

Corinne Frischknecht for QLDC – Summary Statement for Rezoning: Business and Lake Hāwea Zones

1. My rezoning evidence addresses proposed changes to the mapping of the Business Zones and Lake Hāwea Residential Zones in the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**).
2. A total of 27 submission points and 13 further submission points were received on Business or Lake Hāwea Residential mapping/zoning matters.
3. The scope of the notified UIV is set out in Section 9 of Ms Bowbyes strategic s42A and has been addressed in legal submissions. I have identified the submissions that are considered to be out of scope in my s42A but not assessed them.
4. The main issues raised in the (within scope) rezoning requests are:
 - (a) to enable increased residential and commercial development and provide for an efficient use of land; and
 - (b) to more appropriately reflect the existing activities being undertaken on the site.
5. I recommended the following amendments to the notified UIV in my S42A Report in regard to the submission by FII Holdings Limited (410) in regard to 145 Frankton-Ladies Mile Highway, Frankton, that the portion of the HDRZ land located south of the “Primary Road connection between SH6 and Ferry Hill Drive” as identified on the Frankton North Structure Plan, be zoned to BMUZ and amendment to Business Mixed Use Area A as identified on the PDP planning map to reflect the new zoning.
6. I note that the red rectangle identified in Paragraph 7.13 of my s42A Report on rezonings was located in the wrong place and should be as follows:



7. In my view, this is appropriate because it better recognises the consented and receiving environment and sustainable use of land. Consequently, it is more efficient and effective than the notified objective in achieving the purpose of the RMA; and it would give effect to SO 3.2.1, in developing of a prosperous, resilient and equitable economy in the District and also SP 3.3.12 in that it would provide for a wide variety of activities and sufficient capacity within commercially zoned land to accommodate business growth and diversification.
8. The key outstanding matters of disagreement between myself and submitters who have filed evidence are changing the sites at 1 and 3 Hansen Road from LSCZ, LDSRZ and Rural Zone to BMUZ. While some of the relief sought is considered to be out of scope, in respect of the part of the submission that is on urban zoned land, I am not convinced that BMUZ on these sites would:
 - (a) align with PDP Objective 4.2.2A and Policy 3.2.2.1, that urban development occurs in a logical manner so as to appropriately manage effects on infrastructure (airport, SH6 and local road network).
 - (b) achieve PDP Objective 4.2.2 B Urban development within Urban Growth Boundaries that maintains and enhances the environment and protects ONLs and Outstanding Natural Features particularly with the greater height and built form that would be enabled through BMUZ zoning.
9. I note that evidence has been filed by Ms Kealey and Mr Day on behalf of QAC, further submitters against the rezonings at 1 and 3 Hansen Road. That evidence is directly relevant

to the parts of 1 and 3 Hansen Road that are located within the Outer Control Boundary (**OCB**) and Air Noise Boundary (**ANB**). Ms Kealey notes that the existing framework, which limits the establishment of additional noise sensitive activities in the areas most affected by aircraft noise (the OCB and ANB), plays a critical role in protecting and supporting the Airport's long-term viability

Corinne Frischknecht

28 July 2025