



OFFICER'S HEARING INTRODUCTION

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Subdivision

Reporting Officer: Connie Mills

Hearing Date: 2 December 2024

Introduction

1. My name is Connie Mills, and I am employed as the Strategic Planning Lead within Napier City Council's City Development team. My qualifications include a Bachelor of Science (Geography and Psychology) and a Master in Planning.
2. I have seven years of experience working as a resource management planner, with this work including various resource management positions within local government, central government agencies as well as for private firms. I have been involved in the review of the Proposed District Plan (PDP) since March of 2024.
3. I was not involved in the drafting of the Subdivision chapter within the PDP but I have prepared the Section 42A Report for these chapters.

Overview of Subdivision

4. There were 244 submissions points and 122 further submissions received in relation to the subdivision chapter.
5. I note that the provisions of the Subdivision Chapter are unique in that they relate to a number of zone specific and district wide matters. For ease and clarity, the assessments undertaken in the report were organised into related sections based on the zone/district wide matter or theme to which they relate, as set out below:
 - a. Definitions
 - b. General Matters
 - c. Network Utilities
 - d. Urban Subdivision
 - e. Rural Subdivision
 - f. Subdivision involving historic and biodiverse values.

Pre-Hearing Meetings

6. No formal pre-hearing meetings with submitters were held in relation to submissions on this chapter. Some emails have been exchanged with submitters for points of clarity and seeking agreement on phrasing upon consideration of pre-circulated planner statements, these were with:
 - a. Cam Drury on behalf of Emerald Hills Joint Venture Limited
 - b. Pauline Whitney on behalf of Transpower
 - c. Tom Anderson on behalf of The Telecommunications Companies
 - d. Riley Kupa on behalf of Unison
 - e. Dale Meredith and Nichola Nicholson of Hawke's Bay Regional Council.

Responses to Pre-Circulated Evidence

7. Pre-circulated submitter evidence and statements were received from a number of submitters. I have read this evidence and am prepared to respond to any questions or matters raised in relation to the information provided. I believe that in some cases there is some scope to make changes to address the concerns raised but wish to hear from the submitters before providing a response.
8. I note that through the planning evidence provided by Pauline Whitney for Transpower (submitter 99) I concur with their evidence insofar as including a specific rule for subdivision within the National Grid with a default status of restricted discretionary and elevated to non-complying where conditions cannot be met. I understand that this will be further heard in Hearing Stream 3.
9. Based on the planning evidence presented by Emerald Hills Joint Venture Limited (submitter 128), I believe there is merit in affording the precinct-specific rules and assessment criteria, rather than the general subdivision provisions, for the creation of residential and rural-residential allotments in alignment with the structure plan. The notified provisions appear to place an unintended additional burden on structure-planned developments by requiring progression through subdivision processes in addition to the precinct provisions that were not envisioned. The submitter and I have engaged in discussions on how best to address this issue and would welcome direction from the panel to continue collaborating beyond the hearing to achieve a mutually acceptable solution.

Key Issues

10. Throughout the Section 42 recommendation report and submitter evidence, the key matters include:
 - a. Minimum lot size – specifically Rural Lifestyle Zone and Residential Zones,
 - b. Reverse sensitivity protections,
 - c. Management of urban intensification, specifically on highly productive land, infrastructure capacity and community character.



Errors to remedy in S42 Report

11. I note that SUB-S6 was recommended for deletion (para 75 and 264) however, this was not shown in the tracked changes in Appendix A. This is an error.