

PC80

Questions arising from the s42A Report

Having read the Section 42A Report, the Hearing Panel has questions that they would appreciate being answered by the Section 42A Report author in writing either prior to, or at the commencement of, the hearing.

This is in the interests of running an efficient hearing.

Please note this list of questions is not exhaustive. The Panel members may well ask the Section 42A Report author, and Council's expert advisers, additional questions during the course of the hearing.

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question	Councils Response (7/11/24)
2.3.2.1 (page 11) Submission point 1823.04: (NPHS – Te Whatu Ora)	<p>The Planning Maps included in your report on pages 27 and 28 do not appear to show an indicative walkway extending as a pedestrian crossing across Whakarewa Street.</p> <p>Does the Plan and/or PC80 as notified contain appropriate matters for assessment so that when considering a resource consent/subdivision proposal on this land it will be readily apparent that the installation of a pedestrian crossing will likely be required at Whakarewa Street from the plan change area to Motueka High School?</p>	<p>This is correct, the PC80 notified maps (s42A Appendix 1) do not include an indicative crossing across Whakarewa Street.</p> <p>Historically, indicative roads, walkways and reserves have only been used on private land, and not on public land (legal roads etc). Planning for road, reserves and open space has been left to the relevant teams in Council.</p> <p>No, the plan change does not contain matters of assessment that indicate that the installation of a pedestrian crossing is likely to be required. PC80 as notified requires under 6.9.20.4 that an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) be undertaken at the resource consent stage. The ITA is expected to determine the need for traffic measures such as crossings and appropriate locations. I consider that this is appropriate because it will need to be determined at the time of development the extent to which the development triggers the need for a crossing. I do not consider the process of rezoning the land to be the correct time to determine detailed interventions such as a pedestrian crossing.</p>
2.3.2.1 (Page 11) Submission Point 3642.03 (Wakatu Incorporation)	<p>You state that: <i>“The PC80 area is the subject of IAF funding which has provided some financial support towards transport and other infrastructure upgrades. This funding was limited, with some funding been allocated to intersection improvements at Manoy and Whakarewa Streets.”</i></p>	<p>Yes, as part of the IAF application process there was a high-level assessment of requirements on Whakarewa Street at the intersection with Manoy Street and the proposed entrance to the Plan Change site. The assessment determined the requirement</p>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question	Councils Response (7/11/24)
	<p>Has there been any assessment, as part of the IAF, of what other roading works/improvements, that might be required to facilitate development of this land?</p> <p>Can the Panel be assured that if the site is rezoned as proposed there will be funding available to make any further roading upgrades that may be required?</p> <p>Is it appropriate to leave the assessment of wider transportation effects till the resource consent stage, i.e. to leave it for an ITA at a later date?</p>	<p>for a roundabout at the Manoy Street/ Whakarewa Street Intersection.</p> <p>There currently is no funding in Council's 10-year plan for additional roading works/improvements other than those already commissioned for the project through the IAF such as the proposed roundabout at the Manoy Street/ Whakarewa Street Intersection. However, if confirmed as a requirement by the ITA, due to its relative low cost, Council may be able to fund the installation of a safe crossing point at a suitable location in Whakarewa Street, linking to walking/cycling corridors in the PC80 site.</p> <p>It is very unlikely that the full transportation impacts of development from the plan change area will be realised immediately as the development of houses (as outlined in the Infrastructure Acceleration Fund Agreement) is scheduled to be staged from 2024 to 2029. There may be a limited opportunity to include funding for any identified upgrades in Council's 2027-37 Long Term Plan.</p> <p>In previous plan changes undertaken by Council it has been left to the resource consent stage to undertake an ITA. In some cases, the land is deferred until transport upgrades as informed by an ITA are undertaken.</p>

<p>Submission Points 2.3.2.1 (page 12)</p> <p>4215.01, 4215.02 and 4215.03 (Kainga Ora Homes and Communities)</p>	<p>Has the modelling on the storm water considered what extra infrastructure would be required if a large area of land was included in plan change</p> <p>Aside from your reasons for rejecting these submissions, is it not the case that the requests to zone additional land, i.e. beyond that which was included in the notified PC80, is outside of the scope of the Panel to consider now as part of our deliberations on PC80 (including for natural justice issues).</p>	<p>The stormwater modelling for the development has considered flow within the development area but has not considered extra infrastructure for a large additional area, which we consider outside the scope of PC80. Council's long-term plan includes some budget (\$17.8m) beyond 10 years (2034-44) for the stormwater corridor to the west and south of the PC80 development area. The installation of this future greenway/stormwater corridor may relieve some capacity in the current stormwater</p>
---	--	--

	<p>Would requests for additional land to be zoned need to be considered through a separate process?</p>	<p>pipeline that caters for the PC80 development and may provide additional capacity for a small number of additional properties bordering the PC80 development area.</p> <p>On reflection, in addition to the rejection of submission points 4215.01, 4215.02 and 4215.03 for servicing and inundation, extending the proposed compact density residential zone would include additional properties not owned by the submitter and it would result in a significant number of landowners who would not have a real opportunity for participation as potentially affected landowners.</p> <p>As such, I request an amendment to the s42A Report to reject Submission Points 4215.01, 4215.02 and 4215.03 on the basis that they are out of scope.</p>
<p>2.5.1.2 (page 19) Submitter 3642: Wakatu Incorporation</p>	<p>What is the current status of the resource consent application for this land, and what weight should the Panel place on any consents that may have been granted when considering the zoning of the land?</p> <p>Please clarify what is meant by a ‘superlot’ stage, and explain Figure 4 showing the subdivision.</p>	<p>To date, subdivision application RM230553 to create 12 new residential leasehold ‘superlots’ has not been granted. It is currently on hold under s92 due to outstanding issues.</p> <p>The following additional consents are bundled with application RM230553 and are also on hold under s92;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use Consent RM230555 for reduced setback requirements to Rural 1 Zone. • Land Disturbance Consent RM230556 to undertake bulk earthworks associated with subdivision RM230553. • Stormwater Consent RM230557 discharge consent for stormwater which will enter the internal drainage network and detention basins temporarily and not discharge to council network in relation to subdivision RM230553. <p>Wakatu Incorporation in Submission Point 3642 refer to the ‘superlot stage’. The</p>

		<p>reference in the s42a Report attempts to align with this wording.</p> <p>The inclusion of Figure 4 which provides an illustration of the superlot subdivision consent application plan (RM230553) is to provide additional clarity to the submission points which references the superlot subdivision application (RM230553). The landowners superlot subdivision consent application plan shows the creation of 12 new residential 'superlots'.</p>
--	--	---

<p>2.5.2 (page 20)</p> <p>Submission Point 1823.09 (NPHS – Te Whatu Ora)</p>	<p>You note that:</p> <p><i>“Subdivisions are assessed under Schedule 16.3A and if an area is subject to a natural hazard then a geotechnical assessment would be required which would consider liquefaction hazard. The submitter’s point is addressed through this TRMP requirement and it is therefore considered that the submission point should be rejected.”</i></p> <p>Nevertheless, has any prior assessment of natural hazards/liquefaction already been undertaken to be able to satisfy the Panel that the land is suitable for rezoning as proposed?</p>	<p>The PC80 land is currently Rural 1 deferred residential for servicing and is earmarked in the 2022-2052 Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy (FDS) for intensification. A high level natural hazard assessment was undertaken as part of the FDS process.</p> <p>The Proposed PC80 Section 32 Evaluation Report includes an assessment of the natural hazard risks including flooding, coastal inundation and seismic risk.</p> <p>In this report Councils Senior Resource Scientist – Hazards, Glenn Stevens notes that Council’s current liquefaction mapping shows the PC80 site and its wider vicinity as an area where seismic liquefaction is considered possible.</p> <p>Mr Steven advises that this is based on the underlying strata comprising of unconsolidated and geologically recent sediments. At the PC80 site these sediment are expected to be predominantly river gravels and not subject to liquefaction hazard. The presence of “pockets” of fine-grained sediments (sands and silts) in places, such as an old infilled river channel or a buried sandbar, cannot be ruled out. Where such unconsolidated fine grained sediments are present and associated with high groundwater levels (i.e. the sediments are saturated) they could present a localised liquefaction hazard.</p> <p>Any such pockets of fine grained sediments are not expected to be widespread across the PC80 site and will be able to be managed through appropriate engineering solutions. A detailed geotechnical assessment at the resource consent stage would be required to determine the actual ground conditions present. Any resource consent application would then need to account for any such fine grained sediments, if present, and outline the mitigation measures (such as engineering solutions) to be adopted.</p>
<p>2.6.2 (page 23)</p>	<p>Whilst indicative roads are signalled on the planning maps and the final alignment</p>	<p>The resource consent application is on hold under s92 due to outstanding issues. The</p>

<p>Submission Point 3642.01 and Submission Point 3642.02 (Wakatu Incorporation)</p>	<p>typically become a matter discussed by Council and the developer during subdivision consenting, if the resource consent application has been sufficiently advanced/approved would it not now be appropriate to amend the indicative roads/reserves to reflect that approval?</p>	<p>location of the indicative roads and reserves were notified following discussions with the landowner and a review of their concept masterplan. Since notifying PC80 the landowner has amended their masterplan and sought consent. This consent has not been granted and further changes to the roading and reserve layout may result prior to a consent being approved. Retaining the indicative roads and reserves as notified does not prevent the landowner from adjusting the location of reserves and roads as they are 'indicative' only which means there is some flexibility in the final location. The final location is determined at the subdivision stage of a resource consent application.</p>
--	---	--