

DIRECTIONS OF THE HEARINGS PANEL

PC21

MINUTE 4

- [1] The Panel members have read the Section 42A Report: Plan Change 21 – Implementation of the Spatial Plans dated 17 February 2023.
- [2] We have a number of questions for the authors of that Report that are attached to this Minute.
- [3] We would appreciate written answers being provided to those questions on or before Friday 10 March 2023 to enable us to consider the authors' responses prior to the hearing scheduled to now commence on 22 March 2023.
- [4] We would appreciate it if the authors' written response repeats each question and provides the answer immediately below the question.
- [5] We direct that:
 - a) this Minute and the authors' written answers are posted on Council's Plan Change 21 webpage; and
 - b) the Hearings Administrator alerts submitters on Plan Change 21 to the posting of both the Minute and the written answers.
- [6] The Panel may of course have further questions for the Section 42A Report authors that will be posed verbally at the hearing.



Rob van Voorthuysen

Independent Commissioner – Chair - on behalf of the DPR Hearings Panel members

1 March 2023

Paragraph	Panel Questions
31	With reference to Submission 84, when will the Council give effect to the NPS implementation timeframe requirements for definitions for those District Plan chapters not being reviewed across the proposed three stages?
65	<p>Paragraph 65 says "...allowing minor units to be multi storey will have no impact on the outcomes and amenity values sought in the LRZ, with one and two story detached residential units being the predominant building type anticipated in the zone".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would you consider it appropriate to limit a two-story minor unit to sites where the principal residential unit is also two story?
92	<p>You state that <i>"the way in which "avoid" is used in the policy is not to avoid particular land use activities full stop, but rather to avoid unless the listed criteria are met"</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In your review of other district plans, and in your understanding of case law, is it typical for the word "avoid" to be used in this way?
118 -121	<p>Boffa Miskell's advice was that building up rather than out would provide an increased opportunity for onsite open space/amenity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is this a factor you considered when arriving at the view that a reduction to the maximum height limit is appropriate?
130	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If the Hearing Panel decided to include the height in relation to boundary requirement within MRZ-S3, what level of detail would be appropriate to be included within that provision? ▪ If the height in relation to boundary requirement was included within MRZ-S3, would that provision then be inconsistent with other provisions that reference APP1?
137	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would 'structure' include such things as a boundary fence, a private footpath, a freestanding letterbox or a clothesline? ▪ If yes, should these require resource consent to locate within 2m of the road or an internal boundary?
149	<p>TL&GL seek amendments to MRZ-S9 to require all fencing to be visually permeable; not just 1.2m fencing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would that suggestion be consistent with the MRZ Design Guide?
153	Should the phrase "visually permeable" be defined in the Definition section, or is it capable of consistent interpretation based on a common understanding of the phrase?
183	Please can you explain why you do not consider it to be necessary to limit the scale of showrooms?
230	What were the resource management issues identified from permitting visitor accommodation in the residential zones?
232	Which sub-clause(s) of MRZ-P2 do you consider would enable residential visitor accommodation to be provided?
277	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the Mackenzie District Council Solid Waste Bylaw 2021 come up as a relevant matter in PIMs? ▪ If not, how would a developer be aware of these requirements?
328	<p>You refer to MUZ-R6.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should this be MUZ-R5.2?

Paragraph	Panel Questions
336 337	<p>Paragraph 336 says that "...control is applied to buildings and structures within 30m of a residential zone boundary, rather than 50m." However, GIZ R1.1 refers to " at least 50m from the boundary ..".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is GIZ R1.1 correct?
	Should MUZ-R6 matter of discretion R6.3(c) refer to the TCZ?