

My name is Michael Case and I have farmed and owned 32 ha on both sides of Cranford Street I owned the land with my mother and father The land was identified under PC 1 for business and greenfield development The way the council has conducted its self against my family is simply unbelievable that this would be able to happen in a free and democratic country like New Zealand I refer you to attachment 1 released under the official information act 1982

Refer to councillor Wells comment

I refer you to attachment 2 released under the official information act 1982

Refer to email from Benesia Smith to Caroline Hart

Refer to email from Caroline Hart to Treena Davidson

I completed a section 32 for the Cranford basin for PC 1 costing me \$1.5 million there was a huge amount of geotechnical reports done by Dr Kupec of aurecon
Counsellor Wells comments are simply untrue and the way she conducted herself to the advisory committee of Cera is appalling with all the information that was on hand with my section 32
It's worth noting and relevant that the council had placed a section 18 on my land to acquire the land through the P.W.A in early August 2013 you will note the date on attachment 1 : Friday, 13 September 2013. you will also note the date on attachment 2: Monday 23 September 2013 this was happening while the council was in negotiations to buy the land through the P.W.A this is what our family has had to endure and live with .It's Simply unbelievable

We were left with 2.265 ha of our original farm It is worth noting that the land on 45 Mcfaddens Road ,that title is higher land and out of the flood management area that land could be built on and maybe the council should offer that land back to the family as there has been a sewer capacity upgrade for that area 1 to 4 for 1400 homes

Our submission is: Wanting the council to support a high density zone on our land, the Crozier land 60 Crozier's Road and the Case family land 340 Cranford Street Mariehau

Under the Cranford basin recovery plan which saw our land been rezoned as residential new neighbourhood and subject to provisions for our area : area 5 is constrained to access restrictions from Cranford Street and the presence of a flood ponding management area. There shall be no more than 60 residential units within area 5 rule 8.6.11.b.

We are seeking to have this decision completely deleted and allow for a more flexible zoning of high density development

It is our view that the land can be developed to achieve additional density in accordance with the objectives set out in PC 14 and make it both more viable and better able to contribute to residential density in particular the land will overlook a substantial area of open space making it in part ideal for high density zoning : Remember High density leverages off open space and additionally that two areas are to be developed in conjunction with an internal spine Road link

The current zoning does not enable the best use or best development of this land or the opportunity that it provides

I want the council to act in a fair and honest way and allow for our land to be zoned for high-density and to think about the land at 45 Mcfaddens Road that was taken under the P.W.A ;maybe it can also be added to achieve the capacity of area 1 to 4 for 1400 homes

minutes



Advisory Committee

Date and time	Friday 13 September 2013, 8:30am – 10:50am	
Location	Committee Room 1, Level 2, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch	
Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bill Wasley – Independent Chair ▪ David Ayers – Mayor, WDC (Deputy Chair) ▪ Benesia Smith – CERA ▪ Sue Wells – Councillor, CCC ▪ Claudia Reid – Councillor, CCC ▪ Kelvin Coe – Mayor, SDC ▪ Malcolm Lyall – Councillor, SDC ▪ Elizabeth Cunningham – Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rex Williams – ECan Commissioner ▪ Peter Skelton – ECan Commissioner ▪ Dan Gordon – Councillor, WDC ▪ Jim Gerard – Councillor, WDC ▪ Jim Harland – Regional Director - Southern Region, NZTA
Attendees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Caroline Hart – CERA ▪ Tim Walsh – CERA ▪ Lizzy Pearson – CERA ▪ Victoria Caseley – WDC ▪ Tim Harris – SDC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Paul Thomas – CERA ▪ Robert Woods – ECan ▪ Keith Tallentire – UDS Manager ▪ Ivan Thomson – CCC ▪ Rory Smeaton – CERA (minutes)
Apologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bob Parker – Mayor, CCC ▪ Sir Mark Solomon – Kaiwhakahaere, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Roger Sutton – CEO, CERA ▪ Lindsay Philips – Councillor, SDC ▪ Tom Lambie – ECan Commissioner
Objectives	<p>Receive an update on the Land Use Recovery Plan</p> <p>Receive a presentation on the CCRP Residential Redevelopment project</p> <p>Discuss recovery priorities as seen by the Advisory Committee</p>	
Papers		

*Security level:

Low

Medium

High

= generally public information

= in confidence – able to be shared within strategic partner organisations

= in confidence – Committee members only



minutes



Advisory Committee

1. Welcome and Apologies

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed every one present.

The apologies were noted.

Resolution: Moved Elizabeth Cunningham / Seconded Malcolm Lyall

That the apologies of members be accepted.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Chair noted the minutes of the previous meeting held on 9 August 2013.

Resolution: Moved Peter Skelton / Seconded Sue Wells

That the minutes of the previous meeting be accepted as an accurate record.

3. Land Use Recovery Plan

Paul Thomas provided a presentation on the proposed amendments to the draft Land Use Recovery Plan, which are to be included in the advice to the Minister. A copy of the presentation is attached to the minutes.

Topics noted included; Cranford Basin, the Riccarton Racecourse potential exemplar development, potential residential development in Heathcote, potential advancement of Highfield, intensification measures, and the editing of the document to make it more concise and directive and give clarity to the Actions.

Caroline Hart noted the recent input of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Senior Officials Group (CERSOG), which is a group of officials from central government agencies. This group focussed on the Comprehensive Development Mechanism (CDM), or 'floating zone', and also a wider debate on how strong the LURP should be versus having some things delivered through the Christchurch City Plan review. It was also noted that there has been an extension of the timeline to allow for input from central agencies.

Feedback

Cr. Wells commented that the Christchurch City Council does not want Cranford Basin to be included in the LURP as a priority area. It is not council policy for development in this area; there is no geotechnical information on the land. Paul Thomas noted that that this area is complex, and there are still hurdles to development, but that once transport and stormwater issues are sorted, there will still be some residual land. Cr. Wells requested the advice from the CCC officials to CERA on this issue be provided. Benesia Smith agreed to provide this information. Councillor Reid and Jim Harland also requested this material.

In relation to affordable housing, an intensification package for the Christchurch City District Plan is being pursued by CERA for inclusion in the LURP. This includes a proposal for the 'floating zone'. Paul Thomas explained that some central government agencies want the application of the zone to be available over a much wider area, including having no qualifiers for the application of the zone. Benesia Smith added that CERA is balancing requests from other core agencies. Jim Harland noted that a fundamental issue is infrastructural capacity and the integration with SCIRT, and from a Crown perspective the investment of a significant amount of money in the central city area and infrastructure renewal.

minutes

Advisory Committee

Cr. Reid questioned whether the advice to the Minister will include noting the risk of legal challenge if the LURP moves away from the draft. Paul Thomas responded that the Minister will be informed about all potential legal risks, and the Minister is likely to be challenged if changes are not made to the draft. The Minister will also be provided advice on a possible additional public process for some amendments. Caroline Hart added that the cabinet paper will include advice on risks.

Cr. Reid advised that the timeframe extension should be utilised for more engagement with local governance. Benesia Smith responded that CERA has to be very careful, noting previous cases of Ministerial decisions being overturned. Jim Harland added that the governance input is through the Committee.

Cr. Reid advised that the advice to the Minister should also include the consideration of the Councils financial ability to accommodate intensification. Benesia Smith agreed with this. Jim Harland added that CERA should be having discussions with SCIRT.

Comm. Skelton requested clarification on the editing of the document. Paul Thomas responded that the document is being shortened, so that it is more concise and directive, and that the officials within the strategic partners, have been provided with a revised version. He added that there have been no changes to the wider policy of the document, but that it has been made sharper. Jim Harland noted that CERA could be exposed to judicial review if there are not comments supporting the editing. Benesia Smith corrected this statement, noting that under the CER Act the Minister is able to accept, change or reject the draft document. Cr. Wells added that if significant changes are made, CERA is requested to come back to the Committee to present these changes.

Comm. Skelton also questioned the advice being put to the Minister on the Airport Noise Contour. Benesia Smith and Paul Thomas both reassured Comm. Skelton that the advice will be to retain this in the LURP.

Cr. Wells expressed concern that the document may be moving away from recovery into resource management spaces. Benesia Smith responded that CERA is in a tough space, trying to manage the expectations of both the strategic partners and other central government agencies.

Mayor Ayers questioned the criteria used to decide the particular exemplar projects would be pursued. Paul Thomas responded that CERA has tried to move the exemplar matters forward. The rationale for choosing particular projects included; having a range of development types, and incorporating best practice, where the project template could be applied in other locations.

Jim Harland noted that it was considered that the draft LURP contained enough greenfield land for development, and questioned how additional areas line up with the criteria for intensification measures. Benesia Smith responded that the advice may need to be revised, and options provided in relation to the additional areas.

Resolution: Moved Comm. Skelton / Seconded Cr. Wells

That;

- The concern expressed around and redrafting of the LURP which results in a change to policy or a step change from the draft LURP, without engagement with the strategic partners at a governance level, be noted.

minutes

Advisory Committee

- The concern expressed around the LURP moving into the resource management space and incorporating matters that should go through a normal RMA process, be noted.
- A transitional definition is required between earthquake recovery and resource management.
- The need for the Airport Noise Contour in the LURP and the RPS, be reaffirmed.
- The concern expressed around the proposed intensification measures be noted, with wider community engagement required through the resource management process. The concerns expressed around the financial capacity of the Council to support such measures, as SCIRT is repairing infrastructure to pre-earthquake levels, rather than providing for growth, are also to be noted.
- Cranford Basin is not agreed for inclusion in the LURP, based on the information provided in the presentation, it is a special treatment area and should be considered through resource management processes.

4. CCRP Residential Redevelopment Project

Tim Walsh provided a presentation on the CCRP residential redevelopment project. A copy of the presentation is attached to these minutes.

The CCRP does not include much detail on residential development in the central city. A residential chapter has been proposed to address this. The risk of not getting enough residential development is that the central area becomes a 9am-5pm office park. The desirable outcome is to have people living in the CBD, as this supports retail and hospitality, as well as other activities.

It was considered that the central city living zones review proposed alone would not have a real impact on increasing residential development. There is some latent demand for residential development, but this is uncertain.

The draft chapter is being developed with CCC officers and other central government officials.

Feedback

Jim Harland questioned whether discussions are being held with potential developers, and advised that there is a need to be upfront about the difficulties for residential development in the central area. It was responded that research has been completed on potential investment, and agreement that the challenges for development will need to be acknowledged.

Comm. Skelton asked about other interventions that were being considered. Tim Walsh responded that this includes the East Frame residential neighbourhood and a MBIE medium density development opportunity (Confidential: still to be confirmed by the Minister). Lizzy Pearson added that a range of options are being considered, including financial incentives.

Cr. Reid asked about the extent to which public realm improvements were being considered, noting the focus of Melbourne on residential development catering to young people. Tim Walsh responded that while Melbourne is a good example, a major difference is that it had an existing stock of underutilised buildings. Public realm improvements are being considered in Christchurch.

Cr. Wells advised that the project team look back at the draft Recovery Plan produced by the CCC, and that the CCC Planning Committee needs to be engaged in the project. Cr. Wells expressed concern that

minutes

Advisory Committee

the CCC and CERA are not working well together on development of residential provisions, with this CERA project representing a small slice of the Council's responsibility.

Jim Harland questioned the number of households expected to be developed in the eastern frame, to which it was responded that this would be about 1500 households. It was also noted that, the positive aspect of the project is that everyone wants the outcomes sought through the project. The elected representatives may need to be engaged at an early stage to endorse the process.

Resolution: Moved Comm. Skelton / Seconded Cr. Reid

That;

- The presentation be received
- The difficult challenges in respect of intensification occurring particularly in the next 3-4 years are acknowledged until there is clarity on actual CBD redevelopment occurring
- There should be engagement with the Christchurch City Council governance and community boards
- The concerns around a potential disconnection between CERA and the CCC processes be noted (such as annual and district plans etc) and that such concerns be further considered including early elected member engagement.

5. Advisory Committee Recovery Priorities

Caroline Hart noted a request at the last Committee meeting for a discussion on recovery priorities. The recovery is entering a different phase, with the potential for focus and attention to also change. For information purposes, the priorities for CERA were outlined, these being;

- The Residential Red Zone, including the future use of the area
- The central city rebuild
- Strategic central government procurement processes
- Community resilience
- The Transition Plan
- The Land Use Recovery Plan and the Christchurch City District Plan review
 - Including the residential rebuild and insurance matters, and the port.

Feedback

Clarification was sought on the breadth of the strategic procurement work, with it being noted that this is very broad and looks at many different aspects of central government business eg; central city, education and justice.

Elizabeth Cunningham noted that it is very good to hear the community resilience is one of the priorities, as well as that there is an interface between the Committee and educational and health matters.

Cr. Reid questioned whether the priorities will result in a change to the existing processes, leading to working more openly and collaboratively. It was noted that CERA is only in operation for five years, but is supposed to be reviewed annually. Benesia Smith responded that the discussion last month included noting CERA is moving to be more open and transparent. The commitment to this change occurring was reiterated and was noted that annual reviews are undertaken. Jim Harland suggested a workshop on the interface between CERA and the strategic partners next time the Committee meets.

Discussion was held on the need to think about the transition, and how to manage this.

minutes



Advisory Committee

Comm. Skelton questioned whether the Lyttelton Port recovery is also a priority, noting that ECan wrote to the minister last year on this issue. Benesia Smith responded that she is meeting ECan officials about this soon and this is a priority as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP).

Resolution: Moved Comm. Williams / Seconded Mayor Coe

That;

- The outline of recovery priorities be noted
- The key matters raised be noted.

6. October meeting Cancellation

The scheduled October Recovery Strategy Advisory Committee meeting is not to go ahead due to the timing conflict with the local body elections.

7. Other Matters Arising

No other matters were raised.

8. Objectives Evaluation

It was noted that the meeting raised some significant discussion, and that it is positive to be free and frank about issues.

The Chair noted that the contribution of retiring committee members (Mayor Parker, Cr Wells and Cr Philps, would be noted as part of the subsequent UDSIC meeting.

The meeting was closed.

Subject	ACTION / Issues	Person Responsible/ Reporting
Next Scheduled Meeting	Friday 8 November 2013, 8:30am NB This is subject to the territorial authorities having made appointments to the Committee by the meeting date	Caroline Hart

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



From: [Caroline Hart](#)
To: [Treena Davidson](#)
Subject: FW: LURP
Date: Monday, 23 September 2013 3:56:00 PM

Treena - does the reflect the current provisions ??

Mike

I understand from Benesia that you are seeking confirmation as to how the Cranford Basin is being handled in the Land Use Recovery Plan.

We had previously received advice from CCC staff that suggested possible inclusion as a greenfield area in the LURP. However, following the Recovery Strategy Advisory Committee discussion on this matter, this advice has been clarified. The Cranford Basin is no longer in the Land Use Recovery Plan as a priority area.

This is a matter has been signalled as something for consideration in the CCC District Plan Review only.

Please let me know if you would like more details on this.

Thanks.

From: Benesia Smith [DPMC] [mailto:Benesia.Smith@dpmc.govt.nz]
Sent: Monday, 23 September 2013 3:11 p.m.
To: Caroline Hart
Cc: Benesia Smith
Subject: LURP

Hi Caroline

As discussed, I had a call from Mike Theelen this morning about the LURP indicating that he was concerned that we had decided to go ahead and recommend "Cranford basin" as an area where we saw significant housing development occurring.

I noted that this issue had been raised at the last RASC by Sue, and supported by a few other members, that our proposed inclusion went against advice from CCC. I also noted that our preliminary view had come about because of preliminary views tentatively put across by CCC staff but that in the days coming up to RASC, we have been advised that CCC staff had started to review that position.

I therefore noted that I was of the view that Cranford Basin was not an issue that we were proposing to move forward with, but that I would check.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Have I got it correct? If yes, can you confirm in writing direct to Mike and cc me that this is the case. If no, lets discuss.

Nga mihi, na,
Benesia

The information contained in this email message is for the attention of the intended recipient only and is not necessarily the official view or communication of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, copy or distribute this message or the information in it. If you have received this message in error, please destroy the email and notify the sender immediately.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

DRAFT – Not Government Policy

Cranford Basin Information

Contents

1. Strategic Partner Written Comment Advice – CCC 3
 Written Comment 001 and 070 3
 Written Comment 007 4
 Written Comment 040 5
 Written Comment 060 and 082 5
 2. Strategic Partner Written Comment Advice – ECan 6
 RPS Advice 6
 Written Comment 001 6
 Written Comment 060 7
 Written Comment 070 8
 Strategic Advice 8
 Written Comment 001 8
 3. Extract from Global Research Summary of Written Comments and Strategic Partner Responses 10
 Building new communities (section 4.2 and associated Actions 17-20) 11
 Written comment name: 001 11
 Providing for business (section 4.3 and associated Action 21-27) 12
 Written comment name: 001 12
 Transport Comments- ECan 13
 Written comment name: 001 13
 Written comment name: 007 13

Official Information Act 1982
Released under the Official Information Act 1982

DRAFT – Not Government Policy

Written comment name: 040 14

Transport Comments-NZTA 14

Written comment name: 001 14

Written comment name: 040 15

Written comment name: 070 16

Written comment name: 082 17

Regional Policy Statement (Appendix 2) 18

Written comment name: 001 18

Written comment name: 060 19

Written comment name: 070 20

Christchurch City Council Plan changes (Appendix 3) 22

Written comment name: 001 22

Written comment name: 007 23

Written comment name: 040 24

Written comment name: 070 25

Written comment name: 082 26

4. Recovery Strategy Officials Group 28

5. Emails from Richard Osborne - CCC 29

1. Strategic Partner Written Comment Advice – CCC

Written Comment 001 and 070

Issue Raised	Related topic or impact	Discussion	Advice to CERA
<p>001 - Cranford Basin be identified as a greenfield priority area for business and residential activities, or at the very least the west side of Cranford Street, and that the Christchurch City Plan be amended accordingly. But see the other alternatives in 070 immediately following.</p>	<p>Infrastructure</p>	<p>The work that is continuing on the Northern Arterial Connection and the stormwater management area required in Cranford Basin clearly indicates that, as a consequence of taking land for those purposes, a number of balance areas will remain with little potential for rural use. They would be surrounded by urban land and there do not appear to be strong grounds against their urban development. They are likely to be no more difficult to develop for urban activities than some other greenfield priority areas, e.g. Highfield.</p>	<p>Include a direction requiring the Council to prepare a plan change and ODP identifying appropriate urban development of all the balance portions of Cranford Basin once the extent of the Northern Arterial connection and stormwater management needs are resolved. The standard greenfield minimum density requirements for greenfield areas would not apply.</p>
<p>070 – Include all of Case land as priority greenfield area “which will enable the rezoning of the balance land for business or residential” in the District Plan (presumably the balance land is that portion not required for stormwater management or the northern arterial connection);</p>		<p>It is noted that although wastewater infrastructure is unlikely to be available until 2016 at the earliest, this is no different from several other greenfield areas identified in LURP.</p> <p>In light of the above and the other submissions seeking inclusion of other land in a greenfield priority area, it would seem appropriate to agree to something along the lines of the third option in 070. That is to provide for the appropriate urban development of all of the balance portions of Cranford Basin, once the extent of the Northern Arterial and stormwater management needs are resolved (at the District Plan level this is likely to be resolved as part of the preparation of an ODP).</p>	
<p>OR Identify the proposed balance areas of the Case land as priority greenfield areas to enable the rezoning for business or</p>		<p>Note that because of the relatively small size and elongated shape of the balance areas that are likely to be left for urban development, and the fact that some of them adjoin the low density L1B zone, the standard minimum density requirements for greenfield areas would not appear to be appropriate (as suggested</p>	

DRAFT – Not Government Policy

<p>residential in the district plan; OR That the LURP clarify that the District Plan review is not precluded from rezoning areas for residential or business not identified as priority areas.</p> <p>Note overlap with 007, 040, 060, 082 seeking inclusion of other land within Cranford Basin in a priority greenfield area.</p>	<p>in 060).</p>	
--	-----------------	--

Written Comment 007

Issue Raised	Related topic or impact	Discussion	Advice to CERA
<p>Add land located in Cranford Basin area within a greenfield residential area.</p>		<p>As for the reasons indicated for 001 and 070, it would be appropriate to provide for urban development of all of the balance portions of Cranford Basin, once the extent of the Northern Arterial and stormwater management needs are resolved.</p> <p>Note that because of the relatively small size and elongated shape of the balance areas that are likely to be left for urban development, and the fact that some of it adjoins the low density L1B zone, the standard minimum density requirements for greenfield areas would not appear to be appropriate (as suggested in 060).</p>	<p>Identify all of Cranford Basin as a special greenfield area where it is appropriate that balance portions of the basin will be allowed to be used for residential or business activities, once the extent of the Northern Arterial connection and stormwater management needs are resolved. Also that the standard greenfield minimum density requirements for greenfield areas would not apply.</p>
<p>Add land between R6 and the Northern Arterial, either side of Radcliffe road into the R6</p>		<p>This area appears to have been an area that was excluded from R6 because, at the time PC1 was being prepared, an intersection with the Northern Arterial and Radcliffe Road</p>	<p>Include within R6.</p>

greenfield priority area.		was being considered at this point. An intersection is no longer proposed and there is no apparent reason for not including this land within R6. It includes land that is part of a property that is included in R6.
---------------------------	--	--

Written Comment 040

Issue Raised	Related topic or impact	Discussion	Advice to CERA
Add land located in Cranford Basin area within a greenfield business priority area.		As for the reasons indicated for 001 and 070, it would be appropriate to provide for the urban development of all of the balance portions of Cranford Basin, once the extent of the Northern Arterial and stormwater management needs are resolved.	Include a direction requiring the Council to prepare a plan change and ODP identifying appropriate urban development of all the balance portions of Cranford Basin once the extent of the Northern Arterial connection and stormwater management needs are resolved.

Written Comment 060 and 082

Issue Raised	Related topic or impact	Discussion	Advice to CERA
Add land in Cranford Basin area within a greenfield residential priority area and allow it to be low density (adjoins L1B land).		<p>As for the reasons indicated for 001 and 070, it would be appropriate to provide for the urban development of all of the balance portions of Cranford Basin, once the extent of the Northern Arterial and stormwater management needs are resolved.</p> <p>Note that because of the relatively small size and elongated shape of the balance areas that are likely to be left for urban development, and the fact that some of it adjoins the low density L1B zone, the standard minimum density requirements for greenfield areas would not appear to be appropriate.</p>	Include a direction requiring the Council to prepare a plan change and ODP identifying appropriate urban development of all the balance portions of Cranford Basin once the extent of the Northern Arterial connection and stormwater management needs are resolved. The standard greenfield minimum density requirements for greenfield areas would not apply.

2. Strategic Partner Written Comment Advice – ECan

RPS Advice

Written Comment 001

Issue Raised	Related topic or impact	Discussion	Advice to CERA
<p>Include the Case Family land as a priority area for residential and or business development.</p>		<p>The bulk of the Cranford Basin area is currently subject to two significant infrastructure activities, the northern arterial road route and a designation for stormwater management. It is also characterised by being alienated from other rural land, being nearly entirely surrounded by urban land. In this respect, it can be distinguished sufficiently from many other sites that have sought to be included as a priority area for development.</p> <p>It is recommended that the area be included as a priority area for development, but specially notated in Map A that the final areas for urban development are yet to be determined, pending finalisation of the northern arterial and stormwater management designations.</p>	<p>Recommend a change to Map A, with a notation stating that developable areas are to be determined pending the outcome of the stormwater designation and the northern arterial designation processes.</p>

Information Act 1982

Released under Information Act 1982

Written Comment 060

Issue Raised	Related topic or impact	Discussion	Advice to CERA
<p>Include areas fronting onto Grassmere Street as a Greenfield Priority Area.</p>	<p>CCC</p>	<p>The bulk of the Cranford Basin area is currently subject to two significant infrastructure activities, the northern arterial road route and a designation for stormwater management. It is also characterised by being alienated from other rural land, being nearly entirely surrounded by urban land. In this respect, it can be distinguished sufficiently from many other sites that have sought to be included as a priority area for development.</p> <p>It is recommended that the area be included as a priority area for development, but specially notated in Map A that the final areas for urban development are yet to be determined pending finalisation of the northern arterial and stormwater management designations.</p>	<p>Recommend a change to Map A, with a notation stating that developable areas are to be determined pending the outcome of the stormwater designation and the northern arterial designation processes.</p>
<p>Recognise the sites as an exception to minimum density requirements in Policy 6.3.7 for Greenfield development due to prohibitive cost of ground remediation works, reflect in principal reasons and explanation; or Provide for as and exception for rural residential activity in CCC area under Policy 6.3.9 reflect in principal reasons and</p>		<p>This matter should be dealt with at a latter date and as part of the district plan review. It is noted that areas that are geotechnically constrained are excluded from the net density provisions in the definitions section of Chapter 6.</p>	<p>Recommend no change until further work is undertaken regarding final layout and geotechnical investigations.</p>

explanation.

Written Comment 070

Issue Raised	Related topic or impact	Discussion	Advice to CERA
<p>Identify the Case land as a priority greenfield area which will enable rezoning of the balance land [not required for stormwater treatment] for business or residential use, or otherwise identify it in a way that would not preclude a business or residential use.</p>	<p>CCC</p>	<p>The bulk of the Cranford Basin area is currently subject to two significant infrastructure activities, the northern arterial road route and a designation for stormwater management. It is also characterised by being alienated from other rural land, being nearly entirely surrounded by urban land. In this respect, it can be distinguished sufficiently from many other sites that have sought to be included as a priority area for development.</p>	<p>Recommend a change to Map A, with a notation stating that developable areas are to be determined pending the outcome of the stormwater designation and the northern arterial designation processes.</p>
		<p>It is recommended that the area be included as a priority area for development, but specially notated in Map A that the final areas for urban development are yet to be determined, pending finalisation of the northern arterial and stormwater management designations.</p>	

Strategic Advice

Written Comment 001

Issue Raised	Related topic or impact	Discussion	Advice to CERA

<p>Map A should identify at least some case family land as a greenfield priority area</p>	<p>Greenfield Priority Areas and suitability of land</p> <p>RPS considerations</p>	<p>UDS partners have reached a position that the Case family land is not a priority area for residential or business activities, given the constraints on the site – natural hazards, esp. potential flooding and liquefaction.</p> <p>However, a reconsideration of the area, after Designation and SMP requirements are defined is considered necessary.</p> <p>RPS and CCC analysis to provide more detail</p> <p>As above</p>	<p>Recommend closer consideration of these issues.</p> <p>CCC comments to come</p> <p>A specific Action to investigate residential and business development on land within Cranford Basin could be an option. Including a new priority greenfield area for Cranford Basin would not be desirable.</p>
<p>Table 6 should include Cranford Basin</p>			<p>If any amendments are made to include any Case family land, then Table 6 would need to be updated.</p>

3. Extract from Global Research Summary of Written Comments and Strategic Partner Responses

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Building new communities (section 4.2 and associated Actions 17-20)

Written comment name: 001

ISSUE RAISED

Map A should identify at least some Case family land as a greenfield priority area.

DISCUSSION RAISED

UDS partners have reached a position that the Case family land is not a priority area for residential or business activities; given the constraints on the site – natural hazards, especially potential flooding and liquefaction.

However, a reconsideration of the area, after Designation and SMP requirements are defined is considered necessary.

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

Recommend closer consideration of these issues.

CCC comments to come.

A specific action to investigate residential and business development on land within Cranford Basin could be an option. Including a new priority greenfield area for Cranford Basin would not be desirable.

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

Greenfield Priority Areas and suitability of land.

RPS considerations.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Copy of same issue through previous submission process.

Copy of letter explaining environment court hearing to CCC and results of hearing.

Plan change 1 litigation documentation and various letters regarding rezoning of land previous submitted to CERA and CCC. Correspondence date back to November 2011

Appeal of consent to discharge water into Cranford Basin.

Reasons for appeal are provided as well as Decision by Commissioners – 26 June 2013.

Two appendices are also provided ~ Consent considerations; Monitoring Programme for Styx River/Purakaunui Stormwater Management Plan

Evidence provided in support of residential rezoning of Cranford Basin Provided for Plan Change 1.

Providing for business (section 4.3 and associated Action 21-27)

Written comment name: 001

ISSUE RAISED

Table 6 should include Cranford Basin.

DISCUSSION RAISED

UDS partners have reached a position that the Case family land is not a priority area for residential or business activities, given the constraints on the site – natural hazards, esp. potential flooding and liquefaction.

However, a reconsideration of the area, after Designation and SMP requirements are defined is considered necessary.

RPS and CCC analysis to provide more detail Strategic partner advice to CERA on Written comment

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

If any amendments are made to include any Case family land, then Table 6 would need to be updated

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

Nothing identified.

Additional information

Copy of same issue through previous submission process.

Copy of letter explaining environment court hearing to CCC and results of hearing.

Plan change 1 litigation documentation and various letters regarding rezoning of land previous submitted to CERA and CCC. Correspondence date back to November 2011

Appeal of consent to discharge water into Cranford Basin.

Reasons for appeal are provided as well as Decision by Commissioners – 26 June 2013.

Two appendices are also provided. Consent considerations; Monitoring Programme for Styx River/Purakaunui Stormwater Management Plan

Evidence provided in support of residential rezoning of Cranford Basin Provided for Plan Change 1.

Transport Comments- ECAN

Written comment name: 001

ISSUE RAISED

This Comment mentions the proposed CCC northern arterial through the Cranford basin and notes that this is an intended future use of part of the land concerned.

DISCUSSION RAISED

The Commenter correctly identifies this future use of the land.

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

No change required to transport content of the dLURP.

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

Cranford Basin.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Copy of same issue through previous submission process.

Copy of letter explaining environment court hearing to CCC and results of hearing.

Plan change 1 litigation documentation and various letters regarding rezoning of land previously submitted to CERA and CCC. Correspondence back to November 2011

Appeal of consent to discharge water into Cranford Basin.

Reasons for appeal are provided as well as Decision by Commissioner on 25 June 2013.

Two appendices are also provided ~ Consent considerations; Monitoring Programme for Styx River/Purakaunui Stormwater Management Plan

Evidence provided in support of residential rezoning of Cranford Basin Provided for Plan Change 1.

Written comment name: 007

ISSUE RAISED

This Comment mentions the proposed CCC northern arterial through the Cranford basin and notes that this is an intended future use of part of the land concerned.

DISCUSSION RAISED

DRAFT – Not Government Policy

The Commenter is requesting something that is already provided for in partner strategic framework and capital programmes.

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

No change required to transport content of the dLURP.

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

Cranford Basin.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Attachment 1 Map of land in Cranford Basin

Attachment 2 Map 14 and enlargements

Written comment name: 040

ISSUE RAISED

This Comment is regarding the justification of this site for inclusion as a priority area based on existing transport servicing.

DISCUSSION RAISED

The Commenter justifies inclusion as a priority area based on transport servicing. This does not override the greater justification for not being included.

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

No change required to transport content of the dLURP.

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

LURP Map A.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

3 Maps of the property

Commissioners' recommendations on PCL.

Transport Comments-NZTA

Written comment name: 001

DRAFT – Not Government Policy

ISSUE RAISED

This Comment is regarding the use of land for arterial roading and storm water.

DISCUSSION RAISED

The Case Land is a critical part of the Northern Arterial Roads of National Significance (RoNS) project. NZTA supports the Case family comments on the need for the arterial link to Cranford Street.

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

No change.

ISSUE RAISED

The Commenter notes that parts of the land are appropriate for priority Greenfield area.

DISCUSSION RAISED

Mainly a Council issue, but NZTA see the logic of the ensuring a workable land use for residual lots.

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

Has merit but all effects need to be considered through District Plan review. No Change rezoning through LURP. Potential to identify as a post-LURP residential area or other appropriate urban zoning.

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

Nothing identified.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Copy of same issue through previous submission process.

Copy of letter explaining environment court hearing to CCC and results of hearing.

Plan change 1 litigation documentation and various letters regarding rezoning of land previous submitted to CERA and CCC. Correspondence date back to November 2011

Appeal of consent to discharge water into Cranford Basin.

Reasons for appeal are provided as well as Decision by Commissioners – 26 June 2013.

Two appendices are also provided ~ Consent considerations; Monitoring Programme for Styx River/Purakaunui Stormwater Management Plan

Evidence provided in support of residential rezoning of Cranford Basin Provided for Plan Change 1.

Written comment name: 040

<p>ISSUE RAISED</p>	<p>The Commenter suggests that the property fronting Cranford Street (shown in map 2) should be included in a Greenfield (Business) priority area. The background of the area is provided with reference to the Commissioners decision on PCI.</p> <p>The reasoning for the area's inclusion is that much of the Cranford Basin is a proposed designation for roading and storm water purposes so will not be suitable for rural land zoning.</p> <p>The property is consistent with this policy as it is well connected to transport networks.</p> <p>Comments related to: landscaping; services; flooding; and storm water suggest development is appropriate. Other arguments for inclusion as a priority area were: consolidation of and existing business area; it meets all the objectives and policies; and is a good way of promoting urban growth.</p>
<p>DISCUSSION RAISED</p>	<p>Location of this property for development will have positive effects on transport</p>
<p>STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT</p>	<p>From a transport perspective this is supported and agree that it will contribute towards urban consolidation, however there are other RMA issues such as stormwater that the Council need to consider.</p>
<p>RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT</p>	<p>Action 39 realises the need in making decisions about priority urban areas that the effects of natural hazards should be avoided and mitigated</p>
<p>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</p>	<p>Nothing identified.</p>
<p>3 Maps of the property and Commissioners recommendations on PCI</p>	<p></p>
<p><i>Written comment name: 070</i></p>	<p></p>
<p>ISSUE RAISED</p>	<p>The Comment states Case family property at 340-401 Cranford Street and 45 McFaddens Road should be identified by the LURP as a priority greenfield area; or, That the LURP be amended to identify the proposed balance areas of the Case Land as priority greenfield areas; or, That the LURP be amended to clarify that the District Plan review is not precluded from rezoning areas for residential or business use that are not already identified as priority areas within the LURP.</p>

DRAFT – Not Government Policy

Independent commissioners who heard the Case family's detailed expert evidence (Environment Court re: PC1) recommended all the land be identified as land suitable for urbanisation, by way of additional Greenfields supply.

DISCUSSION RAISED

Mainly a Council issue, but NZTA see the logic of the ensuring a workable land use for residual lots.

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

Has merit but all effects need to be considered through District Plan review. No Change rezoning through LURP. Potential to identify as a post-LURP residential area or other appropriate urban zoning.

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

District Plan review process.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Attachment 1 Map of property.

Written comment name: 082

ISSUE RAISED

Inclusion of part of high ground at southern boundary of the site to be available for urban development through the LURP

DISCUSSION RAISED

Mainly a Council issue, but NZTA see the logic of the higher level land to the south of the site with access to Croziers Road as logical.

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

Has merit but all effects need to be considered through District Plan review. No change rezoning through LURP. Potential to identify as a post-LURP residential area.

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

District Plan review process

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Copy of CT CB34B/625

Copy of CT CB1C/14

SMP Styx Sub-Catchments from Styx Blueprint for Surface Water Management Plan 500852/02 D03

Cadastral Map

Aerial Photo

Regional Policy Statement (Appendix 2)

Written comment name: 001

ISSUE RAISED

Commenter suggested to include the Case Family land as a priority area for residential and or business development

DISCUSSION RAISED

The bulk of the Cranford Basin area is currently subject to two significant infrastructure activities, the northern arterial road route and a designation for storm-water management. It is also characterised by being alienated from other rural land, being nearly entirely surrounded by urban land. In this respect, it can be distinguished sufficiently from many other sites that have sought to be included as a priority area for development.

It is recommended that the area be included as a priority area for development, but specially notated in Map A that the final areas for urban development are yet to be determined, pending finalisation of the northern arterial and storm-water management designations:

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

Recommend a change to Map A, with a notation stating that developable areas are to be determined pending the outcome of the storm-water designation and the northern arterial designation processes

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

Nothing identified

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Copy of same issue through previous submission process.

Copy of letter explaining environment court hearing to CCC and results of hearing.

Plan change 1 litigation documentation and various letters regarding rezoning of land previous submitted to CERA and CCC. Correspondence date back to November 2011

Appeal of consent to discharge water into Cranford Basin.

Reasons for appeal are provided as well as Decision by Commissioners – 26 June 2013.

DRAFT – Not Government Policy

<p>Two appendices are also provided ~ Consent considerations; Monitoring Programme for Styx River/Purakaunui Stormwater Management Plan Evidence provided in support of residential rezoning of Cranford Basin: Provided for Plan Change 1.</p>	
<p>Written comment name: 060</p>	
<p>ISSUE RAISED</p>	<p>Commenters refer to property that fronts Grassmere Street and seek for this area to be included in Greenfield Priority Area within Map A of Appendix 2 of the LURP. It is believed that there is no valid environmental, social or economic reasoning for excluding this land from being a Greenfield Priority Area and that regardless of the density of development that might be achieved, the use of this land for urban and semi-urban purposes represents a more efficient and sustainable use of the land resource, is consistent with the RPS policy framework to be inserted, is appropriate for achieving consolidated urban form, is able to be efficiently serviced, and provides land for residential development in a central location in close proximity to a Key Activity Centre.</p>
<p>DISCUSSION RAISED</p>	<p>The bulk of the Cranford Basin area is currently subject to two significant infrastructure activities, the northern arterial road route and a designation for stormwater management. It is also characterised by being alienated from other rural land, being nearly entirely surrounded by urban land. In this respect, it can be distinguished sufficiently from many other sites that have sought to be included as a priority area for development.</p> <p>It is recommended that the area be included as a priority area for development, but specially notated in Map A that the final areas for urban development are yet to be determined, pending finalisation of the northern arterial and stormwater management designations.</p>
<p>STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT</p>	<p>Recommend a change to Map A, with a notation stating that developable areas are to be determined pending the outcome of the stormwater designation and the northern arterial designation processes.</p>
<p>RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT</p>	<p>CCC</p>
<p>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</p>	<p>Attachments: Commissioners recommendations on Submission and Further Submissions – PC1; Proposed 12.5ha residential subdivision Grants Road, Papanui.</p>
<p>ISSUE RAISED</p>	<p>Recognise the sites as an exception to minimum density requirements in Policy 6.3.7 for Greenfield development due to prohibitive cost of ground remediation works, reflect in principal reasons and explanation; or provide for as an exception for rural residential activity in CCC area under Policy 6.3.9 reflect in principal reasons and explanation.</p>

DISCUSSION RAISED

This matter should be dealt with at a later date and as part of the district plan review. It is noted that areas that are geotechnically constrained are excluded from the net density provisions in the definitions section of Chapter 6.

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

Recommend no change until further work is undertaken regarding final layout and geotechnical investigations.

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

Nothing identified

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Attachments: Commissioners recommendations on Submission and Further Submissions – PC1; Proposed 12.5ha residential subdivision Grants Road, Papanui.

Written comment name: 070

ISSUE RAISED

The Comment stated Case family property at 340-401 Cranford Street and 45 McFadden Road requested to be identified by the LURP as a priority greenfield area which will enable rezoning of the balance land [not required for stormwater treatment] for business or residential use, or otherwise identify if in a way that would not preclude a business or residential land use.

Independent commissioners who heard the Case family's detailed expert evidence (Environment Court re: PC1) recommended all the land be identified as land suitable for urbanisation, by way of additional Greenfields supply.

DISCUSSION RAISED

The bulk of the Cranford Basin area is currently subject to two significant infrastructure activities, the northern arterial road route and a designation for stormwater management. It is also characterised by being alienated from other rural land, being nearly entirely surrounded by urban land. In this respect, it can be distinguished sufficiently from many other sites that have sought to be included as a priority area for development.

It is recommended that the area be included as a priority area for development, but specially notated in Map A that the final areas for urban development are yet to be determined, pending finalisation of the northern arterial and stormwater management designations.

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

Recommend a change to Map A, with a notation stating that developable areas are to be determined pending the outcome of the storm water designation and the northern arterial designation processes.

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

CCC

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
Maps of the property.



Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Christchurch City Council Plan changes (Appendix 3)

Written comment name: 001

ISSUE RAISED

Commenter states that Case family land in the Cranford Basin should be designated for residential and business activities. If all is not allocated then at least the West side should be allocated. The Case family acknowledges that some of their land will be required for arterial roading and storm-water retention. Have had discussions with Christchurch City Council, provided attachments and believe that at least part of their land is suitable for residential development.

The primary objection is that the land is not included in the green field priority areas as land identified as a priority area for development of residential and commercial activities. A list of provisions (about 6) that are opposed are listed.

NOTE: The Case family have also entered comment 070 which further details their request for their land to be re-zoned as a priority green field. Whilst 070 has been entered in this report as a separate comment, the discussion provided for comment 01 makes reference to comment 070. Further details of comment 070 can be found under the Written comment name 070 Case Family Trust Lauren Semple ~ GRC Legal.

Comment 070: Include all of Case land as priority green field area "which will enable the rezoning of the balance land for business or residential" in the District Plan (presumably the balance land is that portion not required for storm-water management on the northern arterial connection);

OR Identify the proposed balance areas of the Case land as priority green field areas to enable the rezoning for business or residential in the district plan;

OR That the LURP clarify that the District Plan review is not precluded from rezoning areas for residential or business not identified as priority areas.

Note overlap with 007, 040, 060, 082 seeking inclusion of other land within Cranford Basin in a priority greenfield.

DISCUSSION RAISED

The work that is continuing on the Northern Arterial Connection and the storm-water management area required in Cranford Basin clearly indicates that, as a consequence of taking land for those purposes, a number of balance areas will remain with little potential for rural use. They would be surrounded by urban land and there do not appear to be strong grounds against their urban development. They are likely to be no more difficult to develop for urban activities than some other green field priority areas, e.g. Highfield.

It is noted that although wastewater infrastructure is unlikely to be available until 2016 at the earliest, this is no different from several other green field areas identified in LURP.

In light of the above and the other submissions seeking inclusion of other land in a green field priority area, it would seem appropriate to agree to something along the lines of the third option in 070. That is to provide for the appropriate urban development of all of the balance portions of Cranford Basin, once the extent of the Northern Arterial and storm water management needs are resolved (at the District Plan level this is likely to be resolved as part of the preparation of an ODP).

Note that because of the relatively small size and elongated shape of the balance areas that are likely to be left for urban development, and the fact that some of them adjoin the low density LIB zone, the standard minimum density requirements for greenfield areas would not appear to be appropriate (as suggested in 060)

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

DRAFT – Not Government Policy

Include a direction requiring the Council to prepare a plan change and ODP identifying appropriate urban development of all the balance portions of Cranford Basin once the extent of the Northern Arterial connection and storm-water management needs are resolved. The standard green field minimum density requirements for greenfield areas would not apply.

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

Infrastructure

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Copy of same issue through previous submission process.

Copy of letter explaining environment court hearing to CCC and results of hearing.

Plan change 1 litigation documentation and various letters regarding rezoning of land previously submitted to CERA and CCC. Correspondence date back to November 2011

Appeal of consent to discharge water into Cranford Basin.

Reasons for appeal are provided as well as Decision by Commissioners – 26 June 2013.

Two appendices are also provided ~ Consent considerations; Monitoring Programme for Styx River/Purakaunui Stormwater Management Plan

Evidence provided in support of residential rezoning of Cranford-Basin Provided for Plan Change 1.

Written comment name: 007

ISSUE RAISED

The Commenter states that land outlined on Map provided is believed to be suitable for residential development and included within a Residential Priority Area. Land is believed to be not low lying or peaty and suitable for residential development. Land quality believed to be the same as along the western boundary developed for residential purposes decades ago. Land is close to Christchurch and amenities.

DISCUSSION RAISED

As for the reasons indicated for 001 and 070, it would be appropriate to provide for urban development of all of the balance portions of Cranford Basin, once the extent of the Northern Arterial and storm-water management needs are resolved.

Note that because of the relatively small size and elongated shape of the balance areas that are likely to be left for urban development, and the fact that some of it adjoins the low density LIB zone, the standard minimum density requirements for greenfield areas would not appear to be appropriate (as suggested in 060).

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

Identify all of Cranford Basin as a special greenfield area where it is appropriate that balance portions of the basin will be allowed to be used for residential or business

DRAFT – Not Government Policy

activities, once the extent of the Northern Arterial connection and storm-water management needs are resolved. Also, that the standard greenfield minimum density requirements for greenfield areas would not apply.

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

Nothing identified

ISSUE RAISED

Relates to LURP R6 Area. Purple area in map is stopping some distance short of the proposed new motorway corridor on the western side. In previous conversations and maps the area suitable for residential land went all the way to the motorway corridor. This is believed to be a mistake.

Relief sought

The yellow area on Map 14 (attached) should be included in the purple area

DISCUSSION RAISED

This area appears to have been an area that was excluded from R6 because, at the time PC1 was being prepared, an intersection with the Northern Arterial and Radcliffe Road was being considered at this point. An intersection is no longer proposed and there is no apparent reason for not including this land within R6. It includes land that is part of a property that is included in R6.

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

Include within R6

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

Nothing identified

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Attachment 1 Map of land in Cranford Basin

Attachment 2 Map 14 and enlargements

Written comment name: 040

ISSUE RAISED

Property fronting Cranford Street (shown in map 2) should be included in a greenfield (Business) priority area. Background of the area is provided with reference to the Commissioners decision on PCI.

DRAFT – Not Government Policy

Reasoning for the areas inclusion is that much of the Cranford Basin is a proposed designation for roading and storm water purposes so will not be suitable for rural land zoning.

DISCUSSION RAISED

As for the reasons indicated for 001 and 070, it would be appropriate to provide for the urban development of all of the balance portions of Cranford Basin, once the extent of the Northern Arterial and stormwater management needs are resolved.

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

Include a direction requiring the Council to prepare a plan change and ODP identifying appropriate urban development of all the balance portions of Cranford Basin once the extent of the Northern Arterial connection and stormwater management needs are resolved.

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

CCC

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

3 Maps of the property and Commissioners recommendations on PC1 attached.

Written comment name: 070

ISSUE RAISED

Cranford Basin be identified as a greenfield priority area for business and residential activities, or at the very least the west side of Cranford Street, and that the Christchurch City Plan be amended accordingly.

Other alternatives offered also: Include all of Case land as priority greenfield area "which will enable the rezoning of the balance land for business or residential" in the District Plan (presumably the balance land is that portion not required for stormwater management or the northern arterial connection);

OR Identify the proposed balance areas of the Case land as priority greenfield areas to enable the rezoning for business or residential in the district plan;

OR That the LURP clarify that the District Plan review is not precluded from rezoning areas for residential or business not identified as priority areas.

DISCUSSION RAISED

The work that is continuing on the Northern Arterial Connection and the stormwater management area required in Cranford Basin clearly indicates that, as a consequence of taking land for those purposes, a number of balance areas will remain with little potential for rural use. They would be surrounded by urban land and there do not appear to be strong grounds against their urban development. They are likely to be no more difficult to develop for urban activities than some other greenfield priority areas, e.g. Highfield.

It is noted that although wastewater infrastructure is unlikely to be available until 2016 at the earliest, this is no different from several other greenfield areas identified in LURP.

In light of the above and others, seeking inclusion of other land in a greenfield priority area, it would seem appropriate to agree to something along the lines of the third option

in 070. That is to provide for the appropriate urban development of all of the balance portions of Cranford Basin, once the extent of the Northern Arterial and stormwater management needs are resolved (at the District Plan level this is likely to be resolved as part of the preparation of an ODP).

Note that because of the relatively small size and elongated shape of the balance areas that are likely to be left for urban development and the fact that some of them adjoin the low density LIB zone, the standard minimum density requirements for greenfield areas would not appear to be appropriate (as suggested in 060).

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

Include a direction requiring the Council to prepare a plan change and ODP identifying appropriate urban development of all the balance portions of Cranford Basin once the extent of the Northern Arterial connection and stormwater management needs are resolved. The standard greenfield minimum density requirements for greenfield areas would not apply.

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

Infrastructure

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Note overlap with 007, 040, 060, 082 seeking inclusion of other land within Cranford Basin in a priority greenfield area.

Attachments: Maps of the property

Written comment name: 082

ISSUE RAISED

Regarding land described as being Part Lot 4 DP 16818 and Lot 3 DP 17791, a 13.0629ha area comprised in Computer Freehold Register CB594/19 acquired in 1987 under the Public Works Act for the purposes of road part of the proposed Northern Motorway. The land was gazetted as vesting in Her Majesty the Queen for the purposes of road, and Computer Freehold Register CB34B/625 was issued in the name of Her Majesty the Queen.

Located to the northeast of Cranford Street, St Albans, the land has frontage onto Croziers Road at the southern frontage, zoned Rural 3. The designations over land to be taken for the proposed linkage of the Northern Motorway to Central Christchurch were subsequently uplifted, following the taking of the subject site. The land was supposed to be offered back to the original land owner in 2001. The original owner is now deceased; but the land has been offered to the former owner's sons, and the contract agreement for the sale from the Crown to the descendants of the previous owner has been signed.

The commenters inform that the site lies at the southeastern end of the Styx stormwater catchment. In 2012, the Christchurch City Council undertook modelling of the Cranford Basin in the Styx SMP Blueprint for Surface Water Management. The report stated that due to the 17mm settling rate of peat in the basin, it is becoming impractical for its historic horticultural uses to continue, and has been affected by a further settlement of approximately 120mm since the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes. The report further stated that ceasing the horticultural use of the basin would make way for the land to perform an important hydrological function for the future.

DRAFT – Not Government Policy

In relation to the appended Styx SMP Sub-Catchments Dudley Diversion (9), the commenters note that the land immediately to the west of the area described in the appended document also includes land on the southern side of the water-way which has been considered by the Christchurch City Council as being appropriate for residential development, which fronts onto Cranford Street, an arterial road. The commenters believe there would be logic in including land from both properties located to the south of the water-way within the urban limits for development for residential purposes. This balance of land could also be developed as a flood detention area and suitably designed to include pedestrian walkways and cycle-ways for recreation use.

It is highlighted that the amendments to the Regional Policy Statement contained with the Draft LURP identify provisions including: the methods to ensure integration of land use with natural, cultural, social and economic outcomes, transport and other infrastructure including stormwater management planning, and; areas where rebuilding and development may not occur within the period of the Recovery Plan, including recognising specific constraints including natural hazards and environmental constraints such as the protection of people's health and well-being relating to development under the airport noise contour.

The commenters would be agreeable to the "rebuilding" processes, should that include permitting the rezoning of the 2.5ha for residential subdivision, allowing the "recovery" for the flood basin for stormwater attenuation purposes and the development of recreational activities that enhance the amenity values of the immediate community.

It is considered that the inclusion of the elevated part of the land being returned from the Crown to the descendants of the former owner for the use of residential development to assist in the rebuilding and recovery of Christchurch is not inconsistent with Objective 6.2.1 of the proposed amendments to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. It is also believed by the commenters that the proposal to seek the inclusion of part of the subject site into the area where limited expansion for residential subdivision and erection of dwellings could occur is entirely consistent with the proposed amendments to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, and the report Cranford Basin in the Styx SMP Blueprint for Surface Water Management

DISCUSSION RAISED

As for the reasons indicated for 001 and 070, it would be appropriate to provide for the urban development all of the balance portions of Cranford Basin, once the extent of the Northern Arterial and stormwater management needs are resolved.

Note that because of the relatively small size and elongated shape of the balance areas that are likely to be left for urban development, and the fact that some of it adjoins the low density LIB zone, the standard minimum density requirements for greenfield areas would not appear to be appropriate (as suggested in 060).

STRATEGIC PARTNER ADVICE TO CERA ON WRITTEN COMMENT

Include a direction requiring the Council to prepare a plan change and ODP identifying appropriate urban development of all the balance portions of Cranford Basin once the extent of the Northern Arterial connection and stormwater management needs are resolved. The standard greenfield minimum density requirements for greenfield areas would not apply.

RELATED TOPIC OR IMPACT

Nothing identified

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Attachment 1 Copy of CT CB34B/625

4. Recovery Strategy Officials Group

The issue of Cranford Basin was discussed at the additional Recovery Strategy Officials Group on 9 September.

Draft minutes for the Cranford Basin issue are below:

Paul Thomas noted that the development of Cranford Basin is a contested issue. The land required for roading and drainage infrastructure is currently being worked on out by the Christchurch City Council. The residual land is proposed to be included as an area available for residential development.

Richard Osborne noted that the potential for residual land being available for residential development is 'subject to further investigations'. The stability of the land may mean the residential yield might be low.

Tim Harris added that there is a risk in including the land in Map A, if it is included and shown as a residential priority area, there will be expectations from the land owners for progressing development.

Discussion was held on the potential for the land not to be appropriate for recovery housing needs, Richard Osborne noted that this is difficult to determine in advance of further investigations. Keith Tallentire suggested including an action in the LURP for the investigation and amendments as appropriate, once these have been completed.

Simon Markham questioned whether there is a strategic issue for more greenfield land in the LURP, if there is not than Cranford is an issue for the CCC and CERA to sort out. If the issue is around exceptional circumstances, other commenters will also claim exceptional circumstances. The rationale for inclusion would therefore have to be made explicit. Risk management is needed to address precedent setting.

Paul Thomas noted that Cranford Basin could be dealt with by not including as a priority area, but looking at the area through the Christchurch City District Plan review.

5. Emails from Richard Osborne - CCC

From: Osborne, Richard [mailto:Richard.Osborne@ccc.govt.nz]

Sent: **Wednesday, 11 September 2013 3:38 p.m.**

To: Paul Thomas

Cc: Ingles, Carolyn; de Ronde, Brigitte; Theelen, Michael

Subject: LURP - Working Documents - Council feedback

.....

* Cranford Basin

The Summary of Revisions to the LURP that you circulated with the revised document referred to Cranford Basin, and its inclusion as a priority area, subject to resolution of roading and drainage areas. We presume that it's only referring to the residual land that will remain in Cranford basin outside the land required for the NoR's for Stormwater and the Northern Arterial Extension? We note that Council is seeking to lodge the NoR's this year, however, confirming the designations will be some time away as they go through the relevant statutory processes. Given this, the lack of detailed assessments on the residual land to confirm its suitability for development and the ample supply of Greenfield's land for earthquake recovery purposes we question whether it is appropriate to identify this land as a Greenfield priority area via the LURP.

.....

From: Osborne, Richard [mailto:Richard.Osborne@ccc.govt.nz]

Sent: **Friday, 30 August 2013 1:57 p.m.**

To: Paul Thomas

Subject: RE: Cranford basin

Hi Paul,

There are active and ongoing discussions in this space, so things may change. Also, potential use of this land for residential purposes would need to be subject to geotech and other assessments. But our take is that for Ru3 land south of Winters Road there's approximately 50 ha of residual land that will not be used for Roading or Stormwater purposes. For land that's geotechnically sound a net density of 15 h/h per ha is assumed, which would yield approx 750 h/h. I believe PC 1 assumed 500 h/h for Cranford Basin, which may be a more realistic assumption. Hope this helps. Cheers, Richard

-----Original Message-----

DRAFT – Not Government Policy

From: Paul Thomas [mailto:paul.thomas@emslimited.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 30 August 2013 10:43 AM
To: Osborne, Richard
Subject: RE: Cranford basin

Thanks_ I am not looking for anything to rely on or pass on elsewhere - its just to get a rough idea of what hectareage where might be available and possible yield because we need to plug something general on this into our recommendations.

Paul

Paul Thomas | Director | Environmental Management Services P 04 4795034 F
04 4795045 M 0274 534 816 W www.emslimited.co.nz

-----Original Message-----

From: Osborne, Richard [mailto:Richard.Osborne@ccc.govt.nz]
Sent: Friday, 30 August 2013 10:41 a.m.
To: Paul Thomas
Subject: Cranford basin

Paul,

Im aware that you have asked for a map showing the Cranford Basin and land that sits outside the Northern Arterial Extension and the Stormwater NoR's. There are ongoing discussions around this so Im still trying to track down something that accurately reflects the latest thinking. I will get something to you when I can.

Cheers
Richard Osborne
Transport and Research Unit Manager
Strategy and Planning Group
DDI: 03 03 941 8407
Fax: 03 03 941 8337

DRAFT – Not Government Policy

Mobile: 027 702 0403

Email: richard.osborne@ccc.govt.nz

Web: www.ccc.govt.nz <<http://www.ccc.govt.nz>> Christchurch City Council Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch PO Box 73012, Christchurch, 8154 Please consider the environment before printing this email

Released under the Official Information Act 1982