

PC14 COUNCIL REPLY - SECTION 42A REPORT OF IAN BAYLISS - TABLE OF SUBMISSIONS WITH RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS (UPDATED FOLLOWING HEARING)

The following provides an updated account of response to submissions relevant to the s42A report of Liz White.

Text in **bold dark orange underlined** indicates responses to submissions that are recommended to be altered from the recommendations to the s42A and text recommended to be deleted in ~~**bold dark orange strikethrough**~~.

Submission points highlighted with a light orange background were not included in the s42A evidence in chief.

Where the officer recommendation on a specific submission point is to “reject”, this recommendation may be based on planning merit or if the submission point is considered outside the scope of this plan change, it may be a matter not able to be considered through a change to the District Plan.

Council have provided documentation of both original and further submissions. This is available via the following link:

<https://makeasubmission.ccc.govt.nz/PublicSubmissionSearch.aspx>.

| 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. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitters | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | FS2037.423 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Support | Out of scope |
| John Glennie | 472.1 | 472 | Seek Amendment | That the impact of increased traffic on a shared long driveway be added to the list of | | <u>Reject Out of scope</u> Long driveways are not considered to be an appropriate qualifying matter and the |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons | |
|----------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------------|---|---|--------------|
| | | | | Qualifying Matters and that the owners of existing houses on the driveway be able to object to the effects. | existing matters of control for subdivision in 8.7.4.1 Subdivision design and 8.7.4.4 Transport networks provides scope for this issue to be addressed if it is a significant issue. Regarding facilitating owners of existing houses on long driveways to object to subdivisions, this relief is considered out of scope as it exceeds the scope of this process. | |
| 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 | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | | |
| | | | FS20382.905 | Kainga Ora – Seek Amendment | Reject | |
| Robert J Manthei | 200.14 200.13 | 200 | Seek Amendment | Stop enabling Greenfield developments | Out of scope Relief sought not possible through this topic or exceeds the scope of this process. | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2037.292 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Support | Out of scope |
| Golden Section | 460.2 | 460 | Oppose | [Retain operative standards] - No change to the | Reject | |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--|-------------|---------------|--|--|----------------|--|
| Property | | | | subdivision rules to residential areas. | | Relief sought is contrary to section 77G of the RMA as amended by the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act. |
| Sarah Flynn | 310.1 | 310 | Seek Amendment | Insert provisions to encourage the retention and recycling of materials from demolished buildings | | Out of scope Relief sought not possible through this topic or exceeds the scope of this process. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2037.414 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Support | Out of scope |
| 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 |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2044.91 #FS2045.95 #FS2049.45 | Chapman Tripp on behalf of Catholic Diocese of Christchurch | Support | 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 |
| Lydia Shirley for Fire and Emergency | 842.28 | 842 | Seek Amendment | Add new policy: 14.2.8.8 Policy – Reverse sensitivity a. Within Future Urban areas: | | Reject Consistent with the evidence of Ike Kleybos in relation to 14.2.3 MDRS |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons | |
|--|-------------|---------------|------------------------|--|--|--------|
| | | | | i. enable the ongoing operation, use and redevelopment of existing emergency service facilities. | Objective 2 and associated policies, it is recommended that the addition of a policy addressing reverse sensitivity effects on the operation, use and redevelopment of existing emergency services, that is applicable across all residential zones (including the FUZ) at 14.2.3.6, is an appropriate and effective response to the issue raised. | |
| 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 | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2037.1035 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Support | Accept |
| Carter Group Limited | 814.76 | 814 | Support | Policy 8.2.2.2 - Retain policy as notified | Accept | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2082.906 | Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora | Oppose | Reject |
| The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch | 823.69 | 823 | Support | Policy 8.2.2.2 - Retain policy as notified | Accept | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2037.1301 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Oppose | Reject |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|----------------|----------------------------|
| | | | #FS2045.242 | Chapman Tripp on behalf of Carter Group Limited | Support | Accept |
| Environment Canterbury / Canterbury Regional Council | 689.14 | 689 | Support | Retain Policy 8.2.2.3 as notified | | Accept |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2037.1036 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Support | Accept |
| Environment Canterbury / Canterbury Regional Council | 689.15 | 689 | Support | Retain Policy 8.2.2.7 as notified. | | Accept |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2037.1037 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Support | Accept |
| Carter Group Limited | 814.77 | 814 | Support | Retain Policy 8.2.2.3 as notified | | Accept |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2082.907 | Kainga Ora | Oppose | Reject |
| The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch | 823.70 | 823 | Support | Retain Policy 8.2.2.7 as notified. | | Accept |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2037.1302 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Oppose | Reject |
| | | | #FS2045.243 | Chapman Tripp on behalf of Carter Group Limited | Support | Accept |
| Danne Mora Limited | 903.27 | 903 | Support | | | Accept |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons | |
|---|-------------|---------------|------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd | 914.11 | 914 | Support | Retain Policy 8.2.2.7 as notified where it relates to the net yield specified for the Medium and High Density Zones. | | |
| 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 fails to give effect to the direction of relevant provisions of the CRPS on minimum density in greenfield developments. | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2097.40 | Summerset Group Holdings Limited - support | Support | Reject |
| | | | #FS2098.13 | Rachel Sanders & Neighbours – seek amendment | Oppose | Reject |
| 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 to be considered. "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. "Net | |
| Davie Lovell Smith | 914.11 | 914 | | | | |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|---|-------------|---------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | 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 objectives 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 Kleynbos in |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--------------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|--|----------------|---|
| | | | | | | relation to residential zone requests, the 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, giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS UD. 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. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2082.485 | Kainga Ora | Support | Reject |
| 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 |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---|--|
| 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. |
| 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 ODP 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, supports retaining those matters as appropriate qualifying matters for greenfield areas. |
| Milns Park Limited | 916.11 | 916 | | | |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---|--|
| Patricia Harte for Danne Mora Limited | 903.11 | 903 | Seek Amendment | Amend the High Density Residential Zone boundary to stop at Manarola Road with all land to the south owned by Spreydon Lodge Limited to be zoned FUZ, including Lot 3000 DP 575180, Lot 121 DP 514750 and Lot 120 DP 514570. | Reject Consistent with the evidence of Ike Kleybos in his s42A in relation to extending HRZ into the FUZ, it is recommended that the HRZ catchment around North Halswell be extended to a 600m walking catchment with Greenfield Development QM(s) applied. |
| Patricia Harte for Danne Mora Limited | 903.12 | 903 | Support | Support the FUZ zoning of Lots 120 and 121 DP 514750. | Reject Consistent with the evidence of Ike Kleybos in his s42A in relation to extending HRZ into the FUZ, it is recommended that the HRZ catchment around North Halswell be extended to a 600m walking catchment with Greenfield Development QM(s) applied. |
| 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 ODP 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 Suidivision and ODPs, determined those matters remain |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | important such that they are justified as qualifying matters for greenfield areas. |
| Patricia Harte for Danne Mora Limited | 903.42 | 903 | Oppose | Delete Advice Note in 14.12 Rules Future Urban Zone | Accept As set out in the s32 for Chapter 8 and the FUZ, it is proposed to remove the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay and its associated objective, policy and rules as part of PC14 and this advice note should be removed as part of this change. |
| Patricia Harte for Danne Mora Limited | 903.44 | 903 | Oppose | Delete RD28 Buildings that do not meet Rule 14.12.2.18 – Roof form – Area 1 Appendix 8.10.4 North Halswell ODP | Accept As set out in the s32 for Chapter 8 and the FUZ PC14 proposes to remove the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay and its associated objective, policy and rules. The only Exemplar provisions carried over in PC10 to be retained are requirements that residential lots must face the Green Corridor, with vehicle access to the rear of the site. |
| Patricia Harte for Danne Mora Limited | 903.45 | 903 | Oppose | Delete Built Form Standard 14.12.2.18 | Accept As set out in the s32 for Chapter 8 and the FUZ PC14 proposes to remove the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay and its associated objective, policy and rules. |
| 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 |
| Milns Park Limited | 916.10 | 916 | Seek Amendment | | |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | 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. |
| 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. | <p>Accept in part</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It is recommended that standard 8.6.15 is amended to make it clear which provisions these requirements are referring to and where.</p> |
| Milns Park Limited | 916.9 | 916 | | | |
| 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. | <p>Accept in part</p> <p>These terms are to be removed in relation to the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay only and will continue to apply to East Papanui.</p> |
| Danne Mora Limited | 903.31 | S1.1 | Support | Support the deletion of references to the Meadowlands Exemplar Overlay. | Accept |
| Nick Scott | 455.3 | 455 | Support | [Retain FUZ provisions as proposed] | <p>Accept in part</p> <p>The notified FUZ provisions are recommended to be retained for the most part other than discrete amendments.</p> |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|---|----------------|---------------|----------------|--|---|
| Holly Luzak for Cashmere Park Ltd, Hartward Investment Trust and Robert Brown | 593.3 593.5 | 593 | Seek Amendment | 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 Medium Density 200 Cashmere Road (Lot 1 DP 547021) - Rural Urban Fringe and proposed Future Urban Zone, to Medium Density As shown on Planning Map 45 | Reject Land zoned Rural Urban Fringe is not a zone that falls within the scope of an IPI and requests to upzone RuUF zoned land are considered to be out of scope. If the issue of scope were able to be resolved it is accepted that the proposed ODP will provide for outcomes consistent with the relevant objectives and policies. The issue of the NPS HPL and its prohibition of the development of LUC1-3 land other than in limited circumstances has not been satisfactorily resolved and this national directive necessitates that the proposed rezoning should be refused. |
| Justin Avi | 402.3 | 402 | Seek Amendment | Upzone the Future Urban Zone near the new North Halswell town centre to high density. | Accept in part The land immediately adjoining the new North Halswell town centre has been upzoned from FUZ to HDRZ in the notified mapping for PC14 and is supported by Council. |
| Julie Comfort for 25 KBR Limited | 915.2 | 915 | Seek Amendment | Retain the Future Urban Zone over the residential portion of 432 Spark Road. | Accept Consistent with the evidence of Kirk Lightbody and the Appendix 1 table of rezoning requests in his section 42A report, rezoning the site to Town Centre is not |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--------------|----------------------|---------------|---------|--|---|
| | | | | | supported and the FUZ is recommended to be retained. |
| Alana Harper | 36.2 36.3 36.4 | 36 | Support | Cashmere Hills should all stay as Residential Hills Zone or change to Future Urban Zone. | <p>Reject</p> <p>The notified zoning of the site as FUZ in PC14 contradicts the identification of the site as being within the MRZ – Residential Hills Precinct as the Hills Precinct Provisions do not apply through the FUZ. Also, the Outline Development Plan (ODP) provisions for this area are implemented within the FUZ and are not referenced in the MRZ provisions.</p> <p>The area is considered to have similar characteristics in terms of potential for development and relevant accessibility and environmental constraints as other areas of the Hills and the recommendation for this area is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. to rezone the areas currently zoned FUZ within the ODP area to MRZa; and b. to apply the MRZ Suburban Hills Precinct to the area furthest from the McVicar Drive only and zone the balance of the area as MRZ with no LPTAA constraint to this area only. Residential development areas outside of the land which has already been developed within the ODP area as Residential Suburban Precinct. |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons | | | | |
|---|-------------|---------------|----------------|---|---|------------------------|--|----------------|---------------|
| 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 575m ² . | <p>Reject</p> <p>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:</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 amenity outcomes on sites. o 575m² has no clear advantage in terms of the management of effects. | | | | |
| | | | | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | | | | #FS2068.46 | Red Spur Ltd | Support | Reject |
| | | | | | | #FS2074.5 | Rachel Sanders for Group of Neighbours | Oppose | Accept |
| 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 | <p>Reject</p> <p>The proposed amendments require removal of the LPTAA qualifying matter, (which I</p> | | | | |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|-----------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|--|----------------|---|
| | | | | demonstrating that a permitted residential unit 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. | | agree with and support in a modified form as set out in the evidence of Mr Ike Kleynbos). Where MRZ is to be applied, a Suburban Hills Precinct overlay applying particular constraints in this area to address topography, accessibility to public transport, stormwater and wastewater servicing constraints, and which provides a framework for considering and where appropriate allowing additional development in this area is supported. 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)) in that it would significantly reduce the intended flexibility for future use of the land resource for housing development. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2068.47 | Fiona Aston for Red Spur Ltd | Oppose | Accept |
| | | | #FS2074.6 | Rachel Sanders for Group of Neighbours | Oppose | Accept |
| | | | #FS2082.341 | Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora | Oppose | Accept |
| Andrew McCarthy | 681.7 | 681 | Seek Amendment | Delete Table 1.b. Additional Standards, c. i and ii [minimum building area and curtilage area] | | Reject |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|-----------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|--|----------------|---|
| | | | | | | <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 (in terms of public transport). o Enable three residential units as prescribed by the MDRS, while recognising the more challenging topography and associated challenges with stormwater and discharges within the Residential Hills Precinct. o Ensure allotments are usable and can be serviced and achieve basic onsite amenity outcomes. <p>In light of these factors described in further detail in the s42A evidence and rebuttal of Mr Ike Kleynbos, the changes sought have no clear advantage in achieving the relevant objectives and policies.</p> |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2068.48 | Red Spur Ltd | Oppose | Accept |
| | | | #FS2074.7 | Rachel Sanders for Group of Neighbours | Oppose | Accept |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|---|-------------|---------------|----------------|--|---|
| 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 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. |
| Carlin Rutherford for Rutherford Family Trust | 879.1 | 879 | Seek Amendment | Remove the Moncks Spur/Mt Pleasant Overlay (including reference to it on Planning Map 48) | Accept 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 of this kind. |
| Carlin Rutherford for Rutherford Family Trust | 879.6 | 879 | Seek Amendment | Ensure the zoning of the Land optimally provides for Enabling Housing and Housing Choice to better accord with NPS-UD objectives Subject to materials to be presented, solutions may include: Correct the zoning of the Middle Land [2 Crest Lane] to RH (together with removal of the provisions in referred to in rules referred to in 1-6 in our submission point #1 herein); together with mechanisms that ensure the Land provides for Enabling Housing and Housing Choice to better accord with NPS-UD objectives. OR to better achieve the objectives under NPS-UD, apply FUZ to the Middle Land [2 Crest Lane], but in a manner that increases the density from RH, and enables a variety of some smaller section sizes e.g. 400sqm where appropriate, to allow housing choice as required by NPS-UD. | Reject Consistent with the evidence of Ike Kleynbos (which I agree with and support), I recommend zoning the land MRZ and application of a Suburban Hills Precinct overlay with associated controls on density depending on the accessibility and servicing of the site is considered an appropriate response to the legislative requirements and the relevant objectives and policies. The recommended restricted discretionary standards under 14.5.3.1.3 (RD16 to RD19) and associated subdivision controls and policies under 14.2 (in particular 14.2.6.3) provides a framework for considering smaller sites where appropriate. |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|--|--|
| Cashmere Developments Ltd | 257.1 | 257 | Seek Amendment | <p>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'.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • i. no more than 380 residential allotments shall be crated or enabled by subdivision. • 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):</p> <p>Net Site Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a. No more than 380 residential allotments shall be created or | <p>Accept in part</p> <p>The existing framework of zones and overlays is not supported in that the MRZ 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. This limit does not align as a QM meeting any of those relevant parameters.</p> <p>The matters addressed by the Outline Development Plan such as the vesting of land outside of the development areas have been addressed such that it is no longer justified as a qualifying matter.</p> <p>It is recommended that the site be rezoned to MRZ, the MRZ Suburban Hills Precinct with the 650m² minimum site standard applied and the 380 total residential units standards deleted.</p> |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p><i>enabled by subdivision;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> | |
| 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 MRZ 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. This limit does not align as a QM meeting any of those relevant parameters.</p> <p>The matters addressed by the Outline Development Plan such as the vesting of land outside of the development areas have been addressed such that it is no longer justified as a qualifying matter.</p> <p>It is recommended that the site be rezoned to MRZ, the MRZ Suburban Hills Precinct with the 650m² minimum site standard applied and the 380 total residential units standards deleted.</p> |
| David McLauchlan | 653.8 | 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. | <p>Reject</p> <p>The Council has a duty to give effect to policy 3 of the NPS UD in residential zones through this plan change including enabling</p> |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons | |
|--------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|--|---------------|
| | | | | | density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, and enabling subdivision through provisions that must be consistent with the level of development permitted under schedule 3A for most subdivisions. | |
| 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 MRZ with Suburban Hill Density Precent through applying the LPTAA QM is recommended. | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2089.9 | Four Star Development Ltd and Gould Developments Limited | Support | Reject |
| | 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 | Accept Residential Mixed Density Precinct Redmund Spur Overlay deleted in notified provisions. | |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | the maximum number of allotments shall be 400. | |
| | 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 area.</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 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. |
| 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 | 61.15 | 61 | Seek Amendment | Amend 14.6.1 by requiring High Density Residential development to have a minimum of a 400sq m site | Reject |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---|--------------------------|--|--------|
| Neighbourhood Association (VNA) | | | | to be able to subdivide as set out in the operative District Plan | | 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. | |
| | | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | | #FS2037.103 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Support | Reject |
| | | | | #FS2042.15 | Cambridge 137 Limited | Oppose | Accept |
| | | | | #FS2082.26 | Kainga Ora | Oppose | Accept |
| 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 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. | |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|----------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | 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. |
| 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 MRZ 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 | Reject |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | MRZ and current (not proposed) size for HRZ | The standards proposed for vacant allotments in the MRZ (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 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 <u>Proposed Rule 8.6.2(a) provides for the relief sought in part. This provides for subdivision around existing, approved, or concurrently consented dwellings in the MRZ/HDRZ. In accordance with Schedule 3A this rule cannot have minimum lot size requirements.</u> |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>However, the following drafting changes (shown as underlined text) will make the table consistent with the drafting conventions of the Operative Plan and further clarify that the changes in PC14 are not more constraining than the equivalent existing ones:</p> <p><u>h. Medium Density Residential Zone, High Density Residential Zone, and Future Urban Zone where the 'building' is a residential unit or units (except as provided for below) No Minimum</u></p> <p><u>i. Medium Density Residential Zone Residential Hills Precinct, High Density Residential Zone, and Future Urban Zone</u> where the 'building' is not a residential unit or units/s 400m2 in the Medium Density Residential Zone 650m2 in the Residential Hills Precinct 300m2 in the High Density Residential Zone <u>300m2 in the Future Urban Zone (except as provided for in Rule 8.6.11 Table 8)</u></p> |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose |
| | | | #FS2037.1472 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Oppose |
| | | | | | Accept Reject |
| Megan Power | 769.1 | 769 | Support | [Supports] in general the following provisions: Chapter 8 Subdivision | Accept in part |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|----------------|--|
| | | | | 8.6.1 Minimum net site area and dimension, Table 1, a., Additional Standards | | 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 |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2031.35 | Arlene Baird | Oppose | Reject |
| | | | #FS2051.34 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Oppose | Reject |
| | | | #FS2068.39 | Red Spur Ltd | Oppose | Accept |
| | | | #FS2082.920 | Kainga Ora | Support | Reject |
| The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch | 823.83 | 823 | Oppose | Oppose 8.6.1 Table 1. Seek that it is deleted. | | Oppose |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2031.36 | Arlene Baird | Oppose | Reject |
| | | | #FS2037.1315 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Oppose | Reject |
| | | | #FS2051.35 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | Oppose | Reject |
| | | | #FS2045.256 | Carter Group Limited | Support | Accept |
| | | | #FS2082.1146 | Kainga Ora | Oppose | Reject |
| 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 |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | | |
| | | | #FS2082.921 | Kainga Ora | Oppose | Reject |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|---|---------------|
| The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch | 823.84 | 823 | Support | Table 2 -4 Min net site areas - other zones. Retain the changes as proposed to Rule 8.6.1 Tables 2 – 5. | | Accept |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2037.1316 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Oppose | Reject |
| | | | #FS2045.257 | Carter Group Limited | Support | Accept |
| | | | #FS2082.1147 | Kainga Ora | Oppose | Reject |
| 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 | Accept The changes sought to standards for allotments with existing or proposed buildings in the RNNZ in the operative plan (which had no minimum allotment size) are considered out of scope. However, removing the no-minimum allotment size standard from the operative plan RNNZ and MRZ is mentioned in the section 32 evaluation but having no standard means that such . No minimum allotment size when subdividing around existing building recommended for the FUZ. | |
| 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 | Seek Amendment | Amend the standard to make it clear that there is no minimum allotment size in The FUZ zone around existing buildings | Accept Although the change sought is neutral in terms of legal effect, the changes sought will improve the clarity and consistency of the relevant table (Table 6 of Rule 8.6.2). | |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| | | | | | | No minimum allotment size when subdividing around existing building recommended for the FUZ. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2052.53 | Christchurch International Airport Limited | Oppose | Reject |
| Milns Park Limited | 916.8 | 916 | Seek Amendment | Amend the standard to make it clear that there is no minimum allotment size in The FUZ zone around existing buildings | | Accept Although the change sought is neutral in terms of legal effect, the changes sought will improve the clarity and consistency of the relevant table (Table 6 of Rule 8.6.2). No minimum allotment size when subdividing around existing building recommended for the FUZ. |
| 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 Hills Precinct) Zone the allotment shall have a minimum dimension of 17m x 12m.</p> <p><u>This shape factor shall be located outside of:</u></p> <p><u>1. Land which may be subject to instability or is otherwise geotechnically unsuitable;</u></p> | | Reject 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 through subdivision are fit for development covering both MDRS |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons | |
|-----------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|---|--------|
| | | | | <p><u>2. Any existing or proposed easement areas required for access or services purposes;</u> <u>Network Utilities, including private and public lines.</u></p> | <p>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.</p> <p><u>The 8m x 15m shape factor dimensions recommended by the submitter would allow and potentially encourage significantly smaller sites than the standards needed to enable the level of development enabled by the MDRS. This would allow greater flexibility to maximise development however having the Plan anticipate much smaller sites in these residential zones could in turn could lead to pressure on decision makers to allow infringements to site coverage, outlook space and setback standards in the development of these lots resulting in patterns of subdivision and development with a lack of diversity in terms of housing typologies and reduced amenity values.</u></p> | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2056.20 | Orion New Zealand Limited | Support | Accept |
| | | | # FS2068.13 | Red Spur Ltd | Support | Accept |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------|--|--|
| Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities | 834.131 | 834 | Oppose | <p>Table 1 – Minimum net site area Clause (a) and (c) Table 6 – Allotments with existing or proposed buildings.</p> <p>Delete Table 1 and Table 6.</p> | <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 through subdivision are fit for development covering both MDRS 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.</p> <p><u>The 8m x 15m shape factor dimensions recommended by the submitter would allow and potentially encourage significantly smaller sites than the standards needed to enable the level of development enabled by the MDRS. This would allow greater flexibility to maximise development however having the Plan anticipate much smaller sites in these residential zones could in turn could lead</u></p> |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| | | | | | | <u>to pressure on decision makers to allow infringements to site coverage, outlook space and setback standards in the development of these lots resulting in patterns of subdivision and development with a lack of diversity in terms of housing typologies and reduced amenity values.</u> |
| 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. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2031.37 | Arlene Baird | Oppose | Accept |
| | | | #FS2051.36 | Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - oppose | | Accept |
| Caitriona Cameron | 272.2 | 272 | Seek Amendment | Increase minimum plot sizes for plots with 3+ storey residential buildings. The proposal should facilitate coherent residential planning, rather than allow a solely market-driven approach which risks 'lowest common denominator' development. | | Accept in part The notified provisions and the recommended provisions in 8.5.1.2 (C9 and C10) provide that subdivisions that increase the degree of non-compliance with built form standards of the applicable zone (including 12m (3 storey) height limits in the most residential areas) go from controlled |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|------------------------|--|----------------|--|
| | | | | | | activity to restricted discretionary activity and 8.6.1 activity standards including minimum lot sizes apply. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | FS2037.386 | Ross Gray for Christchurch Civic Trust | Support | Reject |
| Stuart Roberts | 465.6 | 465 | Oppose | Minimum subdivisible section size at 450 sqm for MRZ and current (not proposed) size for HRZ | | Reject 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. These sizes take into account MDRS 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. |
| 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, | | Reject The scope of future monitoring and policy reviews are a separate matter. |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|--|--------|
| | | | | property and the natural environment are not permitted. | | |
| 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 | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2082.923 | Kainga Ora | Oppose | Oppose |
| The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch | 823.86 | 823 | Support | Retain the Rules in 8.9 as notified. | Accept | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2037.1318 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Oppose | Reject |
| | | | #FS2045.259 | Carter Group Limited | Support | Accept |
| | | | #FS2082.1149 | Kainga Ora | Oppose | Reject |
| Daresbury Ltd | 874.9 | 874 | Support | Retain the Rules in 8.9 as notified. | Accept | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|----------------|----------------------------|
| | | | #FS2037.621 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Oppose | Reject |
| 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. Retain the Sites of Cultural Significance qualifying matter. | | Accept |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2052.12 | Christchurch International Airport Limited | Oppose | Reject |
| Environment Canterbury / Canterbury Regional Council | 689.82 | 689 | Support | Rule 8.9.3 Exemptions Retain amendment to a.xii | | Accept |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2037.1104 | Christchurch Civic Trust | Support | Accept |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons | |
|--|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|----------------|--|--------|
| 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> | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | | |
| | | | #FS2037.1132 | Ross Gray for Christchurch Civic Trust | Support | | Reject |
| | | | #FS2082.372 | Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora | Oppose | | Accept |
| 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. | | <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</p> | |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons | |
|---|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|---|--------|
| | | | | | scope to make this change through an ISPP as it is not clear the relief is consequential to the implementation of MDRS. A standalone or follow up Schedule 1 plan change could be advanced to address this matter in the future if needed. | |
| 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. | Reject 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. 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. A standalone or follow up Schedule 1 plan change could be advanced to address this matter in the future if needed. | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2037.781 | Ross Gray for Christchurch Civic Trust | Support | Reject |
| | | | #FS2063.92 | Ryman Healthcare Limited | Support | Reject |
| | | | #FS2064.89 | Retirement Village Association of New Zealand | Support | Reject |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| | | | | Incorporated | | |
| 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 50m3 250m3 [sic] / site <u>net fill above existing ground level</u> | | Reject As this change would affect zones and land not part of PC14 there is potentially no scope to make this change through an ISPP. It is noted that earthworks within the envelope of a building requiring building consent currently do not lead to this rule being breached and while it is accepted that greater intensification in residential is likely to see this standard being breached and resource consents being required more often, an amended form of the changes sought to bring it into scope is not supported. It is further noted that effects such as dust, erosion and sediment migration are proportional to the total volume of earthworks, not just the volume of fill. Height and water displacement are not the only matters to address. A standalone or follow up Schedule 1 plan change (PC17) can address this matter in the near future to the extent that might be needed. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2044.93 | Lucy Forrester for Chapman Tripp on behalf of Catholic Diocese of Christchurch | Support | Reject |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---|---------|--|
| | | | #FS2045.97 | Lucy Forrester for Chapman Tripp on behalf of Carter Group Limited | Support | Reject |
| | | | #FS2049.50 | Lucy Forrester for Chapman Tripp on behalf of LMM Investments 2012 Limited | Support | Reject |
| Otautahi Community Housing Trust | 877.20 | 877 | Seek Amendment | Re 8.9.2.1 Permitted Activities Amend Table 9(d) so the maximum volume is 50m³ 250m³ [sic] / site <u>net fill above existing ground level</u> | | <p>Reject</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. It is noted that earthworks within the envelope of a building requiring building consent currently do not lead to this rule being breached and while it is accepted that greater intensification in residential is likely to see this standard being breached and resource consents being required more often, an amended form of the changes sought to bring it into scope is not supported. It is further noted that effects such as dust, erosion and sediment migration are proportional to the total volume of earthworks, not just the volume of fill. Height and water displacement are not the only matters to address.</p> <p>A standalone or follow up Schedule 1 plan change (PC17) can address this matter in the near future to the extent that might be needed.</p> |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|--|----------------|--|
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2082.1248 | Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora | Oppose | Reject |
| | | | #FS2082.1316 | Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora | Oppose | Reject |
| 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. | | <p>Reject</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. It is noted that earthworks within the envelope of a building requiring building consent currently do not lead to this rule being breached and while it is accepted that greater intensification in residential is likely to see this standard being breached and resource consents being required more often, an amended form of the changes sought to bring it into scope is not supported. It is further noted that effects such as dust, erosion and sediment migration are proportional to the total volume of earthworks, not just the volume of fill. Height and water displacement are not the only matters to address.</p> <p>A standalone or follow up Schedule 1 plan change (PC17) can address this matter in the near future to the extent that might be needed.</p> |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|--|----------------|--|
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2037.159 | Ross Gray for Christchurch Civic Trust | Oppose | Reject |
| Doug Latham | 30.6 | 30 | Seek Amendment | Amend Rule 8.9.2.1, Table 9 Maximum volumes – earthworks to increase the 20m3 threshold for residential sites. Could add standard controls, e.g. having a sediment control plan in place within the permitted activity status. | | <p>Reject</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. It is noted that earthworks within the envelope of a building requiring building consent currently do not lead to this rule being breached and while it is accepted that greater intensification in residential is likely to see this standard being breached and resource consents being required more often, an amended form of the changes sought to bring it into scope is not supported. It is further noted that effects such as dust, erosion and sediment migration are proportional to the total volume of earthworks, not just the volume of fill. Height and water displacement are not the only matters to address.</p> <p>A standalone or follow up Schedule 1 plan change (PC17) can address this matter in the near future to the extent that might be needed.</p> |
| Di Noble | 477.2 | 477 | Oppose | Oppose PC14 changes to the earthworks rules in general. | | <p>Reject</p> <p>There are no significant changes to the earthworks rules proposed through the</p> |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|---|------------------|---------------|------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| | | | | | | notified provisions of PC14 or recommended as a result of submissions. |
| 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. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2082.909 | Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora | Oppose | Accept |
| | | | #FS2082.910 | Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora | Oppose | Accept |
| The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch | 823.72 | 823 | 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. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2037.1304 | Ross Gray for Christchurch Civic Trust | Oppose | Accept |
| | | | #FS2045.245 | Lucy Forrester for Chapman Tripp on behalf of Carter Group Limited | Support | Reject |
| Environment Canterbury / | 689.17 | 689 | Support | Retain Policy 8.2.3.2 as notified | | Accept |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| Canterbury Regional Council | | | #FS2037.1039 | Ross Gray for Christchurch Civic Trust | Support | 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 Common understanding of the term development matches the intent of the policy |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | | |
| | | | #FS2037.1305 | Ross Gray for Christchurch Civic Trust - Oppose | Accept | |
| | | | #FS2045.246 | Lucy Forrester for Chapman Tripp on behalf of Carter Group Limited – Support | Reject | |
| 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 |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | #FS2010.4 | Lydia Shirley on behalf of Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | 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; iii. <u>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 | 806.12 | 806 | Seek Amendment | Seek amendment to Matters of Discretion: Add wording: | | Reject |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons | |
|-------------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------------|--|---|--------|
| (Ministry of Education) | | | | <u>p. Whether the development is supported by additional infrastructure as defined by the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS- UD)</u> | 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. | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | FS2037.195 | Ross Gray for Christchurch Civic Trust | Support | Reject |
| 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. | |
| 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 and affects areas not | |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| | | | | | | part of 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. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | FS2037.642 | Ross Gray for Christchurch Civic Trust | Oppose | Accept |
| ISSUE 7 – CHANGES OF TENURE | | | | | | |
| Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd | 914.22 | 914 | 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. |
| 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 some way) 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. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | FS2037.1105 | Ross Gray for Christchurch Civic Trust | Support | Reject |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| | | | FS2082.345 | Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora | Oppose | Accept |
| 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 directives favour allowing more flexibility. There is no scope to significantly constrain property rights with decisions on PC14. This change could be advanced as a separate plan change but might require specific 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. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | FS2068.34 | Fiona Aston for Red Spur Ltd | Support | Reject |
| | | | FS2082.916 | Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora | Oppose | Accept |
| The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch | 823.79 | 823 | 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. |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------------|--|----------------|---|
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | Support/Oppose |
| | | | FS2037.1311 | Ross Gray for Christchurch Civic Trust | Oppose | Oppose |
| | | | FS2045.252 | Lucy Forrester for Chapman Tripp on behalf of Carter Group Limited | Support | Oppose |
| | | | FS2082.1142 | Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora | Oppose | Accept |
| 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 | 398.1 398.4 | 398 | Seek Amendment | Where existing properties are to be subdivided /redeveloped/ intensified the affected neighboring properties must have the right to decline consent. | | Reject 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 |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | FS2068.36 | Fiona Aston for Red Spur Ltd - support | Support | Accept |
| | | | FS2082.918 | Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – seek amendment | Oppose | Reject |
| The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch | 823.81 | 823 | Support | Retain 8.4.1.1 as notified. | | Accept |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|---|-------------|---------------|------------------------|---|----------------|--|
| | | | FS2037.1313 | Ross Gray for Christchurch Civic Trust | Oppose | Reject |
| | | | FS2045.254 | Lucy Forrester for Chapman Tripp on behalf of Carter Group Limited | Support | Accept |
| | | | FS2082.1144 | Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora | Oppose | Reject |
| Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities | 834.127 | 834 | Support | Retain 8.4.1.1 as notified. | | Accept |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | FS2044.92 | Lucy Forrester for Chapman Tripp on behalf of Catholic Diocese of Christchurch | Support | Accept |
| | | | FS2045.96 | Lucy Forrester for Chapman Tripp on behalf of Carter Group Limited | Support | Accept |
| | | | FS2052.21 | Jo Appleyard for Christchurch International Airport Limited | Oppose | Reject |
| 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. |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|--|----------------|---|
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | FS2068.37 | Fiona Aston for Red Spur Ltd - support | Support | Accept |
| | | | FS2082.919 | Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Seek Amendment | Oppose | Reject |
| The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch | 823.82 | 823 | 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. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | FS2037.1314 | Ross Gray for Christchurch Civic Trust - oppose | Oppose | Reject |
| | | | FS2045.255 | Lucy Forrester for Chapman Tripp on behalf of Carter Group Limited - support | Support | Accept |
| | | | FS2082.1145 | Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Seek Amendment | Oppose | Reject |
| 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 | | 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 |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | network utilities capacity. | |
| Denis Morgan | 315.7 315.10 | 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 in rules 14.5.2 and 14.6.2.</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. |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------|--|----------------|--|
| Fire and Emergency | 842.19 | 842 | Support | [8.5.1.2 Controlled ActivitiesC8] Retain as notified. | | Accept in part Provisions are retained as notified for the most part other than a minor change to C9. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | FS2010.5 | Lydia Shirley on behalf of Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support | Reject |
| 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. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | FS2010.6 | Lydia Shirley on behalf of Fire and Emergency New Zealand - support | Support | Reject |
| Lydia Shirley for Fire and Emergency | 842.44 | 842 | Seek Amendment | <p>Amend 14.12.2.5-Minimum building setbacks from internal boundaries and railway lines as follows:</p> <p>a. The minimum building setback from internal boundaries shall be as follows:</p> <p>c. b. For a retirement village or a comprehensive residential development, this rule applies only to the internal boundaries on the perimeter of the entire development.</p> <p>d. c. For the purposes of this rule, this excludes guttering up to 200mm in width from the wall of a building.</p> <p>Advice note:</p> | | Accept Consistent with the evidence of Ike Kleybos in relation to rule 14.5.2.3, an advice note drawing attention to building code requirements for firefighting access which apply in addition to the building setback requirements is supported. |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Insurance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted. | |
| Lydia Shirley for Fire and Emergency | 842.43 | 842 | Seek Amendment | Amend 14.12.2.1-Building height as follows: Advice note: 1. See the permitted height exceptions contained within the definition of height 2. Emergency service facilities, emergency service towers and communication poles are exempt from this rule. | Accept in part Consistent with the evidence of Ike Kleybos in relation to rule 14.5.2.7 in the MRZ, a blanket exemption from the height limit provisions is not supported, however to address the issue raised, a 14m height limit for emergency service towers and communication poles is recommended to be added to Rule 14.12.2.1. |
| 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. |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|--|--|
| 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 |
| Danne Mora Limited | 903.26 | 903 | Support | Support the removal of NC8 | Accept |
| Gavin Keats | 52.2 | 52 | Seek Amendment | Development should only be provided for when services such as power, waste and storm water are upgraded. | Reject Consistent with Council’s evidence in relation to Residential development and the evidence of Ike Kleybos in his s42A report s77G of the Act requires Council to apply MDRS across all relevant residential zones. Because the Council is required to apply the MDRS (unless a QM exists) submissions expressing general opposition to these standards are out of scope. Only in cases where new QMs have been proposed is there the ability to reduce MDRS or Policy 3 |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|---|-------------|---------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | levels of intensification. In addition, any proposed rule is unable to control a matter that would manage something that MDRS density standards already seek to manage, or would mean that an MDRS density standard could not be achieved. This means that, for instance, additional standards to manage an MDRS density standard are not possible, unless such standards make the MDRS density standard more lenient (s77H). The council still maintains the ability to deny building consent applications where insufficient network capacity is provided for, and it does exercise that power under the Local Government Act 19745 and Building Act 2004. |
| 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. | Reject 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. |
| 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 | Reject |

| Submitter | Decision No | Submitter No. | Request | Decision Sought | Recommendation and Reasons |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------|---|---|
| R.J Crozier | 511.3 | 511 | | (2)(d) provision. | <p>The submitters have not been able to assist with further information and it is still not clear from information available 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> <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 still an undeveloped greenfield area, it is most appropriate to zone it as FUZ and the provisions for this area do not require evaluation as Qualifying Matters.</p> |
| ISSUE 12 – REZONE REQUESTS | | | | | |
| Dean Christie for Ngai Tahu Property | 4.3 4.4 | 4 | Oppose | Rezone the site at 35 Steadman Road, Karamu (Lot 2 Deposited Plan 541604) from Medium Residential Zone to be Future Urban Zone. | <p>Reject</p> <p>With an approved development scheme in place for the site, there is no clear reason to apply the FUZ, and the presumption in section 77G of the RMA that MDRS should be applied should prevail unless there are</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | clear reasons not to consistent with the specified exceptions. |
| Dean Christie for Ngai Tahu Property | 4.2 | 4 | Support | Support the inclusion of the Residential New Neighbourhood Zone (“RNNZ”) provisions within the notified Future Urban Zone (“FUZ”). | Accept |
| Christine Hetherington for Summerset Group Holdings Limited | 443.11 443.16 | 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 MRZ. | Accept Integrated development issues are substantially resolved through resource consent such that FUZ is not required and MRZ will better achieve the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD consistent with the intent of PC14. |
| Michael Case | 508.1 508.2 | 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 | 511.1 511.2 | 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 MRZ can be applied. Land is not subject to Low Public Transport Accessibility Area zoning response. |
| Julie Comfort for Sutherlands Estates Limited | 728.11 | 728 | Seek Amendment | Rezone all of the residential properties that front Storr Close, Glendore Drive, James Mackenzie Drive and Sutherlands Road to Future Urban Zone. | Reject The land north of the FUZ adjoining Sparks and Sutherlands Road has been subdivided and the MRZ is the appropriate zone to give effect to section 77G of the RMA. |

| | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Madeleine Thompson | 435.1 | 435 | Seek Amendment | Focus the development on the rebuild of housing in the green zone and further out of the city Centre. | Reject Relief sought not entirely clear, however Council has a duty under section 77G to incorporate MDRS and enable at least 12m (3 storey) buildings in most residential zones other than where greater intensification around centre zones or where specific qualifying matters apply. | |
| Caroline May | 413.2 | 413 | Seek Amendment | Provision: Chapter 14 - Residential Decision Sought: Inner city living or new subdivisions on the city outskirts is where these new 3-4story houses should be built. Not in existing suburbs where it is unfair to everyone else | Reject Relief sought not entirely clear, however Council has a duty under section 77G to incorporate MDRS and enable at least 12m (3 storey) buildings in most residential zones other than where greater intensification around centre zones or where specific qualifying matters apply. | |
| Andrew Mactier for Independent Producers Limited | 729.1 729.3 | 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 and it is outside of the scope of PC14 and the implementation of s77G and schedule 3A to rezone rural land to FUZ. | |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | FS2052.117 | Jo Appleyard for Christchurch International Airport Limited | Oppose | Reject |
| | | | FS2084.10 | Christian Jordan | Oppose | Reject |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|-----|----------------|---|---|
| Julie Comfort for Benrogan Estates Ltd | 819.2 | 819 | Seek Amendment | Rezone 1.58ha at 376 Sparks Road from Rural Urban Fringe to Future Urban Zone as shown on the attached plan in Attachment A. | 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 | 819.10 | 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 MRZ 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 MRZ from being achieved. |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| Julie Comfort for Milns Park Limited | 916.1 | 916 | Support | Rezone 7,124m ² 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 MRZ 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 MRZ 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. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | |
| Alex Booker for NTP Development Holdings Limited | 2080.5 | 2080 | Seek Amendment | Seeks that the site at 109 Prestons Road zoned Future Urban Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone be amended to be zoned only Medium Density Residential Zone (2080.5). | Reject Split zoning with MRZ 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 MRZ 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. |
| Alex Booker for NTP Development Holdings Limited | 2080.6 | 2080 | Seek Amendment | Seeks that the site at 109 Prestons Road zoned Future Urban Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone be amended to be zoned only Future Urban Zone (2080.6). | Reject Split zoning with MRZ 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 MRZ 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. |
| Alison Dockery | 445.7 | 445 | Oppose | Oppose the zoning of fertile land as development areas. | Accept in part PC14 is confined to urban areas and (in giving effect to the NPS HPL) should not |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-----|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | result in fertile productive land being rezoned as development areas other than where land has been identified for urban development for an extended period of time. |
| Alex Booker for WDL Enterprises Limited and Birchs Village Limited | 704.6 | 704 | Seek Amendment | 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. | 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. |
| Holly Luzak for Cashmere Park Ltd, Hartward Investment Trust and Robert Brown | 593.2 593.3 593.4 | 593 | Seek Amendment | 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 | 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 MRZ are considered out of scope and should be rejected. Those parts of the submission seeking rezoning of land from FUZ to MRZ 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 objectives of the plan. There is currently insufficient information to confirm whether the MRZ could provide |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------|------------|------------------------|---|----------------|--|
| | | | | Fringe and proposed Future Urban Zone, to Medium Density 200 Cashmere Road (Lot 1 DP 547021) - Rural Urban Fringe and proposed Future Urban Zone, to Medium Density As shown on Planning Map 45 | | 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. |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |
| | | | FS2017.13 | Sarah Harrow | Oppose | Accept |
| | | | FS2032.60 | Kelly Bombay | Oppose | Accept |
| 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 Contour and partly within the 55 dB Ldn Air Noise Contour CIA Protection Surfaces control |
| | | | Further submission No. | Further Submitter | Support/Oppose | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------|---|--------|--------|
| | | | FS2052.111 | Jo Appleyard for Christchurch International Airport Limited | Oppose | Accept |
|--|--|--|------------|---|--------|--------|