

APPENDIX 2 - TABLE OF SUBMISSIONS WITH RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
SUBDIVISION, DEVELOPMENT AND EARTHWORKS CHAPTER IN GENERAL					
Denis Morgan	315.8	315	Seek Amendment	That a subdivision creating 18 residential units is outside the scope of PC14 and not in keeping with neighborhood amenity values of 48 Murray Place, Merivale.	Out of scope Relief sought not possible through this topic or exceeds the scope of this process.
John Glennie	472.1	472	Seek Amendment	That the impact of increased traffic on a shared long driveway be added to the list of Qualifying Matters and that the owners of existing houses on the driveway be able to object to the effects.	Out of scope Relief sought not possible through this topic or exceeds the scope of this process. <i>Please note that this submission is not addressed in my main report but I have provided my recommendation and reasons in this table.</i>
Lendlease Limited	855.3	855	Seek Amendment	Retain Chapter 8 as notified, except for amendments to 8.6.1, 8.6.2 and 8.9.2.1.	Reject Relief sought not specified
Carter Group Limited	814.75	814	Seek Amendment	Delete 8.1, or provide a definition or explanation of the term 'development'.	Reject Ordinary meaning of development appropriate
Robert J Manthei	200.14	200	Seek Amendment	Stop enabling Greenfield developments	Out of scope Relief sought not possible through this topic or exceeds the scope of this process.
Golden Section Property	460.2	460	Oppose	[Retain operative standards] - No change to the subdivision rules to residential areas.	Reject Relief sought is contrary to section 77G of the RMA as amended by the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act.

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
ISSUE 1 - SUBDIVISION OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES					
Danne Mora Limited	903.22	900	Support	Support the removal of the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay references in Objective 8.2.2	Accept
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.122	834	Support	Policy 8.2.2.1 –support deletion.	Accept
Lauren Roberts	209.1	209	Support	Policy 8.2.2.2 - Retain provision b.i. a variety of allotment sizes to cater for different housing types and affordability	Accept
Wayne Bond	684.3	684	Support	Policy 8.2.2.2 - Retain proposed additions b.ii and b.iii	Accept
Environment Canterbury / Canterbury Regional Council	689.13	689	Support	Policy 8.2.2.2 - Retain policy as notified	Accept
Carter Group Limited	814.76	814	Support		
The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	823.69	823	Support		
Environment Canterbury / Canterbury Regional Council	689.14	689	Support	Retain Policy 8.2.2.3 as notified	Accept
Environment Canterbury /	689.15	689	Support	Retain Policy 8.2.2.7 as notified.	Accept

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
Canterbury Regional Council					
Carter Group Limited	814.77	814			
The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	823.70	823			
Danne Mora Limited	903.27	903	Support	Retain Policy 8.2.2.7 as notified where it relates to the net yield specified for the Medium and High Density Zones.	Accept
Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd	914.11	914	Support		
Retirement Villages Association of NZ Inc	811.45	811	Seek Amendment	Add "Where practicable" to Policy 14.2.8.3	Reject Inserting "where practicable" will reduce the clarity of language and effectiveness of the policy and fail to give effect to the direction of relevant provisions of the CRPS on minimum density in greenfield developments.
Danne Mora Limited	903.27	903	Seek Amendment	Add a new definition in Chapter 2 for "net yield" in Policy 8.2.2.7.	Reject References to minimum net yields are outcomes that are encouraged rather than required through this policy which allows for the varying circumstances of individual development projects. Net density has a specific definition in relation to land zoned FUZ where the provisions encourage comprehensive consenting of large areas of greenfield land and are subject to specific density requirements set out in the CRPS.
Davie Lovell Smith	914.11	914			

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					Net yield avoids confusion with this definition improving the clarity of the plan while also addressing the broader objectives on efficient use of the scarce land resource.
Greg Olive	2.5	2	Seek Amendment	Apply an exemption to the site density policy 8.2.2.87(a).	Reject Site specific exemptions are not appropriate in a city-wide policy.
ISSUE 2 - OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLANS – NORTH HALSWELL ODP					
Danne Mora Limited	903.23	903	Support	Support the removal of Policy 8.2.2.11 Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay	Accept
Spreydon Lodge Limited	118.2	118	Seek Amendment	Delete reference to main street at Clause 8.10.4.C (a)(i) 'Development Form and Design' as follows: 8.10.4.C Development Form and Design a. The following design elements and features are relevant considerations in exercising control over the matters in Rules 8.7.1 - 8.7.4 or the matters for discretion in 8.8. They are not requirements for the purposes of Rule 8.6.11(a) or Rule 14.12.2.16. i. This development area new neighbourhood is to be established around the Key Activity Centre(zoned Commercial Core Town centre) proposed as a mixed use village centred focused around a main street. This will form a focus for the community.	Reject Consistent with Council's evidence in relation to North Halswell town centre set out in the section 42A report of Kirk Lightbody addressing submissions S118.3-6 the notified provisions are considered the most appropriate way to achieve the objective 15.2.2 and 15.2.4 of the commercial chapter and implement 15.2.2.2. and a preference for specificity of outcomes which will better achieve Objective 3.3.2 that seeks clarity of provisions.
Woolworths	740.2	740	Seek Amendment	Amend the zoned boundaries and North Halswell ODP associated with the Town Centre Zone and High Density Residential Zone	Accept in part Consistent with the recommendations and section 42 report of Mr Ike Kleinbos in relation to Residential Zone Requests, the

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					HDRZ boundary is recommended to be extended in accordance with the Environment Court decision on the extent and location of the town centre, generally achieving a 600m walking catchment beyond this. A Greenfield Development QM is applied to better direct a strategic and integrated development form over those areas with notified zoning of FUZ beyond this extent.
Danne Mora Limited	903.13	903	Seek Amendment	Retain the current boundaries of North Halswell ODP Area, where it relates to residentially zoned land; and remove the Quarryman's Trail from the ODP.	Reject The consenting of development in parts of this area has progressed to a point where MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD can be implemented and the FUZ and ODP are not required to be applied to the whole of the North Halswell ODP area. The location of development in relation to the Quarryman's Trail QM is still considered to be a relevant and significant strategic consideration for development in this area.
Danne Mora Limited	903.14	903	Support	We support the removal of the references to the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay	Accept
Danne Mora Limited	903.15	903	Seek Amendment	Remove reference to Quarryman's Trail as this has been constructed outside of the ODP boundaries 8.10.4 D(4)(g) and (h)	Reject The location of development in relation to the Quarryman's Trail QM is still considered to be a relevant and significant strategic consideration for development in this area.

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
Danne Mora Limited	903.16	903	Seek Amendment	Reinstate the current [Operative] North Halswell Outline Development Plan Area and boundaries so it includes all of the land that is residentially zoned land, and not just some of it.	Reject
Milns Park Limited	916.3	916	Seek Amendment	Reinstate the current [Operative] North Halswell Outline Development Plan Area and boundaries so it includes all of the land that is residentially zoned land, and not just some of it.	Reject
Danne Mora Limited	903.35	903	Oppose	Delete 8.8.13 [8.8.17] Additional Matters Subdivision in the Medium and High Density Residential Zones at North Halswell	Accept in part While it is agreed that cross references to the Meadowlands Exemplar provisions should be deleted, provisions within the North Halswell remain relevant for managing residential greenfield development in accordance with the ODP and to achieve outcomes sought by the NPS UD. The technical review of the land documented in the section 32 Evaluation Report Part 6 Subdivision and ODP's, determined those matters remain important such that they are justified as qualifying matters for greenfield areas.
Milns Park Limited	916.11	916			
Danne Mora Limited	903.34	903	Seek Amendment	Delete Matter of Discretion 8.8.15,8.8.15.1(b), 8.8.15.5(a)(i) where it applies to the North Halswell ODP, 8.15.6(g) where it applies to the South West Stormwater Management Plan, 8.8.15.7, 8.8.15.12,8.8.15.11(c) where it refers to the exemplar area,	Accept in part While it is agreed that cross references to the Meadowlands Exemplar provisions should be deleted, provisions within the North Halswell remain relevant for managing residential greenfield development in accordance with the ODP and to achieve outcomes sought by the NPS-

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					UD. The technical review of the land documented in the section 32 Evaluation Report Part 6 Subdivision and ODPs, determined those matters remain important such that they are justified as qualifying matters for greenfield areas.
Danne Mora Limited	903.33	903	Oppose	Delete Matter of Control 8.7.13	Reject. This provision is a cross reference to aspects of the operative Outline Development Plan for North Halswell that remain relevant for managing residential greenfield development in accordance with the ODP and to achieve outcomes sought by the NPS-UD. The technical review of the land documented in the section 32 Evaluation Report Part 6 Subdivision and ODPs, determined those matters remain important such that they are justified as qualifying matters.
Milns Park Limited	916.10	916	Seek Amendment		
Danne Mora Limited	903.32	903	Oppose	Delete Activity Standard 8.6.15. With the removal of part of the ODP it is not clear where these provisions do and do not apply. If the land is zoned FUZ and the operative ODP is retained, this text becomes redundant.	Accept in part It is agreed that the notified wording is not clear what provisions apply where. This can be addressed by altering the text of 8.6.15 and restoring the Outline Development Plan boundary notation on the map within Appendix 8.10.4. It is recommended that standard 8.6.15 is amended to make it clear which provisions these requirements are referring to and where.
Milns Park Limited	916.9	916			

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
Danne Mora Limited	903.30	S1.1	Seek Amendment	Amend the standard to remove Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay specific terms such as Neighbourhood Plan and Context and Site Analysis.	Accepted in Part These terms are to be removed in relation to the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay only and will continue to apply to East Papanui.
Danne Mora Limited	903.31	S1.1	Support	Support the deletion of references to the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay.	Accept
ISSUE 3 - PRECINCTS AND OVERLAYS					
Andrew McCarthy	681.5	681	Seek Amendment	[Table 1.b. Medium Density Residential Zone - Residential Hills Precinct] That the minimum allotment size is reduced to 575m2.	Reject The vacant allotment control of 650m2 with a minimum 17m x 12m dimension within the Medium Density (Residential Hills Precinct) zone, and requirement for an identified building area, has been selected in order to: o Address the disadvantages of intensification in less accessible areas of the city within the LPTAA qualifying matter area. o Enable three residential units as prescribed by the MDRS, while recognising the more challenging topography and associated development constraints within the Residential Hills Precinct. o Ensure allotments are usable and achieve basic onsite amenity outcomes. o 575m ² has no clear advantage.
Andrew McCarthy	681.6	681	Seek Amendment	Amend Rule 8.6.1.c to: Allotments in the Residential Medium Density Zones, and High Density Residential Zones shall include a plan demonstrating that a permitted residential unit	Reject Proposed amendments require removal of the LPTAA qualifying matter which is supported by Council.

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				<p>can be located on any new allotment, including in relation to recession planes, unit size, access, outdoor living space, and floor level requirements; or for any vacant allotment created it shall have a consent notice per s221 of the RMA attached restricting future subdivision to 2 units if the allotment is less than 60% of the minimum vacant allotment for that zone or 1 unit if the allotment is less than 30% of The minimum vacant allotment size for that zone.</p>	<p>A method that creates a permanent constraint on future subdivision due to the size of sites involved, would be contrary to MDRS standards (clause 8 of schedule 3(a)) and would significantly reduce the intended flexibility to allow an efficient future use of the land resource.</p> <p><i>Please note that this submission is not addressed in my main report but I have provided my recommendation and reasons in this table.</i></p>
Andrew McCarthy	681.7	681	Seek Amendment	Delete Table 1.b. Additional Standards, c. i and ii [minimum building area and curtilage area]	<p>Reject</p> <p>The 100m² minimum building area and 200m² curtilage area within the Medium Density (Residential Hills Precinct) zone has been selected in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Address the disadvantages of intensification in less accessible areas of the city within the LPTAA qualifying matter area. o Enable three residential units as prescribed by the MDRS, while recognising the more challenging topography and associated development constraints within the Residential Hills Precinct. o Ensure allotments are usable and achieve basic onsite amenity outcomes. o the changes sought have no clear advantage in achieving the relevant objectives and policies.

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					<i>Please note that this submission is not addressed in my main report but I have provided my recommendation and reasons in this table.</i>
Rutherford Family Trust	879.5	879	Seek Amendment	8.6.11 - Additional standards for the Future Urban Zone - Remove reference to the Moncks Spur Development Area in 8.6.11 (b)(iv) Remove Row (D) in table 8 in Rule 8.6.11 (d).	Accept in part Relief sought is consistent with Issue 5 of the Residential section 32 Evaluation report that the Moncks Spur development area does not meet applicable criteria for a qualifying matter.
Cashmere Developments Ltd	257.1	257	Seek Amendment	Remove the maximum number of residential allotment standards set out in Rules 8.6.1 and 8.6.11 that apply to the Outline Development Plan 'Cashmere and Worsley's'. Plan Change 14 proposes to continue to apply Rules 8.6.1 and 8.6.11, even though Plan Change 14 rezones the majority of the undeveloped residential land within 'Cashmere and Worsleys' as Future Urban Zone. The standards proposed to be removed are shown with strikethrough below: Rule 6.8.1 Minimum Net Site Area and Dimension, Table 1: Minimum net site area - residential zones, a. Medium Density Residential Zone: Additional Standards: b. In the Cashmere and Worsleys area (shown at Appendix 8.10.7 8.10.6): • i. no more than 380 residential allotments shall	Accept in part The existing framework of zones and overlays is not supported in that the MDRZ Residential Hills Precinct does not apply in the FUZ. The criteria used to determine the suitability of this 380 ceiling on allotments has been superseded by the NPS-UD and the matters in sub-sections (a) to (g) of s771, and this limit does not align as a QM meeting any of those parameters. The matters addressed by the Outline Development Plan have been addressed such that it is no longer justified as a qualifying matter. It is recommended that the site be rezoned to MDRZ, the MDRZ Residential Hills Precinct 650m ² minimum site standard be

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				<p>be crated or enabled by subdivision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ii. No more than 380 residential units shall be created or enabled by subdivision. • c. The historic stonewalled drain shown at Appendix 8.10.6(d) shall be protected. <p>Rule 8.6.11: Additional Standards for the Future Urban Zone, Table 8: Minimum and Maximum net site areas for allotments, c. Within the Cashmere and Worsleys area (Appendix 8.10.6): Net Site Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>a. No more than 380 residential allotments shall be created or enabled by subdivision;</i> • <i>b. No more than 380 residential units shall be created or enabled by subdivision.</i> <p><i>c. The historic stonewalled drain shown at Appendix 8.10.6(d) shall be protected.</i></p>	<p>applied and the 380 total residential units standard be deleted.</p>
Alana Harper	36.4	36	Support	Cashmere Estate in Cracroft should remain Residential Hills Zone or be Future Urban Zone.	<p>Reject</p> <p>The existing framework of zones and overlays is not supported in that the MDRZ Residential Hills Precinct does not apply in the FUZ.</p> <p>The criteria used to determine the suitability of this 380 ceiling on allotments has been superseded by the NPS-UD and the matters in sub-sections (a) to (g) of s771, and this limit does not align as a QM meeting any of those parameters.</p> <p>The matters addressed by the Outline Development Plan have been addressed</p>

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					such that it is no longer justified as a qualifying matter. It is recommended that the site be rezoned to MDRZ, the MDRZ Residential Hills Precinct 650m ² minimum site standard be applied and the 380 total residential units standard be deleted.
Red Spur Ltd	881.6	881	Seek Amendment	[Seeks that council amend Rule 8.6.1 to read as follows] In the Residential Hills/Medium Density Residential Zone – Residential Hills Precinct, the minimum net site area should be; 650m ² for a vacant allotment <u>except that in the Residential Hills (Redmund Spur) Precinct, a maximum of 15% of vacant lots for the entire Precinct shall have a minimum lot size of 400m².</u>	Reject The proposal seeks to apply the same operative controls within a zone not considered to be a relevant residential zone. Consistent with recommendations on other Red Spur submissions, should the Panel consider the area is within the residential scope , applying MDRZ with Suburban Hill Density Precent through applying the LPTAA QM is recommended.
	881.7	881	Seek Amendment	[Seeks that council amend Rule 8.6.1(h) as follows] Additional standards In the Residential Mixed Density Precinct – Redmund Spur: i. the minimum allotment size shall be 650m², however a minimum of 30% of sites shall have a minimum of 1,500m²; and the maximum number of allotments shall be 400.	Accept Residential Mixed Density Precinct Redmund Spur Overlay deleted in notified provisions.
	881.8	881	Seek Amendment	[Seeks that council add the Following in Rule 8.6.2] <u>j. Allotments with existing or proposed buildings in the Residential Hills/ Medium Density Residential Zone -Residential Hills (Redmund Spur) Precinct - no minimum net site</u>	Reject The vacant allotment control of 650m ² with a minimum 17m x 12m dimension within the Medium Density (Residential Hills Precinct) zone, and requirement for an

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				area.	<p>identified building area, has been selected in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Address the disadvantages of intensification in less accessible areas of the city within the LPTAA qualifying matter area. o Enable three residential units as prescribed by the MDRS, while recognising the more challenging topography and associated development constraints within the Residential Hills Precinct. o Ensure allotments are usable and achieve basic onsite amenity outcomes.
ISSUE 4 - ALLOTMENT SIZES					
Debbie Smith	57.2	57	Oppose	Amend 8.6.1-Minimum net site area and dimension to increase the minimum land size and site dimension requirements	Reject Minimum site area and dimension rules in 8.6.1 enable three residential units as required to provide for MDRS while avoiding fragmentation and provide for subsequent development and basic amenity outcomes.
Victoria Neighbourhood Association (VNA)	61.15	61	Seek Amendment	Amend 14.6.1 by requiring High Density Residential development to have a minimum of a 400sq m site to be able to subdivide as set out in the operative District Plan	Reject 300m ² in the HDRZ with minimum dimension are considered suitable to enable three residential units as required to provide for MDRS while avoiding fragmentation and provide for subsequent development and basic amenity outcomes.
Lauren Roberts	209.2 209.3	209	Seek Amendment	Provide for more flexibility on allotment sizes.	Reject Minimum site area and dimension rules in 8.6.1 enable three residential units as

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					required to provide for MDRS while avoiding fragmentation and provide for subsequent development and basic amenity
Property Council New Zealand	242.6	242	Support	Support the proposed plan change having minimum subdivision on vacant sites in medium density residential zones as 400m ² , and in high density residential zones as 300m ² .	Accept
Cody Cooper	289.2	289	Seek Amendment	Amend the minimum section size to be less than as currently proposed.	Reject Subdivision provisions including lot size requirements need to be consistent with the level of development permitted by the MDRS and cannot constrain the ability to build according to the MDRS. Changes to standards under this process cannot further constrain development beyond what is necessary to implement MDRS.
Rebecca West	360.2	360	Seek Amendment	Increase the minimum land size, and minimum street facing site dimension [in the High Density Residential Zone]	Reject Subdivision provisions including lot size requirements and 10m minimum width standard need to be consistent with the level of development permitted by the MDRS and cannot constrain the ability to build according to the MDRS. Changes to standards under this process cannot further constrain development beyond what is necessary to implement MDRS.

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
Kate Gregg	381.22	381	Seek Amendment	[That the] minimum net site area for subdivision varies between Character Areas in the Medium Density Zone, but is generally larger than the underlying Zone requirement.	Accept In Character Areas, minimum net site areas are larger than in the underlying zone.
Kate Gregg	2381.23	2381	Seek Amendment	[That], for activities located outside a Character Area, the net site area standards [are] amended to a minimum of 400m ² .	Accept in part The standard proposed for vacant allotments in the MDRZ is 400m ² however the MDRS standards requirements state there must be no minimum lot sizes for allotments with an existing residential unit or concurrently proposed unit in most circumstances.
Stuart Roberts	465.5	465	Oppose	[Do not allow 400m ² for MRZ (a)] - Minimum subdivisible section size at 450 sqm for MRZ and current (not proposed) size for HRZ	Reject The standards proposed for vacant allotments in the MDRZ (400m ²) and in the HDRZ (300m ²) are suitable to enable three residential units as prescribed by the MDRS, providing for flexibility of form for subsequent development and ensure basic onsite amenity outcomes. The MDRS standards requirements state there must be no minimum lot sizes for allotments with an existing residential unit or concurrently proposed unit in most circumstances.
David McLauchlan	653.7	653	Seek Amendment	Set a minimum net site area standard for developments [e.g., 2,000m ²] that allows for permanent and larger green space areas.	Reject Subdivision provisions including lot size requirements and 10m minimum width standard need to be consistent with the level of development permitted by the

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					MDRS and cannot constrain the ability to build according to the MDRS. Changes to standards under this process cannot further constrain development beyond what is necessary to implement MDRS.
Christian Jordan	737.2	737		There should be no minimum section size for a vacant lot in any urban residential zone if a compliant house can be shown to fit (no requirement for consent or actual building for title to be issued).	Accept in part Proposed Rule 8.6.2(a) provides for the relief sought. This provides for subdivision around existing, approved, or concurrently consented dwellings in the MDRZ/HDRZ. In accordance with Schedule 3A this rule cannot have minimum lot size requirements.
Megan Power	769.1	769	Support	[Supports] in general the following provisions: Chapter 8 Subdivision 8.6.1 Minimum net site area and dimension, Table 1, a., Additional Standards	Accept in part Provisions are retained as notified for the most part other than for the Cashmere and Worsleys area.
Carter Group Limited	814.90	814	Oppose	Oppose 8.6.1 Table 1. Seek that it is deleted.	Reject
The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	823.83	823			
Carter Group Limited	814.91	814	Support	Table 2 -4 Min net site areas - other zones. Retain the changes as proposed to Rule 8.6.1 Tables 2 – 5.	Accept
The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	823.84	823			

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
Sutherlands Estates Limited	728.8	728	Seek Amendment	Amend the standard to make it clear that there is no minimum allotment size in The FUZ zone around existing buildings	<p>Accept</p> <p>The changes to standards for allotments with existing or proposed buildings in the RNNZ in the operative plan (which had no minimum allotment size), compared with the lack of an equivalent provision in the FUZ in the notified provisions in PC14 are considered out of scope.</p> <p>There is no mention of this change in the section 32 evaluation.</p> <p>No minimum allotment size when subdividing around existing building recommended for the FUZ.</p>
Ben Rogan Estates Ltd	819.5	819			
Knights Stream Estates Ltd	820.5	820			
Danne Mora Limited	903.28	903			
Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd	914.12	914			
Milns Park Limited	916.8	916			
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.130	834	Oppose	<p>Amend clause 8.63.1(c) as follows:</p> <p><u>The creation of vacant allotments that do not contain an existing or consented residential unit-Allotments</u> in the Medium Density (including MRZHills), and High Density Residential Zones, shall have accommodate a minimum dimension-shape factor of 10m 8m x 15m. Within the Medium Density Residential (Residential HillsPrecinct) Zone the allotment shall have a minimum dimension of 17m x12m.</p> <p><u>This shape factor shall be located outside of:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Land which may be subject to instability or is otherwise geotechnically unsuitable;</u> <u>2. Any existing or proposed easement</u> 	<p>Reject</p> <p>Council’s testing of a range of minimum allotment sizes to confirm changes needed to give effect to the intent of the NPS-UD and MDRS has confirmed the suitability of the notified allotment sizes to support the provision of affordable housing choices and the forms of development enabled by MDRS with the level of development enabled by the zones. As a method, minimum allotment sizes are considered effective to manage a range of factors that cannot be controlled through land use provisions and ensure that vacant sites created though subdivision are fit for development covering both MDRS</p>

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				<u>areas required for access or services purposes;</u> <u>Network Utilities, including private and public lines.</u>	factors such as outlook space, setbacks and height in relation to boundary, and site coverage as well providing an inviting means of access other than solely private vehicles, and addressing servicing considerations.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.131	834	Oppose	Table 1 – Minimum net site area Clause (a) and (c) Table 6 – Allotments with existing or proposed buildings. Delete Table 1 and Table 6.	
Cameron Matthews	1048.15	1048	Seek Amendment	I oppose the proposed Residential Heritage Areas. I think they shouldn't be Qualifying Matters and should all be removed from the plan, including, but not limited to, [Rule] 8.6.1 [Table 1 - Minimum net site area - Residential Zones].	Reject Consistent with other recommendations seeking deletion of RHA provisions addressed in the section 42A report of Glenda Dixon, the few remaining areas which meet the criteria to be RHAs are significant examples of the City's residential history. The City has more than enough development capacity outside of RHAs. <i>Please note that this submission is not addressed in my main report but I have provided my recommendation and reasons in this table.</i>
ISSUE 5 - EARTHWORKS					
Jessica Adams	784.4 784.8 784.6	784	Oppose	[Seeks] that the Council review policy 8252 Nuisance to ensure that adverse effects on people, property and the natural environment are not permitted.	Reject The scope of future monitoring and policy reviews are a separate matter.

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
Jessica Adams	784.4	784	Seek Amendment	Policy 8.2.5.2 Nuisance - [Seeks] that the Council expand this clause to define what is 'less than minor' and put in place procedures to address issues of persistent noise, vibration, dust or odor nuisance. Where earthworks of a substantial nature is proposed this should be notified to immediate landowners with appropriate monitoring by an independent party not the Developer. I request that the Council define the processes by which residents can address issues of breaches of this clause in a timely and effective manner.	Reject No scope to significantly tighten the policy. Policy is appropriately specific about safety of property, persistent noise, vibration, dust and odours. Earthworks are a necessity with significant benefits and adverse effects vary such that a somewhat broad policy is needed.
Carter Group Limited	814.93	814	Support	Retain the Rules in 8.9 as notified.	Accept
The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	823.86	823			
Daresbury Ltd	874.9	874			
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.13	834	Support	RD5 Earthworks 1. Retain the Sites of Ecological Significance qualifying matter. Retain the Outstanding and Significant Natural Features qualifying matter. Retain the Sites of Cultural Significance qualifying matter.	Accept
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.17	834	Support	1. Retain the Sites of Ecological Significance qualifying matter. 2. Retain the Outstanding and Significant Natural Features qualifying matter.	Accept

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				Retain the Sites of Cultural Significance qualifying matter.	
Environment Canterbury / Canterbury Regional Council	689.82	689	Support	Rule 8.9.3 Exemptions Retain amendment to a.xii	Accept
Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	685.28	685	Seek Amendment	Re 8.9.2.1 Permitted Activities Increase maximum depth and maximum volume[s] in Table 9]	<p>Reject</p> <p>Although it is accepted that greater intensification is likely to see these thresholds being exceeded more frequently requiring more consents, it does not follow that PC14 necessitates changing them.</p> <p>As this change would affect zones and land not part of PC14 there is potentially no scope to make this change through an ISPP as it is not clear the relief is consequential to the implementation of MDRS.</p> <p>A standalone or follow up Schedule 1 plan change could be advanced to address this matter in the future if needed.</p>
Mitchell Coll	720.6	720	Seek Amendment	Re 8.9.2.1 Permitted Activities Seeks increasing the thresholds [earthworks volume and depth] limits to a much higher level or at least streamlining the process for these simple resource consents.	
New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	762.16	762	Seek Amendment	Re 8.9.2.1 Permitted Activities [Increase] the current restrictive maximum earthwork limits to a higher level that is reflective of the increased size of developments.	
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.132	834	Seek Amendment	Re 8.9.2.1 Permitted Activities Amend Table 9(d) so the maximum volume is 50m³250m³ [sic] / site <u>net fill above existing ground level</u>	
Otautahi Community Housing Trust	877.20	877	Seek Amendment	Re 8.9.2.1 Permitted Activities	

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				Amend Table 9(d) so the maximum volume is 50m³ 250m ³ [sic] / site net fill above existing ground level	
Andrew Evans	89.3	89	Seek Amendment	Amend Rules in Clause 8.9 to enable greater volumes of earthworks to be undertaken without resource consent. <i>Please note that this submission is not addressed in my main report but I have provided my recommendation and reasons in this table.</i>	
Doug Latham	30.6	30	Seek Amendment	Amend Rule 8.9.2.1, Table 9 Maximum volumes – earthworks to increase the 20m ³ threshold for residential sites. Could add standard controls, e.g. having a sediment control plan in place within the permitted activity status.	
ISSUE 6 - INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT					
Carter Group Limited	814.79 814.80	814	Seek Amendment	Delete Policy 8.2.3.1 or provide a definition or explanation of the term ‘development’.	Reject Common understanding of the term development matches the intent of the policy.
The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	823.72	823			
Environment Canterbury / Canterbury Regional Council	689.17	689	Support	Retain Policy 8.2.3.2 as notified	Accept
The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	823.73	823	Seek Amendment	Delete Policy 8.2.3.2, or provide a definition or explanation of the term ‘development’.	Reject

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					Common understanding of the term development matches the intent of the policy
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.94	834	Support	Policy 8.2.3.2 - Retain Clause (g) as notified.	Accept
Fire and Emergency	842.18	842	Support	Policy 8.2.3.2 - Retain as notified.	Accept
Te Tāhuhu o te Mātaranga (Ministry of Education)	842.18	842	Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to Policy 8.2.3.2: Add wording to a. (new) ii>...and; <u>iii. Is supported by additional infrastructure as defined by the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD).</u>	Reject Adding a complex definition referencing a document outside of the plan will make the plan harder to use.
Te Tāhuhu o te Mātaranga (Ministry of Education)	806.12	806	Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to Matters of Discretion: Add wording: <u>p. Whether the development is supported by additional infrastructure as defined by the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS- UD)</u>	Reject Adding a complex definition referencing a document outside of the plan will make the plan harder to use.
Steve Burns	276.30 276.31	276	Seek Amendment	That provisions are made for widening main transport routes to enable access.	Reject It is considered to be out of scope of the plan change to create unspecified changes to roading widths through PC14.
Nikki Smetham	112.19	S1.1	Seek Amendment	8.6.4 - Roads - [Require] a wider minimum berm size in road reserves.	Reject It is considered to be out of scope of the plan change to create a set of standards to achieve a widening of berm widths through PC14.

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
Danne Mora Limited	903.29	903	Support	8.6.8 - Wastewater disposal - Support the deletion of (e)	Accept
Justin Avi	402.8	402	Not Stated	Protect the areas on both sides of the Christchurch Southern and Northern motorway for future mass rapid transit like the Auckland Northern busway [road widths are governed by the Infrastructure Design Standards, which are not be changed under PC14).	Reject There is no ability to designate land using this ISPP process. <i>Please note that this submission is not addressed in my main report but I have provided my recommendation and reasons in this table.</i>
Daresbury Ltd	874.30	874	Oppose	Regarding 8.8.3 b Seeks that council delete this rule	Reject Matters of discretion Rule 8.8.3 Road (b.) is not altered by PC14. Requiring consideration of whether new roads or upgrades to existing roads are required is an appropriate consideration in enabling and managing the effects of subdivision and it is recommended this provision is retained. <i>Please note that this submission is not addressed in my main report but I have provided my recommendation and reasons in this table.</i>
ISSUE 7 – CHANGES OF TENURE					
Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd	914.22	814	Seek Amendment	Amend 8.5.1.2 C2A to allow for the conversion of tenure where there are existing buildings	Accept in part 8.5.1.2 C2A recommended to be amended to allow for the conversion of tenure where there are existing buildings.

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	685.1	685	Seek Amendment	Implement a requirement to have all residential units which are attached (touching in someway) to be subdivided under Unit Title and not Fee Simple.	Reject Relevant national policy drivers favour more flexibility. No scope to significantly constrain property rights with decisions on PC14. Could be advanced as a separate plan change but might require legislative support.
Mitchell Coll	720.46	720	Seek Amendment	Seeks that all attached buildings to be subdivided under Unit Title and not Fee Simple.	Reject Relevant national policy drivers favour more flexibility. No scope to significantly constrain property rights with decisions on PC14. Could be advanced as a separate plan change but might require legislative support.
ISSUE 8 – DEVELOPMENT AND FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS					
Carter Group Limited	814.86	814	Oppose	Oppose 8.3.3(b). Seek that it is deleted.	Reject Requirement to pay financial contributions prior to s224C is a standard approach to align payments with the point where potential impacts occur and there is an ability to pay them.
The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	823.79	823			
Knights Stream Estates Ltd	820.2	820	Oppose	Make clearer in the plan how the costs have been attributed and whether it is GST inclusive.	Accept in part Financial contribution requirements should be clearly explained.
ISSUE 9 - NOTIFICATION					
Jan Mitchell	398.4	398	Seek Amendment	Where existing properties are to be subdivided /redeveloped/ intensified the	Reject

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				affected neighboring properties must have the right to decline consent.	Outside of the scope of PC14 to allow neighbours to veto developments
Carter Group Limited	814.88	814	Support	Retain 8.4.1.1 as notified.	Accept
The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	823.81	823			
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.127	834			
ISSUE 10 – SUBDIVISION RULES GENERAL					
Golden Section Property	460.1	460	Oppose	[Retain operative subdivision rules] - No change to the subdivision rules to residential areas.	Reject A number of changes to the provisions are recommended as part of this evidence.
Carter Group Limited	814.89	814	Support	Retain Rules 8.5 as notified.	Accept in part To the extent that most provisions in section 8.5 are considered appropriate, however several changes are considered necessary and appropriate.
The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	823.82	823			
Malcolm Leigh	29.3	29	Seek Amendment	Subdivision application for existing or proposed dwellings should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic effects; • demographic changes; • loss of trees; • sufficiency of recreational facilities; • stormwater effects; • degradation of local visual character; and network utilities capacity. 	Reject It is not practical to address matters such as incremental effects on traffic volumes, demographic changes and the capacity of network utilities with individual subdivision applications. Subdivision applications are not the appropriate place to address broad issues with growth.

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
Denis Morgan	315.10	315	Seek Amendment	Any subdivision of Lot 3 DP27773 be restricted to no more than one residential unit accessing easement 192726.	Out of scope Relief sought not possible through this topic or exceeds the scope of this process.
Kate Z	297.36	297	Seek Amendment	That resource consent to be required for buildings greater than two stories and all subdivisions.	Accept in part All subdivisions require at least controlled activity resource consent under the proposed framework. Limiting permitted building heights to two stories would be contrary to legislative requirements.
University of Canterbury	184.13	184	Seek Amendment	Amendment to the standard 14.5.2.1 to align with the MDRS; Or if no density standard is provided then: standard (b) of [8.5.1.2] (C9) should be removed	Accept in part Rule 8.5.1.2(C9)(b) be amended as follows: <i>The subdivision shall not result in, or increase the degree of, non-compliance with the density built form standards of the applicable zone <u>in rules 14.5.2 and 14.6.2.</u></i> <i>Note: Land use consent is also required where an applicable density standard is breached.</i> The change will improve the clarity of the provisions.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	377.7	377	Support	Support 8.5.1.2 hazard constraints being included as matters of control of subdivision to create allotments within the Medium and High Density Residential Zones.	Accept
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.128	834	Support	Retain C8 and C9 as notified	Accept in part Provisions are retained as notified for the most part other than a minor change to C9.
Fire and Emergency	842.19	842	Support	[8.5.1.2 Controlled ActivitiesC8] Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					Provisions are retained as notified for the most part other than a minor change to C9.
Fire and Emergency	842.20	842	Support	[8.5.1.2 Controlled ActivitiesC10] Retain as notified.	Accept in part Provisions are retained as notified for the most part other than a minor change to C9.
Kate Z	297.37	297	Seek Amendment	That resource consent to be required for buildings greater than two stories and all subdivisions.	Accept in part All subdivisions require at least controlled activity resource consent under the proposed framework. Limiting permitted building heights to two stories would be contrary to legislative requirements.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.12 834.16	834	Support	RD 11 Subdivision of land 1. Retain the Sites of Ecological Significance qualifying matter. 2. Retain the Outstanding and Significant Natural Features qualifying matter. 3. Retain the Sites of Cultural Significance qualifying matter.	Accept
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.129	834	Support	Retain RD2(c) and RD2(c) as notified.	Accept
Danne Mora Limited	903.24	903	Support	Support the removal of RD15	Accept
Danne Mora Limited	903.25	903	Support	Support the removal of D5	Accept

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
Danne Mora Limited	903.26	903	Support	Support the removal of NC8	Accept
ISSUE 11 – OTHER OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLANS					
Belfast Village Centre Limited	917.6	917	Seek Amendment	Amend Appendix 8.10.18 or 8.10.1 North-West Belfast Outline Development Plan to extend the North-West Belfast Commercial Centre across land at 40B Johns Road.	<p>Reject</p> <p>Consistent with Council’s evidence in relation to Zoning of Centres and the evidence of Kirk Lightbody in his s42A report (Issue 1 - Belfast), which has considered this issue in detail, this rezoning request (S917.3) has been evaluated against the relevant objectives and policies and is recommended to be rejected.</p> <p><i>Please note that this submission is not addressed in my main report but I have provided my recommendation and reasons in this table.</i></p>
Michael Case	508.3	508	Seek Amendment	Amend Appendix 8.10.23 East Papanui Outline Development Plan (Area 5), and remove 8.10.23.D (2)(d) provision.	<p>Reject</p> <p>The submitters may be able to assist with further information but it is not clear from the information provided with these submissions that the matters which the 60 unit limit on residential units in Area 5 (such as the need to accommodate stormwater management infrastructure and to manage access through to Croziers Road and through the development) have been resolved, or would be able to be resolved through the consent process, with the limit simply removed.</p>
R.J Crozier	511.3	511			

Submitter	Decision No	Submitter No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					<p>While it is agreed that the 60 unit limit on development within Area 5 in the East Papanui ODP is not consistent with the criteria for an appropriate Qualifying Matter under s77I, 77J or 77K under the Act, it is located within the FUZ and as this is not a residential zone, it is not subject to evaluation on this basis.</p> <p><i>Please note that this submission is not addressed in my main report but I have provided my recommendation and reasons in this table.</i></p>
ISSUE 12 – REZONE REQUESTS					
Christine Hetherington for Summerset Group Holdings Limited	443.11	443	Seek Amendment	[Remove the Future Urban Zone at] Summerset on Cavendish village (147 Cavendish Road, Casebrook, Christchurch) , and legally described as Lot 1 DP 519380 (record of title 815809) and rezone to MDRZ.	<p>Accept</p> <p>Integrated development issues are substantially resolved through resource consent such that FUZ is not required and MDRZ will better achieve the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD consistent with the intent of PC14.</p>

Michael Case	508.2	508	Seek Amendment	Amend part of the Future Urban Zone for 60 Croziers Road and 340 Cranford Road, Mairehau. Seek that part of these properties are zoned MRZ.	Reject Delineation of proposed boundary is not clear. Lack of clarity that the Pedestrian Cycle link will be located in this location is substantially resolved such that the East Papanui Outline Development Plan and FUZ provisions can be dispensed with.
R.J Crozier	511.2	511	Seek Amendment	Amend part of the Future Urban Zone for 60 Croziers Road and 340 Cranford Road, Mairehau. Seek that part of these properties are zoned Medium Density Residential.	Reject Delineation of proposed boundary is not clear. Lack of clarity that the Pedestrian Cycle link will be located in this location is substantially resolved such that the East Papanui Outline Development Plan and FUZ provisions can be dispensed with.
Sutherlands Estates Limited	728.1	728	Support	Retain the Future Urban Zoning of Lot 101 DP 570868, being the development block located at the end of James Mackenzie Drive.	Accept

Sutherlands Estates Limited	728.2	728	Seek Amendment	Rezone all of the residential properties that front Storr Close, Glendore Drive, James Mackenzie Drive and Sutherlands Road to Future Urban	Reject Land can be upzoned as development planning has proceeded such that MDRZ can be applied. Land is not subject to Low Public Transport Accessibility Area zoning response.
Andrew Mactier for Independent Producers Limited	729.1	729	Seek Amendment	The submitter requests that Council amend the zoning of 330, 250 and 232 Styx Mill Road (Lot 4 DP 311370, Lot 5 DP 311370, Lot 6 DP 311370) from Rural Urban Fringe to Future Urban Zone, without the Air Noise Contour overlay.	Accept in Part Land outside of the Air Noise Contour should retain its FUZ. Inside the Air Noise Contour the land is zoned RuUF. It is outside of the scope of PC14 and the implementation of s77G and schedule 3A to rezone rural land to FUZ.
Benrogan Estates Ltd	819.10	819	Seek Amendment	Rezone 1.58ha at 376 Sparks Road from Rural Urban Fringe to Future Urban Zone.	Reject It is considered beyond the scope of PC14 and the implementation of s77G and schedule 3A to rezone rural land to FUZ.

Benrogan Estates Ltd	819.11	819	Seek Amendment	Rezone the residential portions of Lots 1 and 2 DP 82730 and Lot 302 DP 571794, being 376, 388 and 396 Sparks Road Halswell from Medium Density Residential to Future Urban Zone.	Reject The portion of these properties zoned Rural Urban Fringe are substantially affected by the Flood Management and Flood Ponding Management Areas and, absent information assessing these issues and setting out how flooding risk should be addressed under the proposed zone framework, it is premature to rezone these properties to a residential zone.
Knights Stream Estates Ltd	820.6	820	Seek Amendment	Rezone 11 Kahurangi Road, Halswell (Lot 30 DP 571567) to Future Urban Zone.	Reject Rezoning the site to FUZ would create a spot zone surrounded by MDRZ and would not be consistent with the approach to implementing MDRS as required by the Act. There appears to be nothing particular about the site that would prevent MDRZ from being achieved.
Julie Comfort for Milns Park Limited	916.1	916	Support	Rezone 7,124m2 of land at 432 Sparks Road as Neighbourhood Centre (part of Lot 1 DP 581607 as per attached map)	Accept
Milns Park Limited	916.13	916	Support	"Retain the Future Urban (FUZ) zoning for 25-51 Milns Road (Lot 600 DP 579587)"	Accept
Milns Park Limited	916.2	916	Seek Amendment	Rezone Lot 500 DP 5795877 in Kearns Drive, Halswell to Future Urban Zone	Reject It appears that subdivision has progressed to the point where there is no clear reason to apply the provisions of the FUZ to Kearns Drive and that there is nothing stopping MDRS from being achieved.

John Rice	313.1	313	Seek Amendment	[That] the Residential New Neighbourhood - Rural Urban Fringe zone boundary [on Map 50 in the area to the east of Sutherland's Road and to the north of Cashmere road that includes the new Sutherlands basin and the property at 750 Cashmere Road] be amended to be closer to Sutherlands Road:	Reject Down zoning of FUZ land for rural purposes to RuUF to better protect existing trees and plantings is not a reason to rezone land and would not achieve more effective protection of trees.
Alex Booker for WDL Enterprises Limited and Birchs Village Limited	704.1 704.2	704	Seek Amendment	Change all of 109 Prestons Road to either FUZ or MRZ.	Reject Split zoning with MDRZ is applied to designated land all along the designation and changing the land within the designation to FUZ would create a spot zone anomaly. Similarly, zoning the whole of the site MDRZ would create a spot zone within a broader greenfield area of FUZ that would be inconsistent with the approach to the zoning of land in greenfield areas under PC14.

<p>Alex Booker for WDL Enterprises Limited and Birchs Village Limited</p>	<p>704.6</p>	<p>704</p>	<p>Seek Amendment</p>	<p>The Submitter's current view is that it would be most appropriate for the FUZ to apply across the Land (109 Prestons Road) in replacement of RNN.</p>	<p>Accept The site is currently a greenfield area and the policies and rules of the FUZ will better manage the process of initial subdivision and development with its emphasis on integrated well connected development, comprehensive planning of development with open space and movement networks, effective and efficient infrastructure servicing, and emphasis on quality and design of neighbourhoods in policies and rules.</p>
<p>Holly Luzak for Cashmere Park Ltd, Hartward Investment Trust and Robert Brown</p>	<p>593.2</p>	<p>593</p>	<p>Seek Amendment</p>	<p>Rezone land at: 126 Sparks Road (Lot 1 DP 412488) - Rural Urban Fringe to Medium Density 17 Northaw Street (Lot 2 DP 412488) - Rural Urban Fringe to Medium Density 36 Leistrella Road (Lot 3 DP 412488) - Rural Urban Fringe and Residential New Neighbourhood to Medium Density 240 Cashmere Road (Lot 23 DP 3217) - Rural Urban Fringe and proposed Future Urban Zone, to Medium Density 236 Cashmere Road (RS 41613) - Rural Urban Fringe and proposed Future Urban Zone, to</p>	<p>Reject Those parts of the submission from Cashmere Park Ltd, Hartward Investment Trust and Robert Brown's (s593.X) seeking rezoning of land from Rural Urban Fringe Zone to MDRZ are considered out of scope and should be rejected. Those parts of the submission seeking rezoning of land from FUZ to MDRZ should be rejected on the basis that as a largely undeveloped greenfield area, the provisions of the FUZ are the more efficient and effective method to achieve the relevant</p>

				Medium Density 200 Cashmere Road (Lot 1 DP 547021) - Rural Urban Fringe and proposed Future Urban Zone, to Medium Density As show on Planning Map 45	objectives of the plan. There is currently insufficient information to confirm whether the MDRZ could provide an adequate and appropriate framework for managing urban development and ongoing land use in this area.
Jo Appleyard for Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	852.13	852	Oppose	Amend the planning maps to remove Residential New Neighbourhood zoning and rename to Residential Suburban or Residential Suburban Density Transition zone.	Reject Area has not been developed and should not be shown as Residential New Neighbourhood Zone as no such zone is proposed under Plan Change 14. The appropriate zone for underdeveloped greenfield land is Future Urban Zone.
Fiona Aston for Troy Lange	884.3	884	Seek Amendment	Rezone 120, 100, 88, 76, 68, 66, 60, 46, 44, 42, 40 and 38 Hawthornden Road Future Urban Zone or Medium Density Residential.	Reject Rural zoned land is out of scope of PC14. Land is within the 50 dB Ldn Air Noise Controur and partly within the 55 dB Ldn Air Noise Contour CIA Protection Surfaces control