

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF STEWART FLETCHER – HEARING STREAM 12E (RANGIORA, KAIAPOI, WOODEND & VARIATION 1) - SUBMISSION 121

1. My name is **STEWART FLETCHER**, I have provided evidence regarding a submission to zone a property at 216 Giles Road residential. The property is zoned Residential 7 in the Operative District Plan. The Proposed Plan, as notified, changed this to Rural Lifestyle. It is sought that this is corrected back to a residential zoning.
2. In my evidence, in response to questions of error, I place an emphasis on the background to the zoning of the property. Council as a submitter has advised that an error was made in the proposed plan and the property should be zoned residential. Against this, the reporting officer has suggested an error was made in the original zoning of the site. My evidence details that a clear process was followed within which the Council and Minister zoned the site for residential purposes. That zoning has now been in place for over 13 years.
3. The existing zoning of the property in the Operative Plan is Residential 7. Within this zone the predominant activity is residential living. Having an urban zoning has implications when considering documents like the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. The property should be assessed as an existing urban area which is different when compared to establishing a new urban area. As a side note, questions may be asked as to why the property is not marked as an existing urban area in MAP A in the CRPS. In response, the District Council did not update the District Plan maps for the property until two years after Chapter 6 was introduced to the LURP.
4. At a higher level, I consider this situation is unique. The property is 3.1 hectares which is less than the minimum lot size specified for a Rural Lifestyle Zone (4 hectares). If the Lifestyle zoning remains, this would remove existing development rights from the property and would have significant impacts on what the property could be used for, as well as its' value. I have difficulty recalling similar instances where a Council has in effect reversed a zoning. I can only think of situations when there is a physical reason to do so, such as a natural hazard. No such situation exists here.
5. Extensive assessments have been undertaken as part of a subdivision design and it has been determined the property can be serviced, flood risk can be addressed and Council has proposed shared pathway connections to the site. In my opinion there are no physical limitations which would prevent the existing residential zoning from remaining. I have considered whether site specific design controls would be required to enable the development of the property. The Proposed Plan rules include suitable provisions, such as setbacks and access being from side roads such that the combination of Proposed Plan rules and a standard subdivision consent process will ensure the property is developed in a suitable manner. I have also recommended a General Residential zoning is applied. Overall, it is considered there are no impediments to the continued zoning of the property for residential purposes.



ISLAND ROAD

ADDERLEY TCE

KAIAPOI CEMETERY

MAIN NORTH LINE

KAIAPOI RIVER

ISLAND ROAD

TRANSPOWER SUBSTATION

MURRAY PL

KYNNERSLEY S

EYRE PL

AUDLEY ST

SNEYD ST

COSGROVE RD

OHOKA RD OVERPASS

Christchurch Northern Motorway (SH 1)