well provided for in the district's other zones and that a NC status is appropriate as educational facilities fall outside of the activities provided for in GIZ-P1 and GIZ-P2 ...</i></p> <p>Please clarify where the other zones are and how educational facilities are well provided for?</p>
10.17 Corrections Activities	<p>The officer states:</p> <p><i>The PER status for Community Corrections Activities would be consistent with the approach in CMUZ, however, the NC status, as notified, is consistent with the approach taken in the KNOZ and PORTZ as it was deemed these activities were less appropriate to establish in the General Industrial Zone and other Special Purpose Zones due to the potential for reverse sensitivity effects. I continue to agree with this approach.</i></p> <p>The above statement seems to be at odds with the recommendation, which is to make Corrections Activities permitted and not Non-Complying?</p> <p>The recommendation is to make Corrections Prisons a NCA.</p>
10.24	<p>Can you please explain why intensive primary production activities, mineral extraction and plantation forestry are proposed to be non-complying in an industrial zone, where one would expect significant adverse effects to occur. Why are these deemed to be incompatible activities that may be sensitive to the effects expected in the industrial zone?</p>
11.2	<p>Did CDHB supply a submission to the SDC Trade Waste Bylaw and if so were their requests accepted?</p>
11.3	<p>Specified submitters seek to have non-compliance with GUZ-REQ1 be 'non-notifiable'. The s42A author does not consider a non-notification clause appropriate where the breach in activity status is NC. While this may be an</p>

---

<sup>1</sup> MoE DPR-0378.032

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	acceptable approach in principle, in what circumstances would not meeting GIZ-REQ1 need to be notified?
11.8 – 11.10 Height	Can you please provide a comment on to what extent the height limits in these zones was assessed/evaluated as part of the s32 Evaluation Report, and provide any relevant cross references.
11.19	In relation to GIZ-REQ4, PREC6, the s42A report author considers that “the 10m setback at the zone interface should still be retained, however, <i>internally</i> a reduced setback of 3m would be acceptable as long as the 3m landscaping strip and road width requirements are retained.” The amendments in Appendix 2 have been proposed to the road setback. For clarity, does ‘internally’ refer to the road boundary setback or is it internal to PREC6, or to some other internal boundary?
Appendix 2 GIZ- REQ3	The recommended text seems to duplicate the word “Height”
11.24 – 11.24 Set-backs	Can you please comment on whether the significant reduction in set-backs you are recommending will require a s32AA evaluation and if so can you please provide a very brief summary of the relevant considerations for the Panel under that section.
11.30 Landscaping	<p>Is there an error in this para where you state:</p> <p><i>RIDL, RIHL and IRHL<sup>2</sup> also sought that GIZ-REQ5 be amended to include a non-notification requirement, however, given the proposal to amend the activity status <b>from RDIS to DIS</b> I think that retention of the ability to notify such an application if deemed necessary is appropriate. I recommend these submission points be rejected.</i></p> <p>The recommendation is to change the activity status from DIS to RDIS is it not, and if so then would full notification still be appropriate?</p>
11.36	<p>Specified submitters seek a change in activity status from DIS to RDIS where the rule requirement for outdoor storage is breached. The s42A report states that “given the wide variety of items that could potentially be stored, especially given this is an industrial zone, I consider that the DIS status is appropriate.”</p> <p>Noting the wide variety of stored items, what are the likely effects from a breach of this rule? Are they limited to visual amenity matters or do they include other matters such as traffic, commercial distribution, etc? If limited to visual amenity matters, why could this not be covered by an RDIS status?</p>
11.37 Outdoor storage	Whilst it might be true that there is no upper limit for the breach of outdoor storage that might occur, how might full public notification assist in the

<sup>2</sup> IRHL DPR-0363.398, RIDL DPR-0384.476 and RIHL DPR-0374.442

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	assessment of such a breach as would it not be the case that the effects are experienced only by adjacent neighbours?
12.48	Depending on the reply to the question referred to in paragraph 11.3 above, and CDHB did not submit to SDC's Trade Waste Bylaw and notwithstanding the role of the regional council, how confident are you that the bylaw can robustly assess a trade waste discharge and council's reticulated system's ability to deal with trade waste, when viewed through the lens of human health?