

Hearing 26: Special Purpose Zones – Port, Knowledge and Dairy Processing

Questions from the Hearing Panel

As foreshadowed by paragraph 12 of Minute 1, having read the Section 42A Report and other reports for the above 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
KNOZ Definitions – Tertiary Education 8.5	You correctly refer to examples of other ancillary activities based at Lincoln University, but do you consider the amended definition of Tertiary Education to include <i>“ancillary use of facilities by persons not associated with a tertiary education or research activity”</i> might not be a bit too open-ended? Could that potentially open the door for a range of other activities that have no real need to be located there?
8.5	With regard to amending the definition of Tertiary Education, was there an educational reason for the high performance cricket playing and training facility to be located at Lincoln campus?
8.10	As above, if the definition of tertiary education is to be broadened this would appear to widen the range of anticipated uses in the Zone?
8.20	The table summary of the decision requested by Lincoln University to KNOZ-R8 appears to have too many words ‘struck through’ (i.e the first “education or research activity”). Is the decision requested set out accurately?
8.24	Has the potential effect of totally unlimited use of hostels by other than student accommodation been adequately examined? And if we accept the rule amendment what then is the purpose of having the rule at all, i.e. what does the rule achieve?
8.37	Chorus requests a matter of control to consider reverse sensitivity effects on their important infrastructure where the height standard will be exceeded by greater than 2m to ensure buildings don’t block transmission or being exposed to excessive radiofrequency which may cause existing local wireless facilities to be relocated. Kainga ora (legal sub 5.6 CMUZ) do not support the request because they assert, no evidence has been produced. What evidence did the s42A author base their recommendation on, to accept Chorus’s submission point? Would it be more onerous to redesign or relocate existing wireless facilities, than imposing the recommended matter of control (ie) exceeding the height standard by greater than 2m?

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
9.24	<p>The s42A report states that “LPC seek a change in the activity status of PORTZ-R5 from CON to NC for ‘noise sensitive activities’. The submitter considers that noise sensitive activities, such as custodial dwellings, should be precluded within the 55 dBA LAeq Noise Control Overlay.”</p> <p>However, the decision requested in the summary table appears to apply across the whole zone, not just within the 55 dBA noise control boundary. Does the decision requested not fully align with the LPC submission? Alternatively, could the s42A author please comment on this broader request.</p>