

Hearing 3 – Urban Growth

Questions from the Hearing Panel

As foreshadowed by paragraph 12 of Minute 1, having read the Section 42A Report for the Urban Growth 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 |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 7.25 | Where might we find the amended definition of “Housing Bottom Lines” as it does not appear to be included in Appendix 2? |
| 9.7 | <p>The NPS-UD requires short-term and medium-term land to be plan enabled or arguably zoned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the use of an overlay for medium term growth needs give effect to the NPS-UD? ▪ Can you please clarify the use of zoning versus overlays in Section 9? |
| 10.10 | Would it be clearer if the recommended words “outside of the areas identified” were replaced with the words “outside of the Urban Growth Overlay”? |
| 10.14 | <p>Would it be clearer if in response to these submissions the wording in the last paragraph was to read:</p> <p>“The General Rural Zone activity-based rules <u>continue to</u> apply ...”?</p> |
| 11.15 | <p>For UG-01(2) the author has recommended to accept the submission by Kainga Ora to include the words ‘Achieve the built form’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To avoid ambiguity does the author consider that a definition for ‘built form’ might be useful? |
| 12.5, 13.5 & 33.4 | <p>Kainga Ora has recommended that almost all of the Objectives and Policies be moved to Strategic Directions (an exception seems to be Objective 1, and some of the rules are requested to be moved to a Future Urban Zone). Your Report notes that: <i>“The move to Strategic Directions is discussed in Section 20 of the Strategic Directions s42A report”</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As the reporting officer for Urban Growth can you comment on the impact such a transfer of the majority of the policy provisions, as requested by this submitter, will have on the integrity of the Urban Growth Chapter? ▪ If we were to accept that some or all of those provisions should be transferred to Strategic Directions, would it still be necessary to retain (duplicate those provisions) in both chapters to retain the integrity of the Urban Growth chapter in its own right? ▪ If yes, would the Urban Growth chapter then be redundant? ▪ If yes, what would be your recommendation on that? |
| 13.6 | CCC requests the inclusion in UG-02 of relevant recommendations from the Social and Affordable Housing Action Plan of the Greater Christchurch Partnership. The author rejects this request stating “...as this report is currently in development and |

| Paragraph or Plan reference | Question |
|-----------------------------|--|
| | <p><i>has not been approved by the Greater Christchurch Partnership, the report should not be considered as part of this process.</i>" Part of the definition for 'development plan' references Future Development Areas which we understand has been initiated by the Greater Christchurch Partnership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How does the Future Development Areas initiative relate to the Social and Affordable Housing Action Plan? ▪ Does the author have an estimated time for when the Social and Affordable Housing Action Plan will be approved by the Greater Christchurch Partnership? ▪ Should the Social and Affordable Housing Action Plan be given the green light by Selwyn District Council, and assuming that the District Plan will need to be changed to implement it, how soon after the green light is given would a plan change be initiated (ie) would it have to wait until another 10 years has passed? |
| 20.8 | <p>The "effective engagement with infrastructure providers" is not covered in UG-P 12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is it covered elsewhere or is it recommended that the wording sought be rejected? |
| 22.8 | <p>With regard to recommended new UG-P9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the subjective phrase "to the extent reasonably possible" open to a range of possible interpretations and if so, is it appropriate to use in a policy? ▪ What is intended by the use of the phrase "and adjoining rural land"? ▪ Would the phrase "and adjoining rural land" be open to an interpretation that it effectively includes all Class 3 to 8 land in the District? ▪ What is the phrase "adjoining rural land for rural production" intended to mean? ▪ How would readers of the recommended new policy determine what "inappropriate" means in the phrase "inappropriate urban subdivision"? ▪ Is the phrase "urban subdivision" overly narrow and would the phrase "urban growth" be more encompassing of the intent of the UG chapter? |
| 23.8 | <p>In UG-P10 (3) at a practical level on flat land how will rural outlook be preserved in all cases?</p> <p>With preserve being a strong term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should the term outlook be defined? ▪ Should amenity values either be replaced or added to outlook? |
| 24.8 | <p>In the stem of UG-P11 the use of 'avoid' in terms of adverse effects including reverse sensitivity effects is a strong and directive approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has consideration been made of adding the words 'significant' prior to adverse effects? |
| 24.10 | <p>In UG-P11(1) would it be clear to readers of the Plan that the word "anticipated" is intended to mean what is permitted on a site insofar as that is dictated by the full range of permitted activities contained in the Plan?</p> |

| Paragraph or Plan reference | Question |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 25.9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In UG-P12(3) is the recommended phrase “through zoning land” intended mean ‘by zoning land’ (namely a process) or is it intended to mean providing connectivity within and between the listed zones? ▪ If the latter, would the following wording be clearer: “... connectivity <u>within and</u> between the land <u>to be zoned</u> and adjoining ..” |
| 25.9 | <p>In UG-P12 would it be clearer if clause 2 was to read:</p> <p>“Avoiding adverse effects on the ground<u>water</u> and surface <u>water</u> resource ...”</p> |
| 26.14 | With regard to the recommended addition to UG-13(4), would it be clear to readers what the phrase “demonstrated constraints” means? |
| 26.14 | <p>Would it be clearer if the recommended addition to UG-13 clause 4 was to read (amendments in grey wash):</p> <p>The A minimum net densities density of 12 15 hh/ha for residential activities is met, unless there are demonstrated constraints then in which case a minimum net density of no less than 12 hh/ha is met, or 1 to 2hh/ha for rural residential activities a minimum net density of 1 to 2hh/ha are is met</p> |
| 26.25 | <p>For UG-P13 the author explains how increasing the density to 15hh/ha “... <i>potentially leads to increased typologies being developed at different prices to meet the demographic need of the district.</i>”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Could one of the typologies accommodate the social and affordable housing demographic? |
| 33.8 | In UG-SCHED1 which elements of clause 2.c.(i), (ii) and(iii) are the recommended words “when required to” intended to apply to? |