

## 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
2.3.2.1 (page 11)  <b>Submission point 1823.04:</b> (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>
2.3.2.1 (Page 11)  <b>Submission Point 3642.03</b> (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>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>
<b>Submission Points 2.3.2.1</b> (page 12)  <b>4215.01, 4215.02 and 4215.03</b> (Kainga Ora Homes and Communities)	<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>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	Would requests for additional land to be zoned need to be considered through a separate process?
2.5.1.2 (page 19) <b>Submitter 3642: Wakatu Incorporation</b>	<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>
2.5.2 (page 20)  <b>Submission Point 1823.09 (NPHS – Te Whatu Ora)</b>	<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>
2.6.2 (page 23)  <b>Submission Point 3642.01 and Submission Point 3642.02 (Wakatu Incorporation)</b>	<p>Whilst indicative roads are signalled on the planning maps and the final alignment 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>