

**WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**MEMO**

**FILE NO AND TRIM NO:** DDS-14-08-05 / 241029186942

**DATE:** 1 November 2024

**MEMO TO:** Hearing Commissioners

**FROM:** Mark Buckley, Principal Policy Planner – Development Planning Unit

**SUBJECT:** Hearing Streams 1 & 2 and 6 – Urban Form and Development, Strategic Directions, and Rural s42A reports – Missed submissions, further submissions and other errors

---

1. The purpose of this memorandum is to inform the Hearing Panel of missed submission points and missed further submission points, deferred submission points not addressed and various submission point errors across the Rural, Strategic Directions, and Urban Form and Development S42A reports. This memo includes, at Attachment 1, an updated 'recommended response to submissions and further submissions' to address the missed submission points and other errors.
2. The missed points were noticed in a further check of all original submission points and all further submission points across all S42A reports released to date. During the process of identifying missed submission points, a number of numbering errors were identified, and these errors are amended in Attachment 1.
3. The submission points and further submission points that were missed in the reports are as follows:

***Rural s42A report***

- Missed submissions:
  - Maurice Newell [281.4]
  - Dairy Holdings Limited [420.32](errata submission)
  - NZPork [169.1]
  - Horticulture New Zealand [295.23]
- Submission points reallocated/ deferred to rural report:
  - John Stevenson [162.4] and [162.5]
  - ECan [316.3]
    - Including further submissions by Christchurch International Airport Limited [FS 80], Horticulture New Zealand [FS 47], Miranda Hales [FS 46], and R & G Spark [FS 37].
  - CA and GJ McKeever [111.6]

- Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick [256.6]
    - Including further submission by Mark McKitterick [FS 2]
  - Keith Godwin [418.6]
  - Missed further submission points:
    - Survus Consultants [FS103]
    - Ohoka Residents Association [FS 137]
    - Royal Forest & Bird [FS 78]
    - Horticulture New Zealand [FS 47]
    - David Cowley [FS 41].
4. The four missed submitters identified above, all had other submission points addressed in the Rural S42A report and would therefore have been aware that their submission was being heard at Hearing Stream 6. No submitter raised the missed points as an issue at the hearing, or since the hearing. The four missed submission points are responded to in Table B1 in Attachment 1. No further submissions were made against these submission points.
  5. The Survus further submission [FS103] opposed DC and DA Bartram [369.2] that supported the general provisions relating to the use of two rural zones. The substance of Survus's further submission in opposition to the use of two rural zones and the location of the RLZ and GRUZ boundary. The use of two rural zones in the Proposed District Plan and the location of the RLZ to GRUZ boundary was addressed in section 3.22 of the S42A Rural Zones officer report.
  6. Of the missed further submission points identified in the Rural S42A report, the further submissions by the Ohoka Residents Association [FS 137] and Royal Forest & Bird [FS 78] were not identified elsewhere in the report and may therefore have been unaware that their further submissions were relevant to this report.
  7. The further submission by the Ohoka Residents Association (ORA) [FS 137] opposed the entire submission by Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited (RIDL) [326]. RIDL submitted extensively in support of provisions across the Proposed District Plan. ORA's opposition to the RIDL submission relates to the proposed rezoning of land at Ohoka which is not applicable to the RIDL [326] submission points addressed within the Rural s42A report. I therefore do not consider ORA to have been prejudiced by the omission of these further submission points.

### ***Urban Form and Development s42A report***

8. Attachment 1 of this memo includes amendments to errors identified in the Urban Form and Development S42A report including missed further submission points by the Ohoka Residents Association [FS 84 & 137], Royal Forest & Bird [FS 78], David Cowley [FS 41], Malcolm Dartnell [FS 4], and R & G Spark [FS 37]. The 'general further submissions' table in the s42A report has been updated in this memo to include additional further submissions that were made against a whole submission.
9. Of the missed further submissions, the further submissions by David Cowley, Malcom Dartnell and the Ohoka Residents Association were not identified elsewhere in the S42A report.
10. Mr Cowley's further submission [FS41] opposed ECan submissions [316] with respect to all of UFD, and UFD-P2 and UFD-P3 in particular. The further submission stated that the relief sought was contrary to the RMA and the NPS-UD and that the NPS-UD provided for unanticipated development and identified the rezoning of his property as an example (405 Bradley Road, Ohoka). The proposed rezoning of the property was addressed in Section 5.8.6 of the Stream 12C S42A LLRZ Rezoning officer report. Section 3.8 of the S42A UFD officer report recommended to reject the submissions from ECan on UFD-P2 (316.8) and UFD-P3 (316.9) and accepts David Cowley's further submission with respect to these two points. His submission also opposed Hort NZ's submissions and Federated Farmers submissions on UFD-P1 to P9 requesting the inclusion of the protection of LUC Class 1 to 3 soils into each policy. I did not recommend any amendments to UFD policies as the issue of versatile soils was addressed in the Rural Zones objectives and policies.
11. The further submission from Malcolm Dartnell [FS4] was in support of the rezoning request of Mr Allaway and Larsen (236.1). Mr Allaway and Larsen's rezoning submission was addressed in Section 5.9.2 of the Stream 12C S42A LLRZ Rezoning officer report, and recommended that it is rejected. The further submission from Malcolm Dartnell does not change my mind.
12. The further submission from the Ohoka Residents Association [FS84 & 137] opposed RIDL's submissions (160.3 and 326.510, 326.511, 326.512, 326.513, 326.514, 326.515, and 326.316) on UFD-P3 and P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9 and P10 respectively. Submission 160.3 was rejected in Section 3.4.2 and 326.510-516 were either accepted or accepted in part subject to amendments, as the submissions sought to retain the policies as notified. The Ohoka Residents Association further submissions do not change my mind with respect to the RIDL submissions on those policies listed.

### **Strategic Directions s42A report**

13. Attachment 1 of this memo includes amendments to errors identified in the Strategic Directions s42A report including missed further submissions by the Ohoka Residents Association [FS 137], Kainga Ora [FS 88], Forest & Bird [FS 78], David Cowley [FS 41], and Malcolm Dartnell [FS 4]. The 'general further submissions' table in the s42A report has been updated in this memo to include additional further submissions that were made against a whole submission.
14. Of the missed further submissions, the further submissions by the Ohoka Residents Association [FS 137], David Cowley [FS 41] and Malcolm Dartnell [FS 4] were not identified elsewhere in the s42A report. Some of the further submissions generally oppose the original submissions from RIDL (Ohoka Residents Association), ECan and Christchurch City Council (David Cowley), and support in whole for Allaway and Larsen (Malcolm Dartnell). The decision on these submissions is reflected in the decision on the main submission, and the further submissions have not changed my opinion on the original submission.
15. The further submission from David Cowley does identify two specific submission points. David Cowley opposed Christchurch City Council's submission (360.3) and supported Kainga Ora's submission (325.3) on SD-O2. Both Christchurch City Council and Kainga Ora wanted SD-O2 to be amended to recognises changes likely to occur to existing character from new development. David Cowley agreed that the proposed amendments by Kainga Ora to SD-O2 was consistent with the RMA and NPS-UD. My final decision on the submission is in para [44] to [56] of the Strategic Direction Right of Reply report. The further submission does not change my opinion on the Kainga Ora submission.

### **NPS-HPL Consideration**

16. ECan submission 316.3 requested that SD-O4 be amended to "*Amend SD-O4 to more explicitly provide for the need to make appropriate use of soil which is valued for existing or foreseeable future primary production, or through further fragmentation of rural land*". The Planning officer memo dated 22 July 2023 para [20] also noted that SD-O4 would need to be amended to recognise the importance of HPL within the district in line with NPS-HPL Policy 1. The amendments proposed in Section 3.25 of the S42A Rural Zones officer report did not adequately address the intent of the submission.
17. In considering the submission the following changes are recommended:

#### **SD-O4 Rural land environment**

Outside of identified residential development areas and the Special Purpose Zone (Kāinga Nohoanga), rural land is managed to ensure that it remains available for productive rural activities by:

1. providing for rural primary production, ~~activities, activities that directly support rural production activities~~ rural industry and activities reliant on the natural soil resources of Rural Zones and limit other activities; and
2. ensuring that within rural areas the establishment and operation of rural primary production activities are not limited by new incompatible sensitive activities.

### **Section 32AA**

18. The recommended amendment better aligns with Objective 1 of the NPS-HPL and the use of “land based primary production”. While it is recognised that gravel and mineral extraction occurs within the Waimakariri District, the analysis of gravel extraction provided for in the S42A Rural Zones officer report and the Strategic Direction Right of Reply (para [88] to [93] does not indicate that it is of greater national or regional importance than elsewhere in the region. 800,000 tonnes of gravel is extracted each year from the district, the majority of it is from the river systems (table 2 in ROR), which are outside the jurisdiction of the District Council.
19. The recommended amendment to SD-O4 links better with the recommended amendments to RURZ-O1 and RURZ-P2 for the protection of HPL (below).

#### **RURZ-O1 Rural Environment**

An environment with a predominant land use character comprising primary production activities and natural environment values, where rural openness dominates over built form, while recognising:

1. the east of the District has a predominant character of small rural sites with a pattern of built form of residential units and structures at more regular intervals at a low density compared to urban environments; and
2. the remainder of the District, while having a range in the size of rural sites, has a predominant character of larger rural sites with a corresponding density of residential units and built form.

3. the importance of protecting the highly productive and versatile soils that form part of the highly productive land in the District.

#### **RURZ-P2 Rural land**

Maintain the availability and life supporting capacity of land in recognition of its importance for undertaking primary production, and to maintain or enhance natural environment values in Rural Zones, including by:

1. ~~providing Enabling~~ for primary production activities;
2. ~~providing Enabling~~ for those activities that directly support primary production, or those activities with a functional need to be located within Rural Zones, where:

- a. adverse effects on versatile soils and highly productive land are ~~minimised~~ avoided;
  - b. the amenity values and character of Rural Zones are maintained; and
  - c. to the extent practicable, adverse effects are internalised within the site where an activity is being undertaken.
3. ensuring subdivision and subsequent development is managed so that it does not foreclose the ability for rural land to be utilised for primary production activities including not diminishing the potential for rural land to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.

### **Conclusion**

20. All the errors identified in this memo, including specifically the missed submission points and further submission points, were not raised as issues by submitters at the time of the hearings or since. Except where listed above, none of the missed submissions or further submissions have changed my initial assessment.
21. Having reviewed the missed submission and further submission points, I have not changed my opinion or recommendation on any of the submissions.
22. In order to distinguish between the recommendations made in the s42A report and the recommendations that arise from this memo, recommendations from this memo are shown in blue text (with underline and ~~strike-out~~ as appropriate).

## Attachment 1: Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions

Table B 1: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions – Rural s42a report: missed submissions

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
<b>Rural s42A missed submission points</b>							
<a href="#">281.4</a>	<a href="#">Maurice Newell</a>	<a href="#">Planning maps - General</a>	<a href="#">Allow applications that were lodged before notification. Map and protect good soils and allow subdivision of poorer soils. Provide large residential areas near similar zones. Price of land may mean people will buy larger blocks who know nothing about farming.</a>	<a href="#">Sections 3.7.2, 3.20, and 3.22 of the Rural S42A report.</a>	<a href="#">Reject</a>	<a href="#">This submission point seeks the same relief sought as submission points 281.2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 that are addressed in the Rural s42A report.</a>  <a href="#">These submission points are addressed in sections 3.7.2, 3.20, and 3.22 of the Rural S42A report and I refer to the assessment within those sections of the report.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">420.32</a>	<a href="#">Dairy Holdings Limited</a>	<a href="#">GRUZ - General</a>	<a href="#">Retain GRUZ rules as notified.</a>	<a href="#">Only addressed here</a>	<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	<a href="#">Submissions were received in support and in opposition to the GRUZ rules and Appendix A to the s42A report recommends amendments to some of the GRUZ provisions in response to some of these submissions. I therefore recommend this submission point be accepted in part.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">169.1</a>	<a href="#">NZPork</a>	<a href="#">Definitions nesting table - general</a>	<a href="#">Amend by inserting 'primary production' to the definitions nesting tables.</a>	<a href="#">Only addressed here</a>	<a href="#">Reject</a>	<a href="#">It is unclear from the submission where the submitter intends the definition of 'primary production' to be nested within the definitions nesting tables. The definitions nesting tables as notified in the Proposed District Plan relates to 'Commercial Activities' and 'Industrial Activities', neither of which are relevant to the definition of 'primary production'. I therefore recommend this submission point is rejected.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">295.23</a>	<a href="#">Horticulture New Zealand</a>	<a href="#">Definition of cultivation</a>	<a href="#">Retain definition of 'cultivation' as notified.</a>	<a href="#">Only addressed here</a>	<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">The definition of 'cultivation' is a National Planning Standards definition and is unable to be amended through the Proposed District Plan hearings process. I also note that the submission point is the only submission on the definition. I therefore recommend the definition be retained as notified and the submission point be accepted.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>

Table B 2: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions - Rural s42a report: other errors

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
<b>Rural s42a report – submission points addressed in s42A report but missing from Appendix B</b>							
<a href="#">16.11</a>	<a href="#">Drucilla Kingi - Patterson</a>	<a href="#">General</a>	<a href="#">Quarry cannot be established within a certain area of Airport due to dust levels.</a>	<a href="#">3.24</a>	<a href="#">Reject</a>	<a href="#">The submission is addressed in the Rural s42A report but is missing from the Appendix B. See section 3.24 of the Rural s42A report for the assessment of this submission point.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">359.2</a>	<a href="#">DC and DA Bartram</a>	<a href="#">Planning maps - general</a>	<a href="#">Support general principle of two rural zones where the land use is rural.</a>  <a href="#">[Specific relief sought not specified]</a>	<a href="#">3.22</a>	<a href="#">Accepted</a>	<a href="#">The submission is addressed in the Rural s42A report but is missing from the Appendix B. See section 3.22 of the Rural s42A report for the assessment of this submission point.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">FS 103</a>	<a href="#">Survus Consultants</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
<a href="#">55.1</a>	<a href="#">The Broken River Trust</a>	<a href="#">Definitions - General</a>	<a href="#">Request Council to expand on the National Planning standard definition of 'building' and add 'drawn vehicle' to the exclusion definition so that caravans or tiny homes on wheels (mobile or static, factory manufactured or custom built) are acknowledged as vehicles and have a legitimate place beside Motor Homes. This new wording would read "but excludes any motorised vehicle or drawn vehicle or other mode of transport that could be moved under its own power "</a>  <a href="#">Allow the siting, storage, parking, and utilisation of 'Vehicles' in appropriate residential zones used for short term stays, or used for long term stays if compliance under schedule 1 or 1(2) of the Building Act 2004 is achieved. Cover the classification of trailer type vehicle in a new permitted sleeping place. This wording to allow for this could include 'Temporary Residential Unit', 'Temporary Family living space', and 'Temporary Living Place' (refer to full submission for definitions).</a>	<a href="#">3.26</a>	<a href="#">Reject</a>	<a href="#">The submission is addressed in the Rural s42A report (para [953] and [954]) but is missing from the Appendix B. See section 3.26 of the Rural s42A report for the assessment of this submission point.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<b>Rural s42A report – submission point errors in Appendix B</b>							
<a href="#">276.10</a>	<a href="#">Z Energy, BP Oil, Mobil Oil New Zealand</a>	<a href="#">Definition of sensitive activity</a>	<a href="#">Support 'sensitive activities' definition.</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">284.10</a>	<a href="#">Clampett Investments Ltd</a>	<a href="#">Definition of gross floor area</a>	<a href="#">Retain 'gross floor area' definition as notified.</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">See the relevant section of the report. Noting that the definition is a National Planning Standards definition and that Council is required to use the definition when it is used in the same context as the meaning.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">295.10</a>	<a href="#">Horticulture New Zealand</a>	<a href="#">Definition of addition</a>	<a href="#">Retain definition of 'addition' as notified.</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">See the relevant section of the report.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">295.40</a>	<a href="#">Horticulture New Zealand</a>	<a href="#">Definition of intensive indoor primary production</a>	<a href="#">Retain definition of 'intensive indoor primary production' as notified.</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">The definition is a National Planning Standards definition and that Council is required to use the definition when it</a>	<a href="#">No</a>



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
						<a href="#">is used in the same context as the meaning.</a>	
<a href="#">254295.60</a>	Horticulture New Zealand	Definitions - General	Insert new definition:  " <u>Crop Support Structure</u> means an open structure on which plants are grown."		Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">169.50</a>	NZPork	GRUZ-R17	Combine GRUZ-R17, GRUZ-R18 into new rule for Intensive Primary Production and retain RDIS activity status.	3.11.40	Accept	See the relevant section of the report	Yes
<a href="#">295.150</a>	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-R21	Retain GRUZ-R21 activity status as notified.		Accept		No
<a href="#">295.160</a>	Horticulture New Zealand	GRUZ-R35	Amend GRUZ-R35 activity status to non-complying.	3.11.55	Reject	See the relevant section of the report	No
<a href="#">326.560</a>	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited	GRUZ-R11	Retain GRUZ-R11 as notified.		Reject		No
<a href="#">326.570</a>	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited	GRUZ-R21	Retain GRUZ-R21 as notified.		Accept		No
<a href="#">326.580</a>	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited	GRUZ-R31	Retain GRUZ-R31 as notified.		Accept		No
<a href="#">326.590</a>	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited	GRUZ-R41	Retain GRUZ-R41 as notified.		Reject		No
<a href="#">351.10</a>	Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited	GRUZ-R18	Amend GRUZ-R18:  " <u>Activity Status: RDIS</u> <u>Activity status: PER</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>(1) the activity complies with all built form standards (as applicable).</u> <u>Activity status when compliance with GRUZ-R18 (1) not achieved: RDIS</u> ..."	3.11.40	Accept in part	See the relevant section of the report.	Yes
<a href="#">41.50</a>	Fulton Hogan	GRUZ-R30	Amend GRUZ-R30: ".... 1. the quarry shall be set back a minimum of <del>400</del> 500m from the boundary of a Residential Zone."	3.11.51	Accept	See the relevant section of the report.	Yes
<a href="#">414.190</a>	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	GRUZ-R2	Delete GRUZ-R2.	3.11.5	Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">420.30</a>	Dairy Holdings Limited (DHL)	GRUZ-P2	Retain GRUZ-P2 as notified.		Accept		No
<a href="#">147.10</a>	Kaipoi-Tuahiwi Community Board	RLZ - General	People wanting a rural lifestyle do not want 4ha and 1ha minimum is a more efficient use of land. Allow more than one dwelling on lots in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	3.22	Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">169.70</a>	NZPork	RLZ-R4	Amend RLZ-R4: "....	3.17.13	Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			- <u>In the case of a minor residential unit used for farm workers accommodation:</u> - <u>limited to a maximum GFA of 120m2 (exclusive of garages, and decks) and</u> - <u>must share vehicle access with the principal residential unit on the site. ..."</u>				
171.20	Rayonier Matariki Forests	RLZ - General	Amend Rural Lifestyle Zone by adding statement in regard to National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry prevailing for plantation forestry activities.	3.13.2	Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No
221.10	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association	RLZ-R1	Amend RLZ-R1:  "1. The activity complies with all built form standards (as applicable). 2. A building is moved: a. It shall be fixed to permanent foundations within 2 months (unless being stored as a temporary activity) and b. Reinstatement works to the exterior of the building shall be completed within 12 months, including connection to services, and closing in of the foundations. c. A building pre-inspection report to accompany the application for a building consent for the destination site which identifies all reinstatement works that are to be completed to the exterior of the building and a certification by the property owner that the reinstatement works shall be completed within the specified [12] month period."	3.11.2	Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No
275.80	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	RLZ-R7	Amend Rule RLZ-R7:  "Where: ... 2. a maximum of eight visitors shall be accommodated per site; and 3. where the activity is accessed off a state highway, any existing vehicle crossing shall comply, or be upgraded to comply, with TRAN-S5."	3.17.16	Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No
295.180	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-R22	Retain RLZ-R22 activity status as notified.		Accept		No
295.190	Horticulture New Zealand	RLZ-R38	Retain RLZ-R38 as notified.		Accept		No
316.170	Canterbury Regional Council	RURZ-P2	Retain RURZ-P2 as notified or retain original intent.		Accept in part		No
419.130	Department of Conservation	RURZ-P4	Retain RURZ-P4 as notified.		Accept		No
FS 78	Royal Forest & Bird		Support		Accept		
46.30	Woodstock Quarries Limited	RURZ-P2	Retain RURZ-P2 as notified.		Accept in part		No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
<b>Rural s42A report – Missed further submissions</b>							
169.10	NZ Pork	Farm workers accommodation	Insert new definition: "Farm workers' accommodation Means a minor residential unit for people whose duties require them to live on-site, and in the rural zones for people who work on the site or in the surrounding rural area. Includes farm managers, workers and staff."	3.26	Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 47</a>	<a href="#">Hort NZ</a>		<a href="#">Support</a>		<a href="#">Reject</a>		

**Rural s42A report updated table of general further submissions**

Further submitter	FS number	Provision	Submission number	Original submitter	Support/ oppose	Outcome sought
Richard & Geoff Spark	37	Whole submission	360	Christchurch City Council		
Miranda Hales	46	Whole submission	360	Christchurch City Council	Oppose	Reject
CIAL	80	Whole submission	360	Christchurch City Council	Support	Accept
Kainga Ora	88	Whole submission	254.01 - 254.155	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Oppose	Disallow
Forest & Bird	78	Whole submission	419.1 - 419.155	Department of Conservation	Support	
Richard & Geoff Spark	37	Whole submission	295	Horticulture NZ	Oppose	Disallow
CIAL	80	Whole submission	295	Horticulture NZ	Support	Accept
CIAL	80	Whole submission	316	Canterbury Regional Council	Support	Accept
Rachel Hobson & Bernard Whimp	90	Whole submission	316	Canterbury Regional Council		Disallow in part
<a href="#">David Cowley</a>	<a href="#">41</a>	<a href="#">Whole Submission</a>	<a href="#">316</a>	<a href="#">Canterbury Regional Council</a>	<a href="#">Oppose</a>	<a href="#">Disallow</a>
<a href="#">Ohoka Residents Association</a>	<a href="#">137</a>	<a href="#">Whole Submission</a>	<a href="#">326</a>	<a href="#">Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited</a>	<a href="#">Oppose</a>	<a href="#">Disallow</a>

**Table B 3: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions – Rural s42a report: Submission points reallocated/ deferred to rural report**

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
<b>Submission points reallocated/ deferred to rural report</b>							
162.4	John Stevenson	SD-O4	Neutral on SD-O4	<a href="#">Addressed here</a>	<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">The Strategic Directions s42A report recommends the submission point be accepted and that the "Submission relates to rezoning of San Dona and is covered in the hearing report on Rural Zones."</a> <a href="#">The rezoning part of the submission has been addressed in Hearing Stream 12C. As the submission point is neutral on SD-O4, I recommend this submission point be accepted.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
316.3	ECan	SD-O4	Amend SD-O4 to more explicitly provide for the need to make appropriate use of soil which is valued for existing or foreseeable future primary production, or through further fragmentation of rural land.	<a href="#">Addressed here</a>	<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">The submission was discussed in section 3.20.3 of the S42A Rural Zones officer report and the Planning Officer Memo dated 22 July 2023 on the NPS-HPL.</a>	<a href="#">Yes</a>
<a href="#">FS 80</a>	<a href="#">Christchurch International Airport Limited</a>		<a href="#">Support</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
<a href="#">FS 47</a>	<a href="#">Hort NZ</a>		<a href="#">Support</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
<a href="#">FS 46</a>	<a href="#">Miranda Hales</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Reject</a>		
<a href="#">FS 37</a>	<a href="#">R &amp; G Spark</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Reject</a>		
111.6	CA and GJ McKeever	SD-O5	Neutral on SD-O5		<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">The Strategic Directions s42A report recommends the submission point be accepted and that the "Submission relates to rezoning of San Dona and is covered in the Section 42a hearing report on Rural Zones."</a> <a href="#">The rezoning part of the submission has been addressed in Hearing Stream 12C. As the submission point is neutral on SD-O5, I recommend this submission point be accepted.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
162.5	John Stevenson	SD-O5	Neutral on SD-O5		<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">The Strategic Directions s42A report recommends the submission point be accepted and that the "Submission relates to rezoning of San Dona and is covered in the Section 42a hearing report on Rural Zones."</a> <a href="#">The rezoning part of the submission has been addressed in Hearing Stream 12C. As the submission point is neutral on SD-O5, I recommend this submission point be accepted.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
256.6	Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	SD-O5	Neutral on SD-O5		<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">The Strategic Directions s42A report recommends the submission point be accepted and that the "Submission relates to rezoning of San Dona and is covered in the Section 42A hearing report on Rural Zones."</a> <a href="#">The rezoning part of the submission has been addressed in Hearing Stream 12C. As the submission point is neutral on SD-O5, I recommend this submission point be accepted.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">FS 2</a>	<a href="#">Mark McKitterick</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>				
418.6	Keith Godwin	SD-O5	Neutral on SD-O5		<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">The Strategic Directions s42A report identifies that the "Submission relates to rezoning of San Dona and is</a>	<a href="#">No</a>

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
						<a href="#">covered in the Section 42A report on Rural Zones.</a> The rezoning part of the submission has been addressed in Hearing Stream 12C. As the submission point is neutral on SD-O5, I recommend this submission point be accepted.	

Table B4: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions – Urban Form and Development s42a report: errors

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
<b>Urban Form and Development s42A report - submission points addressed in s42A report but missing from Appendix B</b>							
<a href="#">284.11</a>	<a href="#">Clampett Investments Ltd</a>	<a href="#">Definition of key activity centre</a>	<a href="#">Retain 'key activity centre' definition as notified.</a>	<a href="#">CMUZ report</a>	<a href="#">NA</a>	<a href="#">Section 3.3 of the S42A CMUZ officer report addresses this submission</a>	<a href="#">NA</a>
<a href="#">326.13</a>	<a href="#">Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited</a>	<a href="#">Definition of key activity centre</a>	<a href="#">Retain definition of 'key activity centre' as notified.</a>	<a href="#">CMUZ report</a>	<a href="#">NA</a>	<a href="#">Section 3.3 of the S42A CMUZ officer report addresses this submission</a>	<a href="#">NA</a>
<a href="#">FS 137</a>	<a href="#">Ohoka Residents Association</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>				
<a href="#">284.9</a>	<a href="#">Clampett Investments Ltd</a>	<a href="#">Definition of future development strategy</a>	<a href="#">Retain 'Future Development Strategy' definition as notified.</a>	<a href="#">3.9</a>	<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">Agree with submitter</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">326.11</a>	<a href="#">Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited</a>	<a href="#">Definition of future development</a>	<a href="#">Retain definition of 'future development strategy' as notified.</a>	<a href="#">3.9</a>	<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">Agree with submitter</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">FS 137</a>	<a href="#">Ohoka Residents Association</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>				
<b>Urban Form and Development s42A report – submission point errors in Appendix B</b>							
<a href="#">326.50</a>	<a href="#">Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited</a>	<a href="#">UFD-P9</a>	<a href="#">Retain UFD-P9 as notified.</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">Agree with submitter</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">FS 137</a>	<a href="#">Ohoka Residents Association</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Reject</a>		
<a href="#">145.10</a>	<a href="#">Daiken New Zealand Limited</a>	<a href="#">UFD-P1</a>	<a href="#">Retain UFD-P1 as notified.</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">Agree with submitter subject to amendments made in response to other submissions</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">284.350</a>	<a href="#">Clampett Investments Ltd</a>	<a href="#">UFD-P4</a>	<a href="#">Retain UFD-P4 as notified.</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">Agree with submitter</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">284.40</a>	<a href="#">Clampett Investments Ltd</a>	<a href="#">UFD-P2</a>	<a href="#">Retain UFD-P2 as notified.</a>		<a href="#">Accept in part</a>	<a href="#">Accept in part, subject to amendments made in response to other submissions</a>	<a href="#">No</a>

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
326.51 <sup>10</sup>	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited	UFD-P4	Retain UFD-P4 as notified.		Accept	Agree with submitter	No
<a href="#">FS 137</a>	<a href="#">Ohoka Residents Association</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Reject</a>		
<b>Urban Form and Development s42A report – Missed further submission points</b>							
160.3 <sup>1</sup>	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	UFD-P3	Amend UFD-P3: "... 2. new Large Lot Residential development, other than addressed by (1) above, is located so that it: a. occurs in a form that is attached to an existing Large Lot Residential Zone or Small Settlement Zone or <u>General Residential Zone</u> and promotes a coordinated pattern of development; ..."	3.4	Reject	Inconsistent with intent in UFDP3(2)(c) that excludes LLRZ development on the direct edge of townships as it would constrain future residential development in that area due to increase land pricing, result in uneconomic development potential of small parcels, piecemeal infrastructure development.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Support</a>		<a href="#">Reject</a>		
<a href="#">FS 84</a>	<a href="#">Ohoka Residents Association</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
<a href="#">FS 137</a>	<a href="#">Ohoka Residents Association</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
295.205 <sup>2</sup>	Hort NZ	UFD-P1	Amend UFD-P1 to ensure the life supporting capacity of soils are safeguarded.	3.7	Reject	The policy addresses the housing bottom line and is not intended to address the life supporting capacity of soils.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
295.206 <sup>3</sup>	Hort NZ	UFD-P2	Amend UFD-P2 to ensure the life supporting capacity of soils are safeguarded.	3.7	Reject	See relevant section of the report	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
295.207 <sup>4</sup>	Hort NZ	UFD-P3	Amend UFD-P3 to ensure the life supporting capacity of soils are safeguarded.	3.7	Reject	See relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
295.208 <sup>5</sup>	Hort NZ	UFD-P4	Amend UFD-P4 to ensure the life supporting capacity of soils are safeguarded.	3.7	Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
295.209 <sup>6</sup>	Hort NZ	UFD-P5	Amend UFD-P5 to ensure the life supporting capacity of soils are safeguarded.	3.7	Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		

<sup>1</sup> 54 Waka Kotahi FS110 oppose; J & C Docherty FS36 oppose; P & M Drive FS51 oppose; E Liddell FS56 oppose; M Emms FS59 oppose; C Mullins FS61 oppose; Oxford Ohoka Community Board FS62 oppose; J Armstrong FS65 oppose; S M Brantley FS69 oppose; B G Brantley FS70 oppose; A G Brantley FS71 oppose; S Holland FS72 oppose; M Holland FS73 oppose; V & R Robb FS74 oppose; E & J Hamilton FS75 oppose; M Koh FS98 oppose; G C Alexander FS112 oppose; A Marsden FS119 oppose; C Marsden FS120 oppose; R Hall FS128 oppose; Waimakariri District Council FS48 oppose

<sup>2</sup> Michael & Jean Schluter FS89 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose

<sup>3</sup> Michael & Jean Schluter FS89 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>4</sup> Michael & Jean Schluter FS89 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>5</sup> Michael & Jean Schluter FS89 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>6</sup> Michael & Jean Schluter FS89 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
295.210 <sup>7</sup>	Hort NZ	UFD-P6	Amend UFD-P6 to ensure the life supporting capacity of soils are safeguarded.	3.7	Reject	See relevant section of the report	
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
295.211 <sup>8</sup>	Hort NZ	UFD-P7	Amend UFD-P7 to ensure the life supporting capacity of soils are safeguarded.	3.5	Reject	See relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
295.212 <sup>9</sup>	Hort NZ	UFD-P8	Amend UFD-P8 to ensure the life supporting capacity of soils are safeguarded.	3.7	Reject	See relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
295.74 <sup>10</sup>	Hort NZ	UFD-P9	Amend UFD-P9 to ensure the life supporting capacity of soils are safeguarded.	3.7	Reject	See relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
414.58 <sup>1112</sup>	Federated Farmers	UFD-P1	Amend UFD-P1 by inserting an additional clause 3: "... <u>3. Avoid where practicable any development on LUC 1-3 soils.</u> "	3.7	Reject	See relevant section of this report	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
414.59 <sup>1314</sup>	Federated Farmers	UFD-P2	Amend UFD-P2 by inserting an additional clause 3: "... <u>3. Avoid where practicable any development on LUC 1-3 soils.</u> "	3.6	Reject	See relevant section of the report	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
169.12 <sup>15</sup>	NZ Pork	UFD-P2	Amend UFD-P2 to include criteria for considering effects on primary production and highly productive land.	3.7	Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
414.60 <sup>1617</sup>	Federated Farmers	UFD-P3	Amend UFD-P3 by inserting an additional clause (2)(f): "... <u>Avoid where practicable any development on LUC 1-3 soils.</u> "	3.7	Reject	See relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
414.61 <sup>1819</sup>	Federated Farmers	UFD-P4	Amend UFD-P4 by inserting an additional sentence:	3.7	Reject	See the relevant section of the report	No

<sup>7</sup> Michael & Jean Schluter FS89 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>8</sup> Michael & Jean Schluter FS89 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>9</sup> Michael & Jean Schluter FS89 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>10</sup> Michael & Jean Schluter FS89 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>11</sup> ECan FS105 support

<sup>12</sup> Transpower FS92 oppose; Michael & Jean Schluter FS89 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>13</sup> ECan FS105 support

<sup>14</sup> Transpower FS92 oppose; Michael & Jean Schluter FS89 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>15</sup> Michael & Jean Schluter FS89 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>16</sup> ECan FS105 support

<sup>17</sup> Transpower FS92 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>18</sup> ECan FS105 support

<sup>19</sup> Transpower FS92 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			"Avoid where practicable any development on LUC 1-3 soils."				
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
414.62 <sup>20212223</sup>	Federated Farmers	UFD-P5	Amend UFD-P5 by inserting an additional sentence:  "Avoid where practicable any development on LUC 1-3 soils."	3.7	Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
414.63 <sup>2425</sup>	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc. - Peter Wilson	UFD-P6	UFD-P6 does not need any amendment as the relief in UFD-P2 would cover it.		Accept in part	Accept in part, subject to amendments made in response to other submissions. Submission relates to the protection of highly versatile soils, which will be covered within the relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Reject</a>		
414.64 <sup>2627</sup>	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc.	UFD-P7	Amend UFD-P7: "... 6. Avoid where practicable any development on LUC 1-3 soils."	3.7	Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
414.65 <sup>2829</sup>	Federated Farmers	UFD-P8	Amend UFD-P8: "... 5. Avoid where practicable any development on LUC 1-3 soils."	3.7	Reject	See relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
414.66 <sup>3031</sup>	Federated Farmers	UFD-P9	Amend UFD-P9: "... 4. Avoid where practicable any development on LUC 1-3 soils."	3.7	Reject	See relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
414.67 <sup>32</sup>	Federated Farmers	UFD-P10	Amend UFD-P10: "... 3. Minimise reverse sensitivity effects on primary production, including LUC 1-3 soils."	3.7	Reject	See relevant section of the report.	No

<sup>20</sup> ECan FS105 support

<sup>21</sup> Transpower FS92 oppose

<sup>22</sup> R & G Spark FS37 oppose

<sup>23</sup> M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>24</sup> ECan FS105 support

<sup>25</sup> Transpower FS92 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>26</sup> ECan FS105 support

<sup>27</sup> R & G Spark FS37 oppose; Transpower FS92 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>28</sup> ECan FS105 support

<sup>29</sup> Transpower FS92 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>30</sup> ECan FS105 support

<sup>31</sup> Transpower FS92 oppose; R & G Spark FS37 oppose; M Hales FS46 oppose

<sup>32</sup> Michael & Jean Schluter FS89 oppose



Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		

Urban Form and Development s42A report - updated Table 3: General Further Submissions

Further submitter	FS number	Provision	Submission number	Original submitter	Support / oppose	Outcome sought
I.W and L.M. Bisman	38	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Oppose
Waimakariri District Council	48	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	Oppose	Disallow
Martin Hewitt	60	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Whole disallowed
Steven Holland	72	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Whole disallowed
Michelle Holland	73	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Whole disallowed
Val & Ray Robb	74	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Whole disallowed
Edward & Justing Hamilton	75	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Whole disallowed
David & Elaine Brady	130	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Disallow
Jan Hadfield	132	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Disallow
Emma Wood	136	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Disallow
MainPower NZ Ltd	58	Whole submission	325	Kainga Ora	Oppose	
Richard & Geoff Spark	37	Whole submission	325	Kainga Ora		Disallow
Miranda Hales	46	Whole submission	325	Kainga Ora	Oppose	Disallow
Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	85	Whole submission	325	Kainga Ora	Oppose	Disallow
R J Paterson Family Trust	91	Whole submission	325	Kainga Ora		Allow in part
Richard & Geoff Spark	37	Whole submission	360	Christchurch City Council		
Miranda Hales	46	Whole submission	360	Christchurch City Council	Oppose	Reject
CIAL	80	Whole submission	360	Christchurch City Council	Support	Accept
Richard & Geoff Spark	37	Whole submission	408	Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd		
Kainga Ora	88	Whole submission	207.1 - 207.49	Summerset Retirement Villages (Rangiora ) Ltd	Oppose	Disallow
Kainga Ora	88	Whole submission	254.01 - 254.155	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Oppose	Disallow
DEXIN Investment Ltd	101	Whole submission	416.1 - 416.15	Sports & Education Corporation	Support	Allow
Forest & Bird	78	Whole submission	419.1 - 419.155	Department of Conservation	Support	
R J Paterson Family Trust	91	223.1 - 223.15 Covers Planning Maps, SD, UFD, SUB, RESZ, GRZ, WR	223	John and Coral Broughton		Allow in Part
FS Damian & Sarah Elley	28	236.1 - 236.28 covers PLANNING MAPS, SD, UFD, SUB, LLRZ, RESZ	236	Rick Allaway & Lionel Larsen	Support	
FS JP Bailey Family Trust	29	236.1 - 236.28 covers PLANNING MAPS, SD, UFD, SUB, LLRZ, RESZ	236	Rick Allaway & Lionel Larsen	Support	
FS Kim Manson & Neihana Kuru	30	236.1 - 236.28 covers PLANNING MAPS, SD, UFD, SUB, LLRZ, RESZ	236	Rick Allaway & Lionel Larsen	Support	
FS Ross Fraser	31	236.1 - 236.28 covers PLANNING MAPS, SD, UFD, SUB, LLRZ, RESZ	236	Rick Allaway & Lionel Larsen	Support	

Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

FS L N R deLacy	32	236.1 - 236.28 covers PLANNING MAPS, SD, UFD, SUB, LLRZ, RESZ	236	Rick Allaway & Lionel Larsen	Support	
FB Louise Marriott	33	236.1 - 236.28 covers PLANNING MAPS, SD, UFD, SUB, LLRZ, RESZ	236	Rick Allaway & Lionel Larsen	Support	
<a href="#">Malcolm Dartnell</a>	<a href="#">4</a>	<a href="#">Whole submission</a>	<a href="#">236</a>	Rick Allaway & Lionel Larsen	<a href="#">Support</a>	<a href="#">Allow</a>
Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	85	242.1 - 242.14 covers PLANNING MAPS, SD, UFD, SUB, RESZ, GRZ, GENERAL	242	Dalkeith Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Disallow
Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	85	246.1 - 246.16 covers PLANNING MAPS, WR, SD, UFD, SUB, RESZ, GRZ, GENERAL	246	Miranda Hales		Disallow
Richard & Geoff Spark	37	Whole submission	295	Horticulture NZ	Oppose	Disallow
CIAL	80	Whole submission	295	Horticulture NZ	Support	Accept
CIAL	80	Whole submission	316	Canterbury Regional Council	Support	Accept
Rachel Hobson & Bernard Whimp	90	Whole submission	316	Canterbury Regional Council		Disallow in part
<a href="#">David Cowley</a>	<a href="#">41</a>	<a href="#">Whole Submission</a>	<a href="#">316</a>	<a href="#">Canterbury Regional Council</a>	<a href="#">Oppose</a>	<a href="#">Disallow</a>
<a href="#">R &amp; G Spark</a>	<a href="#">37</a>	<a href="#">Whole Submission</a>	<a href="#">316</a>	<a href="#">Canterbury Regional Council</a>	<a href="#">Oppose</a>	<a href="#">Disallow</a>
<a href="#">Ohoka Residents Association</a>	<a href="#">137</a>	<a href="#">Whole Submission</a>	<a href="#">326</a>	<a href="#">Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited</a>	<a href="#">Oppose</a>	<a href="#">Disallow</a>

Table B5: Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions – Strategic Directions s42a report: errors

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
<b>Strategic Directions s42A report - submission points addressed in s42A report but missing from Appendix B</b>							
<a href="#">326.33</a>	<a href="#">Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited</a>	<a href="#">Definition of urban environment</a>	<a href="#">Retain definition of 'urban environment' as notified.</a>	<a href="#">3.12</a>	<a href="#">Accept</a>	<a href="#">See the relevant section of the s42A report. It should be noted that "urban environment" was recommended to be replaced with "urban centres" in SD-O2 to clarify what areas Council actually considers are urban.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">FS 137</a>	<a href="#">Ohoka Residents Association</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
<a href="#">347.4</a>	<a href="#">Ravenswood Developments Limited (RDL)</a>	<a href="#">Definition of urban environment</a>	<a href="#">Amend definition of 'urban environment' from "Woodend (including Ravenswood), Pegasus" to "Woodend (including Ravenswood and Pegasus)"</a>	<a href="#">3.12</a>	<a href="#">Reject</a>	<a href="#">See the relevant section of the s42A report.</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
<a href="#">158.5</a>	<a href="#">A. Carr</a>	<a href="#">Definition of urban environment</a>	<a href="#">Amend definition of 'urban environments' to reference the Large Lot Residential Zone Overlay.</a>	<a href="#">3.12</a>	<a href="#">Reject</a>	<a href="#">See the relevant section of the Strategic Directions s42A report. I note that in section 3.12 of the s42A report, this submission point is incorrectly identified as 185.5. The response to the overarching question in the Stream 12C LLRZ Rezoning Preliminary Response frames the approach taken by Council</a>	<a href="#">No</a>

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
						<a href="#">with respect to whether LLRZ is an urban environment.</a>	
<b>Strategic Directions s42A report - submission point errors in Appendix B</b>							
277.10	Ministry of Education	SD-O2	Amend SD-O2: "... 9. provides limited opportunities for Large Lot Residential development in identified areas, subject to adequate infrastructure and <u>10. provides for educational facilities throughout the district to support urban growth and development and ...</u> "	3.10	Reject	See the relevant section of the report. The provision of education facilities is provided for in Policy RESZ-P6 and is not a strategic direction issue.	No
192.30	Forest and Bird	SD-O2	Amend SD-O2 to insert additional clause:  <u>"X incorporates and sustains indigenous biodiversity"</u>	3.4	Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No
254.20	Christchurch International Airport Limited	SD-O4	Amend SD-O4:  "Outside of identified residential development areas and the Special Purpose Zone (Kāinga Nohoanga), rural land is managed to ensure that: 1. it remains available for productive rural activities by: a. providing for rural production activities, activities that directly support rural production activities and activities reliant on the natural resource of Rural Zones and limit other activities and b. ensuring that within rural areas the establishment and operation of rural production activities are not limited by new incompatible sensitive activities. and 2. development and land use does not adversely affect the efficient operation, use and development of strategic infrastructure."	3.8	Reject	See the relevant section of the report.	No
<a href="#">FS 88</a>	<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>		<a href="#">Oppose</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
373.132	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	SD-O3	Retain SD-O3 as notified.		Accept	Agree with submitter.	No
419.30	Department of Conservation	SD-O1	Retain SD-O1 as notified.		Accept	Accept in part, subject to amendments made in response to other submissions.	No
<a href="#">FS 78</a>	<a href="#">Royal Forest &amp; Bird</a>		<a href="#">Support</a>		<a href="#">Accept</a>		
<b>Strategic Directions s42A report – Missed further submission points</b>							
325.3 <sup>3334</sup>	Kainga Ora	SD-O2	Amend SD-O2:  "Urban development and infrastructure that: 1. is consolidated and integrated with the <u>well-functioning</u> urban environments;	3.2	Accept in part	See the relevant section of the report. Accept the changes to SD-O2(1) to be consistent with the wording of Objective 1 of the NPS-UD.  Accept changes to SD-O2(2) as they are covered in other objectives in	Yes

<sup>33</sup> Michael & Jean Schluter FS89 support in part

<sup>34</sup> R & G Spark FS37 support; M Hales FS46 support

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
			<p>2. <del>that recognises existing character, planned urban form and amenity values, and is attractive and functional to residents, businesses and visitors;</del></p> <p>...</p> <p>4. provides a range <u>and mix</u> of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to achieve <u>at all times at least</u> the housing bottom lines in UFD-O1;</p> <p>...</p> <p>10. <del>recognise and support Ngāi Tūāhuriri cultural values through the protection of sites and areas of significance to Māori identified in SASM-SCHED1."</del></p>			<p>Strategic Direction and objectives and policies of Urban Form and Development. The submission point regarding the removal of existing character is no longer considered appropriate due to its linkages across most of the zone chapters in the PDP.</p> <p>Reject changes to SD-O2(4) as the wording does not reflect the intent of the NPS-UD, as the housing bottom lines are set for short-medium and long term.</p> <p>Reject changes to SD-O2(10) as it is inconsistent with the Sections 6(e) and 8 of the RMA.</p>	
<a href="#">FS 41</a>	<a href="#">David Cowley</a>		<a href="#">Support in part</a>		<a href="#">Reject</a>		

Strategic Directions updated Table 1: General Further Submissions

Further submitter	FS number	Provision	Submission number	Original submitter	Support / oppose	Outcome sought
I.W and L.M. Bisman	38	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Oppose
Waimakariri District Council	48	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	Oppose	Disallow
Martin Hewitt	60	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Whole disallowed
Steven Holland	72	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Whole disallowed
Michelle Holland	73	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Whole disallowed
Val & Ray Robb	74	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Whole disallowed
Edward & Justing Hamilton	75	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Whole disallowed
David & Elaine Brady	130	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Disallow
Jan Hadfield	132	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Disallow
Emma Wood	136	Whole submission	160	Rolleston Industrial Developments	Oppose	Disallow
MainPower NZ Ltd	58	Whole submission	325	Kainga Ora	Oppose	
Richard & Geoff Spark	37	Whole submission	325	Kainga Ora		Disallow
Miranda Hales	46	Whole submission	325	Kainga Ora	Oppose	Disallow
Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	85	Whole submission	325	Kainga Ora	Oppose	Disallow
R J Paterson Family Trust	91	Whole submission	325	Kainga Ora		Allow in part
Richard & Geoff Spark	37	Whole submission	360	Christchurch City Council		
Miranda Hales	46	Whole submission	360	Christchurch City Council	Oppose	Reject
CIAL	80	Whole submission	360	Christchurch City Council	Support	Accept
Richard & Geoff Spark	37	Whole submission	408	Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd		
Kainga Ora	88	Whole submission	207.1 - 207.49	Summerset Retirement Villages (Rangiora ) Ltd	Oppose	Disallow
Kainga Ora	88	Whole submission	254.01 - 254.155	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Oppose	Disallow
DEXIN Investment Ltd	101	Whole submission	416.1 - 416.15	Sports & Education Corporation	Support	Allow
Forest & Bird	78	Whole submission	419.1 - 419.155	Department of Conservation	Support	

**Proposed Waimakariri District Plan**

R J Paterson Family Trust	91	223.1 - 223.15 Covers Planning Maps, SD, UFD, SUB, RESZ, GRZ, WR	223	John and Coral Broughton		Allow in Part
FS Damian & Sarah Elley	28	236.1 - 236.28 covers PLANNING MAPS, SD, UFD, SUB, LLRZ, RESZ	236	Rick Allaway & Lionel Larsen	Support	
FS JP Bailey Family Trust	29	236.1 - 236.28 covers PLANNING MAPS, SD, UFD, SUB, LLRZ, RESZ	236	Rick Allaway & Lionel Larsen	Support	
FS Kim Manson & Neihana Kuru	30	236.1 - 236.28 covers PLANNING MAPS, SD, UFD, SUB, LLRZ, RESZ	236	Rick Allaway & Lionel Larsen	Support	
FS Ross Fraser	31	236.1 - 236.28 covers PLANNING MAPS, SD, UFD, SUB, LLRZ, RESZ	236	Rick Allaway & Lionel Larsen	Support	
FS L N R deLacy	32	236.1 - 236.28 covers PLANNING MAPS, SD, UFD, SUB, LLRZ, RESZ	236	Rick Allaway & Lionel Larsen	Support	
FB Louise Marriott	33	236.1 - 236.28 covers PLANNING MAPS, SD, UFD, SUB, LLRZ, RESZ	236	Rick Allaway & Lionel Larsen	Support	
<a href="#">Malcolm Dartnell</a>	<a href="#">4</a>	<a href="#">Whole submission</a>	<a href="#">236</a>	Rick Allaway & Lionel Larsen	<a href="#">Support</a>	<a href="#">Allow</a>
Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	85	242.1 - 242.14 covers PLANNING MAPS, SD, UFD, SUB, RESZ, GRZ, GENERAL	242	Dalkeith Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Disallow
Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	85	246.1 - 246.16 covers PLANNING MAPS, WR, SD, UFD, SUB, RESZ, GRZ, GENERAL	246	Miranda Hales		Disallow
Richard & Geoff Spark	37	Whole submission	295	Horticulture NZ	Oppose	Disallow
CIAL	80	Whole submission	295	Horticulture NZ	Support	Accept
CIAL	80	Whole submission	316	Canterbury Regional Council	Support	Accept
Rachel Hobson & Bernard Whimp	90	Whole submission	316	Canterbury Regional Council		Disallow in part
<a href="#">David Cowley</a>	<a href="#">41</a>	<a href="#">Whole Submission</a>	<a href="#">316</a>	<a href="#">Canterbury Regional Council</a>	<a href="#">Oppose</a>	<a href="#">Disallow</a>
<a href="#">David Cowley</a>	<a href="#">41</a>	<a href="#">Whole Submission</a>	<a href="#">360</a>	<a href="#">Christchurch City Council</a>	<a href="#">Oppose</a>	<a href="#">Disallow</a>